

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Brandon Success Center



2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 7 |
| Planning for Improvement | 12 |
| R.A.I.S.E | 0 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |

Brandon Success Center

1019 N PARSONS RD, Seffner, FL 33584

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jeanne Terry Byrd

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2021

| | |
|--|--|
| 2021-22 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Function (per accountability file) | Alternative |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 6-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Alternative Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | |
| School Improvement Rating History | 2021-22: I 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: No Rating 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: No Rating |
| DJJ Accountability Rating | 2023-24: No Rating |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Brandon EPIC-3 will provide a safe, structured learning environment that promotes the academic and social changes that allow students to achieve their highest level of success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Brandon EPIC-3 will be the model for non-traditional alternative education programs nationwide.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

Students needing a smaller learning environment with wrap around services and interventions to guide their path to success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Terry-Byrd, Jeanne | Principal | Supervise and facilitate the daily operations of the school. Creating Educational Objectives. One of the primary duties of a school principal is to oversee School Finances. School principals are largely responsible for overseeing their schools'... Train and Evaluate Staff. School principals must work closely with teachers to ensure... Interaction With Students and Parents. |
| Bramlett, Glenn | Assistant Principal | Performs responsible administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, personnel, curriculum, public relations. |

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/20/2021, Jeanne Terry Byrd

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

13

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

7

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

130

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

1

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

1

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 | 14 | 23 | 13 | 22 | 16 | 9 | 97 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 40 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 23 | 13 | 22 | 16 | 9 | 97 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 19 | 10 | 18 | 14 | 8 | 79 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 21 | 11 | 21 | 14 | 8 | 86 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 30 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 21 | 11 | 20 | 14 | 7 | 84 |

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 | 14 | 22 | 11 | 20 | 15 | 9 | 91 |

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 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 8 | 18 | 11 | 5 | 57 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/26/2021

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 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 38 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 27 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 8 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 10 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 15 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 13 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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 | | | | | 56% | 56% | | 54% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | | 54% | 51% | | 53% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 41% | 42% | | 43% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | | 49% | 51% | | 48% | 51% |

| School Grade Component | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | | 48% | 48% | | 49% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 45% | 45% | | 45% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | | 69% | 68% | | 65% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | | 75% | 73% | | 73% | 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 |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 15% | 53% | -38% | 54% | -39% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 6% | 54% | -48% | 52% | -46% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -15% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 4% | 53% | -49% | 56% | -52% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 55% | -55% | 55% | -55% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 53% | -53% | 53% | -53% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 49% | -49% | 55% | -55% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 62% | -62% | 54% | -54% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 31% | -31% | 46% | -46% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 4% | 47% | -43% | 48% | -44% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 25% | 66% | -41% | 67% | -42% |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 5% | 67% | -62% | 71% | -66% |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 73% | -73% | 70% | -70% |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 30% | 63% | -33% | 61% | -31% |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 57% | -57% | 57% | -57% |

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 |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 |

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 | 3 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 3 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 1 |
| Percent Tested | |

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

| | |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |

English Language Learners

| | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 0 |
| 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 | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 0 |
| 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.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the Areas of Focus?

Data analysis and data chats with teachers, school counselor, Transition specialist and Leadership team.

Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our lowest level readers improved their reading skills according to the data gather from Achieve 3000.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

Reading skill improvement will impact the learning of our students.

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

The need for improvement in reading is the most common trend across these groups, levels and content areas.

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

Continued use of reading instruction and a focus on vocabulary development will assist the students in greater learning gains.

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.

Standards Based Lesson Planning along with exposure to the BEST standards will be offered for professional development.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Improve Student Literacy through the use of strategically planned lessons that aligned with the Florida BEST standards and a balanced curriculum.

Increase the Reading Level of students which will translate into better understanding and increased comprehension.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Improve student performance in reading based on data from School City, FSA scores, and curriculum baseline assessment scores to the proficiency level.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress monitoring with the use of Achieve 3000.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Glenn Bramlett (glenn.bramlett@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

1. Teachers who are involved in coaching cycles, including modeling, and giving focused feedback (written and/or face-to-face) from assigned admin at least weekly. Other team members at least twice monthly in order to provide individual feedback about progress and continued needs assessments.

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

2. Focused walk-throughs conducted by admin team in order to provide school-wide feedback about progress in the classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Research indicates teachers are able to retain and apply new learning and skills when support and PD is provided in the classroom/school setting with colleagues.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Professional Development regarding Standards and aligning Task Complexity to Standards.
2. Lesson Modeling / Demonstration Classrooms.
3. Increase student engagement and hands-on opportunities as well as exposure to supplemental materials and resources.

Person Responsible

Glenn Bramlett (glenn.bramlett@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

Our areas of focus are related of one or more of our ESSA subgroups.

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Creating a Positive School Culture and Climate (SCC) for both Faculty and Students

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

ASQI Survey Results, Discipline Data, and Teacher Retention rates all suggest that SCC suffered last year. Stakeholder perception (Including Teachers, Students, and Community) can negatively impact participation in school functions and performance. Student time spent out of classroom as a result of unexcused absences and disciplinary actions impeded academic performance.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

On the 2020-2021 ASQI Survey, results in all components of the following domains will increase at least 10% for the upcoming year:

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The 2021-2022 ASQI data will be analyzed for progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeanne Terry-Byrd (jeanne.terry-byrd@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Brandon EPIC-3 will implement systems of supports for Teachers, Students, and Families/Community Stakeholders including on-boarding for new staff, PBIS, on-going reinforcement of systems/expectations for all, increased involvement opportunities for all stakeholders and encouraging teacher leadership.

1. Stakeholders who feel valued and included in school happenings and decision-making, will improve our overall culture and climate.
2. Teacher retention will improve through the on-boarding supports that will be provided to new teachers.
3. Students will be explicitly taught expectations that will be reinforced consistently via incentives and Social Emotional Learning (SEL). Enabling SEL opportunities for students regularly will provide them with the tools to successfully manage emotions and allow for positive social experiences.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Shared Decision-making amongst the faculty will increase buy-in, resulting in increased participation in school initiatives and functions.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. School-wide implementation of PBIS with fidelity (Point Sheets).
2. New Teacher On-Boarding process throughout the school year that is tailored to their needs.
3. Implementation of SEL.
4. Grade-level assemblies at the start of each semester to reinforce expectations.
5. Shared decision-making, when appropriate, via Committees, Leadership Team, and PLCs.
6. Increased opportunity for Family and Community Involvement via building partnerships within the community, the SAC, and more frequent communication with Families, etc. Parent liaison will assist and

mange Parent room resources.

7. MTSS/Data Team will coordinate Tier 2 and 3 Interventions.

Person Responsible

Jeanne Terry-Byrd (jeanne.terry-byrd@hcps.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

Our areas of focus are related of one or more of our ESSA subgroups.

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The use of Restorative Practices will be used as an alternative to OSS.

Measurable Outcome:
 State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

10 percent increase in Restorative Practices as a use for discipline.

Monitoring:
 Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Discipline data will be analyzed

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeanne Terry-Byrd
 (jeanne.terry-byrd@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

PBIS, Interventions surrounding our EdConnect Behavior Tracker, Student Enrichment Team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Based on prior years data, these strategies have shown marked improvement over previous reporting periods.

Action Steps to Implement:
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. AP and student support staff created interventions based on behavior tracker data
2. Student Enrichment Team discussions based n success of behavior tracker data
3. restorative Practices Circles within classrooms
4. Student PBIS point sheets
5. Increased collaboration between classroom teachers and lab managers

Person Responsible

Jeanne Terry-Byrd
 (jeanne.terry-byrd@hcps.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:
 If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

Our areas of focus are related of one or more of our ESSA subgroups.

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.

Motivation, success, and feeling valued are what drives individuals, at any level and in any profession. In the school setting, it is critically important that we celebrate and recognize the outstanding accomplishments of our school community, both inside and outside of our campus.

Below compiles a list of attributes we will execute an Brandon EPIC-3:

1. Invest in People--Build relationships
2. Have a Shared Vision
3. Be the Role Model--Set the Standard
4. Praise and Celebrate

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

1. Contributions from our Community Stakeholders who feel valued and included in school happenings and decision-making, will improve our overall culture and climate.
2. Teacher retention will improve through the on-boarding supports that will be provided to new teachers.
3. Students will be explicitly taught expectations that will be reinforced consistently via incentives and Social Emotional Learning (SEL). Enabling SEL opportunities for students regularly will provide them with the tools to successfully manage emotions and allow for positive social experiences.

Shared Decision-making amongst the faculty will increase buy-in, resulting in increased participation in school initiatives and functions.