Palm Bay Magnet Senior High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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.](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

Palm Bay Magnet Senior High School

101 PIRATE LN, Melbourne, FL 32901

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	72%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kaminski, Jud	Principal	Principal Kaminski serves as the leader of PBMHS as he engages all stakeholders and collaborates in the school's decision making process.
Owens, Angela	Assistant Principal	Ms. Owens serves as the instructional leader of PBMHS, engages stakeholders collaborates in the school's decision making process.
Fahy, Paul	Assistant Principal	Mr. Fahy serves an instructional leader of PBMHS, engages stakeholders and collaborates in 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.
Newman, Michael	Dean	Mr. Newman 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.
Colona, Stefany	School Counselor	Ms. Colona is director of guidance and ensures our students meet the graduation requirements so they will achieve success in college and career.
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. Also, she monitors the Intensive Reading classes and promotes literacy across the curriculum.
Storer, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Ms. 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 as well, as collaborates in the school's decision making process.
Muse, Ellen	Magnet Coordinator	Ms. Muse serves as an instructional leader at PBMHS, engages stakeholders and collaborates in the school's decision making process. In addition, she is the Magnet and Partner's in Education Coordinator and collaborates in the school's decision making process.
Karikas, Jonna	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Karikas serves as the SAC Co-Chair and is an AVID coordinator 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.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hughes, Jennifer	Dean	Ms. Hughes serves as the SAC Co-Chair and is an instructional leader at PBMHS, engages stakeholders and collaborates in the school's decision making process. In addition, she is the Teacher on Assignment in the Dean's office and works diligently to implement Positive Behavior Intervention Strategies.

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

86

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,285

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	363	366	340	196	1265
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	84	91	35	313
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	69	50	15	203
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	40	44	8	138
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	48	72	21	199
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
LEVEL 1 on 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	106	77	27	330
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	135	81	24	348

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	107	94	74	20	295

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	37	67	41	15	160
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	37	35	18	128

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/30/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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	35	67	40	16	158
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	22	8	11	55

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				42%	59%	56%	41%	58%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	52%	51%	43%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	40%	42%	34%	44%	44%
Math Achievement				28%	48%	51%	34%	50%	51%
Math Learning Gains				41%	49%	48%	43%	46%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	45%	45%	35%	43%	45%
Science Achievement				44%	66%	68%	49%	67%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				60%	70%	73%	59%	70%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	40%	62%	-22%	55%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	44%	59%	-15%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

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
2021					
2019	43%	66%	-23%	67%	-24%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	58%	71%	-13%	70%	-12%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	16%	61%	-45%	61%	-45%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	37%	60%	-23%	57%	-20%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The following progress monitoring tools were used to compile the data below. English Language Arts used Reading Plus and Mathematics used MAP to progress monitor.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21%	16%	14%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	16%	14%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	10%	6%
	English Language Learners	8%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16.7%	30%	27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	26%	28%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	13%	6%
	English Language Learners	0%	25%	33%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	14.7%	16%	24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	14%	27%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	12%	8%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	14.7%	16%	24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	14%	27%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	12%	8%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Biology	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
US History	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27%	24%	18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	22%	17%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	4%	7%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11%	5%	13%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5%	3%	14%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	25%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29%	20%	9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27%	20%	12%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	13%	6%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3%	8%	0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	0%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	13	26	20	16	29	36	15	27		77	14
ELL	13	32	29	22	21		24			89	33
BLK	18	34	29	15	27	34	17	25		88	33
HSP	38	44	35	24	19	29	43	43		89	28
MUL	31	34	20	29	29		36	53		90	53

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
WHT	50	44	19	32	30	40	56	56		83	48
FRL	33	39	29	23	27	35	37	40		83	36

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	12	32	33	9	28	31	24	23		71	20
ELL	22	43	38	20	48	60	28	22		58	43
ASN				55							
BLK	24	43	41	17	32	28	32	45		79	42
HSP	46	45	27	30	49	48	45	58		82	51
MUL	50	64	58	40	43		58	65		81	50
WHT	52	50	47	35	44	63	52	71		83	54
FRL	37	44	38	26	40	38	39	53		80	45

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	11	30	26	16	41	42	23	28		70	27
ELL	17	31	32	25	45		18	29		57	
ASN	45	64									
BLK	26	37	38	21	36	40	26	48		66	40
HSP	40	42	33	27	41	29	51	48		75	51
MUL	56	52	30	31	47		53	77		65	60
WHT	49	45	29	46	46	40	60	70		83	52
FRL	36	40	32	29	43	39	43	57		73	40

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	444
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	83%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	42
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	46
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The Reading Plus progress monitoring showed a decline for all grade levels from Fall results till Spring results. Also, ELA learning gains for 2020-2021 of the lowest 25% decreased from 42% to 27%. In addition, there was an increase of students retained two or more times from 55 students to 124 students for the 2020-2021 school year. There was a trend for the 124 students retained two or more times, a total of 60 were students with disabilities (SWD). Student absences are a contributing factor to retention data as 29% of our student population demonstrates chronic absenteeism.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Algebra 1 EOC showed the lowest performance at 25% scoring level 3 or above on the 2020-2021 state assessments.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Factors that contributed to the decline include a lack of common planning time and differentiated instruction. Differentiated instruction was difficult due to e-learning and should be easier to implement this school year. Also, common planning time for Algebra 1 and English teachers was prioritized when creating the master schedule.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based off of the 2020-2021 Reading Plus progress monitoring, ELA achievement for 10th Grade increased from 14.7% in the Fall to 24% in the Spring.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Collaborative mutual and accountability meetings targeted the standards that proved challenging for students as well, as progress monitoring assisted with the needs of our students.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

WICOR strategies were included in pre-planning professional development at the start of the school year. WICOR strategies can also be considered best teaching practices and include writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization, and reading. AVID is offering tutoring 3 days per week for students who need assistance with MESH classes. ELA and IR teachers were given professional development during the summer, pre-planning, and semester 1 to garner confidence in effectively navigating instructional curriculum for English.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

AVID strategies are infused to our mandatory professional development since we strive to be a demonstration school and school of distinction. In addition, focused note-taking is an initiative at our school and will continue to be a focus in our professional developments.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Classroom walkthroughs will take place weekly by the school leadership team and instructional coaches to provide feedback for teachers. In addition, district resource teachers will walk through classrooms bi-weekly to look for trends to improve instruction and provide feedback.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Description: Increase MESH Student Achievement Rationale: Overall test scores for core subjects (Mathematics, English, Science, and History) decreased, and as a result, our projected school grade would have been a D if school grades were assigned by the state. Our overall math proficiency decreased 3%, our ELA proficiency decreased by 6%, science decreased by 4%, and social studies decreased by 17%.
Measurable Outcome:	- Increase our school grade by at least 10 points to achieve a school grade of a C. - Decrease chronic absenteeism from 29% to 20%
Monitoring:	To combat absenteeism, our school is currently pursuing to employ a parent liaison to target chronic absenteeism by offering support to families with getting their students to school contribute and transparency with school-home communication. With regard to MESH student achievement, there is a defined master schedule for 10 walk-through team members that is consistently monitored. A feedback worksheet is provided to monitor instruction and copies are kept by both parties. Admins, school coaches, and district resource teachers held meetings and determined what to look for to ensure quality instruction aligned with district and state standards. Teachers are evaluated for effectiveness and assigned into tiers. Classroom walkthrough frequency changes based on the tier the teacher falls into. The administrative team then meets weekly and feedback is provided to teachers via the instrument after the observation. Consistent feedback with our teachers will contribute to our goal of increased achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Owens (owens.angela@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Classroom walk through observation document, Collaborative and Mutual Accountability meetings, Planning Time, and discussion with support from district resource teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Researchers including Brown and Coley (2011) and Stephens (2011) called classroom walkthroughs a transformative tool with the power to provide meaningful data to holistically support leaders, teachers, and student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration will form teams including instructional coaches to support classroom walk throughs and create a schedule.
2. Pending parent liaison to target absenteeism and encourage attendance through PBIS initiatives.
3. Weekly walkthroughs targeting CBC and best practices to identify areas of strength are ongoing and teachers are being coached with a purpose.
4. Teachers will be evaluated with a multi-tier rubric to determine level of support.
5. Teachers will collaborate with district resource teachers and instructional coaches during department meetings.
6. District resource teachers will complete walk throughs using observable criteria with feedback focusing on improving standards based instruction.
7. CMA's are required to have documentation items turned into administration and feedback will be provided.
8. Classroom walkthrough trends will be identified to plan next steps for PD.
9. IA's are strategically assigned to maximize the support for students with disabilities (SWD).

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Description: Increase Algebra 1 and 9th/10th grade English Language Arts Performance Rationale: 25% of our students scored level 3 or above in 2020-2021 compared to 28% in 2019-2020.
Measurable Outcome:	PBMHS 9th graders will improve ELA state assessment scores by at least 15% and Algebra 1 EOC scores by at least 13%
Monitoring:	Classroom walk throughs will include feedback by using defined criteria specific to identify quality instruction / needs with copies kept by both parties. Instructional coaches will provide feedback and address any instructional needs with teachers. In addition, Collaborative and Mutual Accountability groups will be required to submit agendas and/or notes to admins for feedback. MAP and SRI data will be utilized to assess student outcomes prior to end of the year assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Owens (owens.angela@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	WICOR Strategies (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading), Collaborative and Mutual Accountability meetings, and Planning Time.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The BERC Study (AVID Schoolwide Impact) found that students can learn skills, behaviors, and techniques for academic success, especially when teachers have been trained and coached in effective instructional strategies to build a college-going culture.

Action Steps to Implement

1. CMA groups were selected based on subject level and meetings will focus on student performance and will include submission to administration with feedback.
2. ELA and IR will have department meetings to share one vision/one voice.
3. Algebra 1 and ELA teachers were provided common planning and as a result, will be able to vertically plan with feeder middle school(s) to determine curricular focused needs.
4. Teachers and Instructional Coaches will progress monitor with MAP and SRI, analyze data and inform instruction based on student needs.
5. Teachers were trained in WICOR during pre-planning.
6. Classroom walk throughs will occur to look for trends to improve instruction and provide feedback.
7. Schoolwide graduation requirement posters will be provided and mandatory in all classrooms for a visual student reminder of minimum test scores.
8. SWD in all Learning Strategies classes are receiving Algebra 1 review problems for daily bell work.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Description: Increase Biology / U.S History Performance Rationale: 40% of our students passed the Biology EOC in 2020-2021 compared to 44% in 2019-2020. In addition, U.S History showed the the largest decline, as 43% of our students passed the EOC in 2020-2021 compared to 60% in 2019-2020
Measurable Outcome:	PBMHS will improve Biology EOC scores by at least 5% and U.S History EOC scores by at least 12%.
Monitoring:	Our school currently hosts a "Bio Skills Day" to help maximize student achievement in this area. Teachers with same curriculums collaborate in CMA groups to evaluate strategies for implementation. In CMA groups, teachers will assess areas of weakness within their department and create instruction based on student performance. These teachers will evaluate a common assessment, and will re-teach components based on student performance in class and on formative/summative assessments. Regarding focused note-taking, summative assessments will include extended response answers which will help evaluate FNT success.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Owens (owens.angela@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	WICOR Strategies (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading) / FNT (Focused Note-Taking). Teachers provide feedback when students utilize focused note-taking and should be revisiting these notes at least 5 times total to allow students the ability to process what they are writing.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Fox (2003) and Christianakis (2010), "Without collaboration, academic researchers run the risk of developing ideas only through their data, while practitioners risk developing ideas only through interactions with students". Teacher collaboration ensures that shared teacher mastery is represented and that knowledge production is not undirectional. This article also shares research that states how teacher collaboration also helps, "Build reciprocal alliances amongst teachers as well as between teachers and academics. Alliance building helps create communities of educators who have common instructional goals and agendas." Christianakis, Mary (2010). Collaborative Research and Teacher Education. Issues in Teacher Education: 19(2).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Facilitate WICOR / FNT refresher for faculty during pre-planning. Also, FNT is infused in all courses and students will receive feedback/grades.
2. Teachers and instructional coaches will plan lessons in CMA's incorporating WICOR strategies / FNT , analyzing data, and planning next steps.
3. Enrichment / Skills Days for Biology and U.S History will incorporate WICOR strategies / FNT regularly throughout the year to provide practice / review / test preparation (supported by resource teachers).
4. Skills Days will involve all students including students with disabilities and EOC questions will be reviewed as their common assessment.
5. Classroom walk-throughs targeting CBC (Common Board Configuration) and evidence of WICOR / FNT strategies will occur bi-weekly with feedback.
6. Schoolwide graduation requirements specific posters will be provided and required to display in all classrooms for visual student reminders of required minimum test scores.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Focus: 25% of our students scored a level 1 in ELA and 20% of our students scored a level 1 in Math and 16% of our students had at least 1 or more ISS or OSS.

Rationale: For the 2021-2022 school year, Palm Bay Magnet High School is in year two of implementing the Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (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 of school suspensions, and high-frequency disciplinary infractions. The addition of student "time-out" periods have been implemented in hopes of providing consequences that will improve student behavior while limiting instructional seat time.

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.

Palm Bay Magnet High School has some challenges and successes in regards to building a positive school culture and environment. According to the Winter 2020 Insight Data for PBMHS, the Academic Opportunity section, decreased as 37% of teachers responded that they use the adopted curriculum rather than materials found or created. A school wide-effort by administrators, district resource teachers, instructional coaches, and department chairs promoting the use of district curriculum will improve this aspect. Furthermore, Collaborative and Mutual Accountability agendas and notes will be submitted to the AP Curriculum for feedback to ensure use of the district adopted materials while using data to progress monitor student achievement.

The January 2021 Youth Truth Survey revealed that PBMHS scored lowest in "Culture" described by "students and staff do not trust each other with enough respect and fairness." PBMHS is in year two of

implementing the Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) which is a problem-solving data-driven framework to improve outcomes for all students. In addition, PBMHS' key expectations for all students is to be respectful, responsible, prompt, and prepared.

The Parent Survey indicated that 92% of parents felt welcomed at PBMHS and most of our parents were interested in attending information meetings and/or activities focused on, "Planning for College and Career." As a result, we plan to increase the frequency of these informational resources so that parents are informed. Including College Informational Nights to educate and provide resources to families for their students' academic resources.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Deans Office:
-Offers incentives (Pirate Bucks) based on teacher referrals
-Students use Pirate Bucks at PBIS store on Fridays
-Weekly announcements to remind students of expectations
-Student of the week are recognized

Faculty:
-Complete PBIS poster of positive behavioral expectations with students
-Utilize the reward system with incentives
-Stand at doorway during class change to greet and meet students to set a positive tone

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00