Brevard Public Schools

Bayside High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| | |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| | |
| School Information | 7 |
| | |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| | |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 24 |
| | _ |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

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

| 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) | 51% |
| 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: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (52%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | ermation* |
| 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. Fo | or more information, click here. |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

- 1. have a school grade of D or F
- 2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
- 3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Information | 7 |
| | , |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Bayside High School

1901 DEGROODT RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

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

School Demographics

| School Type and Gi (per MSID | | 2020-21 Title I Schoo | l Disadvan | Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|------------|--|
| High Scho 9-12 | ool | No | | 56% |
| Primary Servio (per MSID I | • • | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 48% |
| School Grades Histo | ory | | | |
| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
| Grade | | В | В | В |

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.

Empowering students to embrace learning by promoting excellence and independence to become responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through a supportive culture, we will engage every learner in academically challenging activities and build strong relationships that inspire responsible citizenship and foster readiness for college and careers.

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 |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|
| Zander, Holli | Principal | Oversees the running of the administrative teams and their individual objectives. 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. |
| Torlak, Naim | Assistant Principal | Leads and organizes facility-based needs and the teams that address them. Assesses teacher instruction to foster positive pedagogical growth. |
| Crews, Tiffany | Assistant Principal | Monitors and influences student behaviors throughout the school in her role as dean. Assesses teacher instruction to foster positive pedagogical growth. |
| Gladden, Michael | Assistant Principal | Monitors and influences student behaviors throughout the school in her role as dean. Assesses teacher instruction to foster positive pedagogical growth. |

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.

1

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.

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

91

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,672

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

8

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

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indiantar | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 472 | 478 | 432 | 286 | 1668 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 140 | 113 | 62 | 417 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 14 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 | 132 | 86 | 37 | 368 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 | | | | | | Gr | ade | Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 88 | 78 | 10 | 202 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 41 | 34 | 11 | 111 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/3/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 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 | 66 | 73 | 41 | 36 | 216 |
| One or more suspensions | 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 | 77 | 66 | 52 | 20 | 215 |
| Course failure in Math | 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 | 65 | 85 | 63 | 40 | 253 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 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 | | | | | | G | irac | l et | _ev | el | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|------|-----|----|-----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| 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 | |

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 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 | 66 | 73 | 41 | 36 | 216 |
| One or more suspensions | 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 | 77 | 66 | 52 | 20 | 215 |
| Course failure in Math | 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 | 65 | 85 | 63 | 40 | 253 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 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 | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|-------|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| Students with two or more indicators | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 101 | 63 | 52 | 298 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 |

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).

| Sahaal Crada Component | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State | |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 54% | 59% | 56% | 55% | 58% | 56% | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 49% | 52% | 51% | 56% | 53% | 53% | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 37% | 40% | 42% | 46% | 44% | 44% | |
| Math Achievement | | | | 45% | 48% | 51% | 43% | 50% | 51% | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 46% | 49% | 48% | 42% | 46% | 48% | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 34% | 45% | 45% | 36% | 43% | 45% | |
| Science Achievement | | | | 66% | 66% | 68% | 68% | 67% | 67% | |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 60% | 70% | 73% | 65% | 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 | 54% | 62% | -8% | 55% | -1% | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | nparison | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 59% | -5% | 53% | 1% | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -54% | | | | | | | | | |

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

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

| | | BIOLO | GY EOC | | |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 64% | 66% | -2% | 67% | -3% |
| | | CIVIC | S EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| | | HISTO | RY EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 59% | 71% | -12% | 70% | -11% |
| • | | ALGEB | RA EOC | • | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 30% | 61% | -31% | 61% | -31% |
| | | GEOME | TRY EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |

| | GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | | | | | |
|------|--------------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State | | | | | |
| 2019 | 53% | 60% | -7% | 57% | -4% | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool for ELA was Reading Plus. The progress monitoring tool for math was the MAP assessment. Brevard Public Schools does not progress monitor Biology or U.S. History.

| | | Grade 9 | | |
|--------------------------|--|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 38% | 40% | 42% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 30% | 35% | 32 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 9% | 7% | 13% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 9% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| | | Grade 10 | | |
|--------------------------|--|----------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 42% | 40% | 36% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 34% | 35% | 31% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15% | 17% | 15% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| | | Grade 11 | | |
|--------------------------|--|----------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 30% | 25% | 21% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 23% | 22% | 20% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8% | 8% | 12% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 12% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| | | Grade 12 | | |
|--------------------------|--|----------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 4% | 12% | 16% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 8% | 8% | 8% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 0% | 12% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

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 | 25 | 19 | 11 | 25 | 26 | 22 | 41 | | 87 | 34 |
| ELL | 16 | 26 | 23 | 11 | 12 | 16 | 32 | 44 | | 82 | |
| BLK | 27 | 35 | 20 | 17 | 23 | 22 | 31 | 41 | | 93 | 58 |
| HSP | 31 | 31 | 25 | 25 | 23 | 33 | 47 | 45 | | 84 | 49 |
| MUL | 51 | 54 | | 39 | 41 | | 72 | 60 | | 78 | 71 |

| 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 | 47 | 42 | 27 | 31 | 26 | 26 | 63 | 73 | | 88 | 63 |
| FRL | 34 | 35 | 23 | 23 | 24 | 24 | 45 | 52 | | 86 | 56 |
| 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 |
| 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 | SCHO | DL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 |

ESSA Data Review

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

| 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 | 45 | | | | |
| 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 | 57 | | | | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 499 | | | | |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 | | | | |
| Percent Tested | | | | | |
| Subgroup Data | | | | | |
| Students With Disabilities | | | | | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 30 | | | | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 32 |
| 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 | 38 |
| 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 | 41 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 58 |
| 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 | 49 |
| 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 | 42 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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?

During the 2020/21 SY Bayside was below the district and state averages in proficiency in all core content areas. Students with disabilities and English Language Learners were the subgroups that were significantly out performed by other subgroups

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

The core content areas that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement are ELA, Algebra, and Geometry. Only 40% of students were proficient on the ELA FSA. Whereas, 15.9% of ELL students and 13.1% of SWD were proficient. on the ELA FSA. In addition, only 26.7% of students were proficient in Algebra and Geometry. EOC. Whereas, 10.6% of ELL students and 10.8% of SWD were proficient. on the Algebra and Geometry. EOC.

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

Due to COVID 19 and the elearning option instruction was sporadic and inconsistent. The Bayside Achievement Mentorship program was unsuccessful as a result of many of the students not being in school. ELL and SWD students were disproportionately affected by this. Given that all students are in person this year, the full implementation of the Bayside Achievement Mentorship program would be a way to address this need for improvement.

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

Based on the state assessments U.S. History saw the lowest dip in proficiency. Unfortunately, proficiency and learning gains declined in all areas and subgroups.

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

Due to COVID 19 and the elearning option instruction was sporadic and inconsistent.

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

All U.S. History English I, English II, and Algebra, classes will be set up in Edgenuity. Students will be assigned the virtual tutor for the weakest strand within the subject area. For U.S. History, Global Military, Political and Economic Challenges: 1890-1940 was assigned since it was the weakest strand during the .2020-21 SY. For English, Integration of Knowledge was assigned since it was the weakest strand during the .2020-21 SY. For Algebra, Functions and Modeling was assigned since it was the weakest strand during the .2020-21 SY. Each department will t to utilize this tool consistently in order to accelerate learning by increasing background knowledge in the various strands.

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.

The literacy coach will set up the classes for teachers in Edgenuity and demonstrate how to enroll students in courses so teachers can become autonomous in their use of the acceleration tool. Teachers will also receive PD during preplanning and within their PLC's in the use of high impact strategies such as Focused Note- Taking.

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

Administrative walkthroughs will increase during the use of the acceleration tool in order to provide feedback to the teacher on their utilization of the tool. Data will be analyzed every grading period to determine if the utilization of the tool is effective. Modifications to the program will be made based on the data and student need.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and

Based on the Youth Truth Survey there is a need to increase positive relationships, belonging, and collaboration among students. There are also 350 students with two or more early warning indicators and a need to increase attendance and academic achievement within this group.

Measurable Outcome:

Rationale:

Reduce the number of retentions by 50% from the previous year and increase positive relationships between students and staff.

Monitoring:

This will be monitored by the MTSS Data Team

Person responsible

Tiffany Crews (crews.tiffany@brevardschools.org)

for monitoring outcome:

outcome:

Evidence-

Strategy:

based

We will utilize the MTSS process. According to the MTSS Guidebook for Brevard Public Schools, integrated academic and behavioral instruction and intervention is delivered to students in varying intensities (multiple tiers) based on student need. The three tiers are Core Instruction (Tier 1), Supplemental Instruction (Tier 2), and Intensive Instruction (Tier 2).

3).

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: Identification of student strengths and weaknesses as part of a problem-solving team are instrumental in giving feedback that deals directly with interventions that could contribute to student engagement. In order for the systemic intervention to take place on campus a school-wide model needs to be addressed and proposed to involve all staff in the process of an intervention model". Key components of the MTSS process that our school needs to improve or implement for the intervention process to be successful have been identified based on research, professional development, personal experience, feedback from administration and colleagues, and trial and error.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. Students with two or more early warning indicators will be placed on the MTSS list to be reviewed by the data team (monthly).
- 2. Students that were not successful during the 2020/21 SY in relation to attendance or retention will be assigned a mentor through the Bayside Achievement Mentorship Program.
- 4. Academic and attendance reports will be ran monthly to determine additional students in need of interventions.
- Data team will select students to participate in Student Voice and SAC.
- 6. Coaches/ Sponsors will be encouraged to incorporate strategies to enhance faculty and staff involvement with students outside the classroom.

Person Responsible

Tiffany Crews (crews.tiffany@brevardschools.org)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback

Area of

Focus
Description
and

According to the Insight Survey 9 out of the 11 categories improved. However, an opportunity for improvement teachers' interest in more frequent feedback relating to instructional practice by administration.

Rationale:

Measurable Outcome: Increased informal observation and feedback by administration will result in an improved score on the Insight Survey from 5.2 to the Brevard average of 6.1. In addition, student achievement on statewide assessments in all school grade components will increase by improved instructional practice.

improved instructional practice.

This will be monitored by the leadership team. Leadership team members will share out the number of classrooms they were able to observe the previous week, and adjust coverage needs so all leadership can get in to classrooms to observe.

Person responsible

Monitoring:

for monitoring outcome:

Michael Gladden (gladden.michael@brevardschools.org)

Evidencebased Strategy: Increasing the frequency of informal teacher observations by administrative staff will in turn provide the teacher more frequent feedback regarding their instructional practice. This will allow teachers to change instructional practices that are deficient in a a timely manner. Furthermore, it will enhance teacher efficacy for those teachers that are demonstrating

exemplary professional practice.

Rationale for Evidence-

"Feedback is what allows teachers to grow and improve. Without feedback, poor teachers may assume that their instruction is satisfactory, and successful teachers may remain indefinitely anxious about their performance. Translate your focus on student achievement and improvement of instruction into immediate and meaningful feedback for staff."

based Strategy:

Kafele, B. K. (2015). Instructional Leadership. In The Principal 50: Critical Leadership Questions for Inspiring Schoolwide Excellence (pp. [35]-41). ASCD.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. Present Area of Focus from SIP at Preplanning.
- 2. Each administrator will conduct informal observations or classroom walkthroughs, two times a week.
- 3. Administrators will coordinate with one another to protect observation time and conduct observations together in order to promote consistency in feedback from all administrative staff.
- 4. Following the observation a feedback note will be left on the teacher's desk or mailbox.
- 5. Observation feedback will be shared with evaluating administrator to be included in the evaluation(s).

Person Responsible

Michael Gladden (gladden.michael@brevardschools.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of

Focus
Description
and

Two subgroups missed the ESSA federal index target, which were students with disabilities and English Language Learners. Only 17% of ELL students were proficient in ELA and only 21% of SWD were.

Rationale:

Measurable Outcome: Our ELL students will demonstrate 31% proficiency in ELA by May 2022, as measured by the ELA FSA. Our SWD will demonstrate 35% proficiency in ELA by May 2022, as

measured by the ELA FSA.

Monitoring:

This area will be monitored through the school-wide progress monitoring Reading Inventory as well as review of individual student grades and attendance by the MTSS Data team.

Person responsible

for monitoring outcome:

John Johnson (johnson.john@brevardschools.org)

Evidencebased Strategy: ELL students and SWD will attend tutoring opportunities with Intensive Reading teachers, Learning Strategies teachers, ESOL assistants, and BAM mentor teachers. During this time the teachers will conduct data chats with these students and allow the student to access the READ 180 intervention program. In addition, we will seek involvement from parents of students in both these subgroups by increasing thheir membership in the School Advisory

Council.

Baker and colleagues' (2002) meta-analysis of effective mathematics interventions is instructive for any intervention. They advise that interventions should include:

Rationale for

- A feedback mechanism for student and teacher to continuously foster learning gains.
- Peer interaction to further scaffold student understanding.

Evidencebased Strategy:

Explicit instruction that emphasizes skill building.

Fisher, Douglas, and Nancy Frey. "Supplemental Interventions: A Second-Level Defense."

Enhancing RTI: How to Ensure Success with Effective Classroom Instruction &

Intervention, ASCD, 2010, pp. 51-74.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. Present Area of Focus from SIP at Preplanning.
- 2. Pre-planning PD regarding ELL best practices.
- 3. Pre-planning PD regarding ESE best practices and IEP writing training for case managers.
- 4. Invite parents to first SAC meeting.
- 5. Implement student tutoring opportunities.
- 6. Literacy Coach retrieves data for data chats.
- 7. Literacy Coach coordinates progress monitoring.
- 8. MTSS Data team reviews student progress monthly.

Person Responsible

John Johnson (johnson.john@brevardschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In 2019 Bayside scored below the district and state averages in all School Grade Components. During classroom walkthroughs it was evident that many students were not engaged during instruction. For example, during a lecture students were passively listening to the teacher. Therefore, PLC/ CMA's will be implemented schoolwide. Peer observations was an area lacking on the most recent Insight Survey. Incorporating Professional Learning Communities provides teachers the opportunity to collaborate on instructional practices that will increase student learning. Providing an environment where peers can observe, make mistakes, reflect, and improve professional practice will also create a positive culture within the school. During the last FSA administration, 54% of students were proficient in ELA and 45% were proficient in math.

Measurable Outcome:

Bayside will score above state and district averages in all School Grade Components

during the 2021/2022 SY.

The implementation of effective instructional strategies (i.e. differentiated Instruction, focused note-taking, and formative assessment) will be monitored through classroom observations by administration as well as documentation of discussion within PLC notes. Student achievement will be monitored through the Reading Inventory and MAP progress

monitoring tools.

Person responsible

Monitoring:

for Naim Torlak (torlak.naim@brevardschools.org)

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased Strategy: PLC's will meet twice a month. They will be provided data as it relates to their students and will be shown how to access this data themselves. During PLC time teachers will collaborate, develop, and reflect on which type of focused notes they will utilize within their classroom and which formative assessments they will use to check for understanding. The school will utilize substitutes so PLC members can observe each other and provide one another feedback on instructional practice.

"This study concludes that school leaders must provide supportive and shared leadership structures for teachers in order to ensure a positive school culture and effective professional learning communities that impact school improvement. Leaders in schools must work directly with teachers to create policies and procedures that provide teachers the leadership structure to directly impact school improvement through professional

for Evidencebased Strategy:

Rationale

Carpenter, D. (2015), "School culture and leadership of professional learning communities", Vol. 29 No. 5, pp. 682-694. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-04-2014-0046

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. Present Area of Focus from SIP at Preplanning.
- 2. Preplanning PD on effective instructional strategies (Differentiated Instruction, Focused Notes, Formative Assessment, and Data Analysis).
- 3. Schedule PLC Meeting times/expectations.
- 4. Provide PLC's with student data.
- 5. Peers will conduct walkthroughs to view teachers utilizing effective instructional strategies.
- 6. During PLC time, peers will reflect and share observations of instructional practice. Data will be analyzed, instructional strategies will be modified, and gaps will be addressed.

Person Responsible

Naim Torlak (torlak.naim@brevardschools.org)

learning community collaborative efforts."

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

There are 394 students that have less than 90% attendance rate or have 5 or more referrals. We currently have 101 instructional and non-instructional faculty members. Students that were not successful during the 2020/21 SY in relation to attendance, retention, or discipline will be assigned a mentor through the Bayside Achievement Mentorship Program. Mentors will hold bimonthly meetings with mentee, review grades, discipline, and attendance, and develop and discuss SMART goals. Mentors will also communicate with parents, counselors, teachers and refer mentees as needed to administration, counselors, the social worker, or MTSS data team. Discipline and attendance reports will be reviewed weekly by the dean to determine additional students in need of interventions. The MTSS data team will encourage students on the Bayside Achievement Mentorship Program to participate on the School Advisory Council to enhance leadership and a sense of belonging among this group. Coaches and club sponsors will also incorporate strategies to enhance faculty and staff involvement with students outside the classroom.

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.

Bayside will create a positive school culture among all stakeholders by creating a new mission and vision statement. At the conclusion of the 2020/21 SY the School Advisory Council approved a process for developing the mission and vision statements that includes students, staff, parents, and community members. Developing these statements with input from all stakeholders will foster a positive school culture. Bayside will also try to build a positive school culture by increasing participation in the School Advisory Council. This will be accomplished by actively recruiting SAC members at registration and throughout the school year.

Bayside will further build a positive school culture by enhancing its social media. SAC members stated at the end of the 2020/21 SY that they felt Bayside's social media could be better utilized to disseminate school information. This will be accomplished by involving teachers and students regarding social media content and communicating that content with parents and community members. Involving everyone will create a collaborative culture and positive environment.

Bayside will create a positive culture and environment for students specifically by providing at risk students with a mentor through the Bayside Achievement Mentorship (BAM) Program. According to Mentoring.org, mentoring has significant positive effects on high levels of absenteeism and recurring behavior problems. Student will also be given the opportunity to give their input on school matters in addition to SAC through "Student Voice". Diverse groups of students will meet with administration to problem solve issues on campus in order to create a more positive school environment. Administration will celebrate positive student achievement through a monthly recognition program.

Bayside will create a positive culture and environment for teachers specifically by increasing the frequency of feedback of their instructional practice by visiting classrooms more often. This will lead to increased teacher efficacy and morale. Administration and peers will also be able to submit teachers and staffs names and positive comments to the "Brag on a Bear" box. Names and comments will be drawn at faculty meetings for various prizes and the remainder will be displayed in the mailroom on the "Brag on a Bear" board. In addition, monthly celebrations to promote faculty/staff comradery and build positive collegial relationships will be organized.

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

Holli Zander- Vision and Mission
Tiffany Crews- Student Voice Coordinator
Tiffany Crews- BAM Program Coordinator
Tiffany Crews- Student/ Faculty Recognition/ Celebrations
Michael Gladden-Classroom walk throughs
Brandon Sherrill- Social Media Communication
Scott Head/ Rick Flesher- School Advisory Council