

Brevard Public Schools

Eau Gallie High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	13
III. Planning for Improvement	18
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Eau Gallie High School

1400 COMMODORE BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32935

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To serve every student with excellence as the standard. (Revisited SY22)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Eau Gallie High School will serve every student in an environment of college and career readiness by delivering the highest quality education in a culture of professionalism, collaboration, and learning.
(Revisited SY22)

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the 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
Barton, Keith	Principal	<p>Create mission and vision statements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Model instructional delivery methods at faculty meetings, observe and guide teachers to best practices in the classroom based on the evaluation rubric, IPPAS. - Provide support to all stakeholders by taking input and keeping them informed on operations and progress of the school - Evaluate and mentor department chairs and administrative staff - Create Budget / Respond to Audit - Support athletic director and programs to facilitate activities - Rule on administrative hearings facilitated by the administrative team - Identify future educational leaders and facilitate growth - AVID site team member, provide input and support for AVID strategies across the campus
Gladden, Michael	Assistant Principal	<p>Serves as an instructional leader, guiding teachers to further improve instructional practice through observations and feedback using evaluation tool, state standards, and assessment data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oversee teacher certifications and renewals - Ensure teachers follow district curriculum guides - Monitor the use of curriculum guides and the use of proper texts to ensure pacing is following FLDOE state standards - Create and oversee the master schedule - Track graduation rates - Oversee testing and aggregate data from testing - AVID site team member, provide input and support for AVID strategies across the campus
Farrell, Robert	Assistant Principal	<p>Serves as an instructional leader, guiding teachers to further improve instructional practice through observations and feedback using IPPAS, state standards, and assessment data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Administrative contact for Eau Gallie's ESE program - Work with Instructional Assistants - Review ESE student data to help with the master schedule - A member of the school's MTSS team - School Advisory Council Member - AVID site team member, provide input and support for AVID strategies across the campus

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Briley, Mileah	Dean	<p>Serves as an instructional leader, guiding teachers to further improve instructional practice through observations and feedback using evaluation tool, state standards, and assessment data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manage and positively influence student behavior by monitoring and analyzing discipline data to drive school-wide practices for student engagement, behavior, and positive school culture - Member and administrative representative for the PBIS team - Teacher evaluations and constructive conversations - Analyze and aggregate student data - Involve stakeholders in school improvement by gathering and analyzing feedback to offer support and create plans for improvement. - Support and build the capacity of teachers through professional development - Collaborate with the administrative team and stakeholders for the school decision-making process - Lead PLC's and cohort groups to ensure consistency
Humphrys, Carrie	Dean	<p>Serves as an instructional leader, guiding teachers to further improve instructional practice through observations and feedback using evaluation tool, state standards, and assessment data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manage and positively influence student behavior by monitoring and analyzing discipline data to drive school-wide practices for student engagement, behavior, and positive school culture - Member and administrative representative for the PBIS team - Teacher evaluations and constructive conversations - Analyze and aggregate student data - Involve stakeholders in school improvement by gathering and analyzing feedback to offer support and create plans for improvement. - Support and build the capacity of teachers through professional development - Collaborate with the administrative team and stakeholders for the school decision-making process - Lead PLC's and cohort groups to ensure consistency
Frye, Jason	Teacher, K-12	<p>Coordinate and manage state and county standardized testing</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordinated a team of teachers as we created a data driven assessment to track student strengths and weaknesses in preparation for state End of Course Assessment - Aggregate and analyze data in conjunction with the Administrative Team to determine areas of weakness and strength. Specific examples involve tracking progress of subsets of students.

Webb, Catherine	Teacher, K-12	AVID coordinator <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordinate tutors for AVID tutorials in all AVID classes - Oversee the AVID site team for the school - Deliver instruction in AVID classes - Coordinate the mentor team for AVID students - Implement and run professional development for faculty and staff
-----------------	---------------	--

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholder involvement and SIP development was done by reviewing survey data received from parents teachers, and students from 22-23 school year with faculty and the school's SAC committee for input and suggestions to support moving into the new school year. AVID site goals were shared with the SAC committee to ensure stakeholders were aware of school-wide goals and initiatives. Teacher leaders came together to review achievement data from the previous year and contributed suggestions for interventions and support. Additionally, student achievement data and discipline data was used in determining areas of improvement to include in the development of the SIP.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) will be systematically monitored to ensure effective implementation and measure its impact on increasing student achievement, with special attention given to addressing the achievement gap among students. This monitoring process will involve various evidence-based practices to track progress and make informed decisions for continuous improvement. Here’s how the monitoring process will be carried out:

Evidence of Implementation:

Classroom Walkthroughs: Regular classroom walkthroughs will be conducted by school administrators,

instructional coaches, and designated staff members. These walkthroughs will focus on observing instruction, classroom environment, and student engagement. The observations will be aligned with the goals and strategies outlined in the SIP. Feedback from walkthroughs will be shared with teachers to provide support and identify areas for improvement.

Data Team Meetings: Data team meetings will be held on a regular basis, bringing together teachers, instructional specialists, and administrators. During these meetings, student performance data will be analyzed in detail. This includes data from formative and summative assessments, standardized tests, and other relevant sources. The team will collaboratively review trends, identify areas of concern, and adjust instructional strategies based on the data.

Professional Learning Communities (PLC's): PLCs will provide teachers with a structured platform for collaboration and professional development. Teachers will work in grade-level or subject-area teams to discuss student performance data, share effective teaching practices, and collectively address challenges. These discussions will directly inform instructional decisions and adjustments to the SIP.

Evidence of Impact:

Student Achievement Data: Various forms of student achievement data will be collected and analyzed to gauge the impact of the SIP. This may include results from standardized assessments like FAST as well as more immediate measures such as exit slips or short quizzes. Comparing pre/post implementation data will allow for an assessment of the plan's effectiveness in improving student performance.

Plan Revision for Continuous Improvement:

Data Analysis: Student achievement data will be regularly reviewed to identify trends and patterns. This analysis will help pinpoint areas of success and areas that require improvement. The data analysis will highlight achievement gaps among different student groups. These gaps will guide the revision process, with a focus on implementing targeted interventions to address disparities.

Review of Strategies: The school's leadership team, instructional specialists, and teachers will collectively review the effectiveness of the strategies outlined in the SIP. They will determine which strategies are yielding positive outcomes and which need adjustments. Based on the data analysis and collaborative discussions, adjustments to the SIP will be proposed. New strategies may be added, existing ones refined, or ineffective strategies replaced.

Implementation of Revisions: The revised strategies will be implemented, and the cycle of monitoring, data collection, and analysis will continue. Regular check-ins during data team meetings, PLCs, and walkthroughs will ensure that the revisions are being effectively implemented.

By following this comprehensive monitoring process, the school will be able to ensure the effective implementation of the SIP and measure its impact on student achievement, particularly among those students with the greatest achievement gap.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	43%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	56%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	48
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	61
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	35
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	111
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	92
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169	169

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	93

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	50

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	318
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	271
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	249
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	381

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level								Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level								Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level								Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Retained Students: Current Year	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	0

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	35	43	50	44	52	51	50		
ELA Learning Gains				49			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			35		
Math Achievement*	19	34	38	21	40	38	20		
Math Learning Gains				35			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			36		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	47	59	64	52	37	40	54		
Social Studies Achievement*	53	63	66	64	44	48	63		
Middle School Acceleration					43	44			
Graduation Rate	85	87	89	90	63	61	89		
College and Career Acceleration	71	72	65	65	66	67	69		
ELP Progress	44	57	45	58			37		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	354
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	85

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	565
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	90

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	4	1
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	33	Yes	2	
HSP	46			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	45			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	3	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	54			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	48			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	50			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	35			19			47	53		85	71	44
SWD	16			8			25	19		42	6	
ELL	13			7			24	13		77	7	44
AMI												
ASN	63						75				2	
BLK	18			8			23	26		41	6	
HSP	23			13			36	43		79	7	41
MUL	40			14			53	65		70	6	
PAC												
WHT	43			24			55	63		73	6	
FRL	29			16			38	46		61	7	45

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	44	49	40	21	35	47	52	64		90	65	58
SWD	11	43	41	10	25	48	28	30		79	26	
ELL	25	42	35	16	29	47	41	33		88	43	58
AMI												
ASN	53	50					60					
BLK	24	39	25	15	33	36	34	39		93	50	
HSP	40	40	34	19	35	48	53	57		85	60	59
MUL	44	58	91	26	43	50	48	77		95	54	
PAC												
WHT	48	52	41	22	35	49	54	65		90	69	
FRL	38	47	39	22	38	51	48	58		88	57	62

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	50	45	35	20	22	36	54	63		89	69	37
SWD	21	34	27	6	25	33	17	42		78	36	
ELL	16	37	42	11	21	25	37	30		100	52	37

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	86	56						73		100	92	
BLK	22	31	27	8	27	52	30	39		91	48	
HSP	42	40	43	22	28	33	52	58		93	62	39
MUL	53	50	33	22	32	64	57	37		86	63	
PAC												
WHT	54	47	35	22	18	23	57	72		87	73	
FRL	37	37	34	18	23	39	42	51		82	57	36

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	41%	54%	-13%	50%	-9%
09	2023 - Spring	47%	56%	-9%	48%	-1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	13%	51%	-38%	50%	-37%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	27%	50%	-23%	48%	-21%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	46%	61%	-15%	63%	-17%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	51%	62%	-11%	63%	-12%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Based on the previous year's data, the component that showed the lowest performance was student proficiency in ELA, which was at 33%. What can be determined to have contributed to the decrease in performance is a high rate of discipline referrals and absenteeism.

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

Looking at the previous year's data, ELA proficiency decreased by 11% from the district average of 58%. More specifically our students with disabilities decreased to 17% and African American subgroup decreased to 19% proficiency.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The component that showed the greatest gap compared to the state average was math proficiency. More specifically, our Algebra 1 data, which was at 13% proficiency compared to the state average of 50% and district average of 51%.

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

Geometry proficiency scores for students scoring level three and above increased from the previous year from 21% to 27%. Increased planning and meaningful data chats to discuss common assessments contributed to the increase.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

As a school, we will focus on behavior and decreasing the number of discipline referrals from the previous school year. With this focus, building positive relationships and a positive school culture will also increase student attendance as well.

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

Our top priorities at Eau Gallie High School will be to :

- (1) Enhance our ELA instruction to improve students assessment data.
- (2) Increase ELA assessment scores for specific subgroups that are deficient.
- (3) Build a more positive school culture while decreasing overall discipline referrals.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In 2023, 16% of Students with Disabilities were proficient in ELA in comparison to 11% in 2022 and 21% in 2021. This subgroup has underperformed below 41% for the third consecutive year. Our African American subgroup has also underperformed below 41% in the previous year as well.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2023-2024 school year, 20% of Students with Disabilities will be proficient in ELA. Based on FAST PM3 reports, 19.32% of African American students scored proficient on ELA assessment during the 23-24 SY. As a school, we would like to increase this data point to 30%.

Monitoring:

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

Evidence of implementation: Regular classroom walk-throughs by administration and coaches to observe implementation of instructional strategies provided through school-based and district professional development opportunities. Teachers will be provided feedback to enhance instruction and increase student outcomes.

Evidence of impact: Student performance data such common assessments, will be reviewed and analyzed during regular data and PLC meetings, to make instructional changes to increases student learning gains. Furthermore, IEP case managers will review the student supports and academic progress in order to make any necessary instructional changes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Keith Barton (barton.keith@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

At Eau Gallie, we will promote a school-wide organizational system and Interactive note-taking strategies that will help support students as they grow from ninth grade through 12th grade and on to college and/or careers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Eau Gallie plans to incorporating AVID organizational strategies and interactive note-taking to increase literacy scores in students with disabilities and African American students. This intervention aligns with the broader goals of providing equitable educational opportunities, fostering independence, and supporting the academic success of all students, regardless of their learning needs. Furthermore, it provides an inclusive and effective educational experience that supports the unique needs and strengths of these students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

A team of teacher leaders(8) and administration will be sent to the AVID Summer Institute to learn and acquire the training methods to effectively return back to campus and provide support to the faculty on implementation of AVID core strategies within their classrooms.

Person Responsible: Catherine Webb (webb.catherine@brevardschools.org)

By When: AVID summer institute is was June 25-28.

The AVID site team will provide breakout sessions during preplanning week to review AVID site goals that were created at the summer institute and present the plan for school-wide implementation. The AVID site goals for the 23-24 SY will be implementation of AVID organizational strategies and interactive note-taking.

Person Responsible: Michael Gladden (gladden.michael@brevardschools.org)

By When: The AVID site team will provide breakout sessions during preplanning week to review AVID site goals that were created at the summer institute and present the plan for school-wide implementation. The AVID site goals for the 23-24 SY will be implementation of AVID organizational strategies and interactive note-taking.

Teachers will be provided detailed AVID lesson plans from the AVID site coordinator modeling how to students can organize using interactive binders and note taking during instruction.

Person Responsible: Catherine Webb (webb.catherine@brevardschools.org)

By When: Lessons plans will be provided to all teachers during preplanning week. Lessons will be integrated into teacher lessons plans within the first two weeks of school and reviewed as needed.

AVID site coordinator will disperse out monthly AVID strategies for teachers to utilize with their instruction. Site coordinator will be available to model lessons/strategies for teachers as needed.

Person Responsible: Catherine Webb (webb.catherine@brevardschools.org)

By When: AVID strategy newsletter will be sent out monthly beginning October and classroom modeling will be provided year round as needed.

Administration and AVID coordinator will conduct weekly classroom observations to support teachers with the strategies and assist with implementation of organization and note-taking strategies. Further professional development will be provided during faculty/PLC meetings.

Person Responsible: Keith Barton (barton.keith@brevardschools.org)

By When: Classroom observations will be conducted weekly and support will be provided year round as needed.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Targeted and consistent ELA instruction through department and cross-curricular planning to enhance ELA instruction school wide and increasing student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Eau Gallie High School plans to increase the ELA proficiency from 33% to 45% by the end of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Evidence of implementation: Regular classroom walk-throughs by administration and coaches to observe implementation of instructional strategies provided through school-based and district professional development opportunities. Teachers will be provided feedback to enhance instruction and increase student outcomes.

Evidence of impact: Student performance data such as common assessments, will be reviewed and analyzed during regular data and PLC meetings in order to make instructional changes that increases student learning gains. Furthermore, IEP case managers will review the student supports and academic progress in order to make any necessary instructional changes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Gladden (gladden.michael@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will facilitate text-based writing and discussion that encourage analysis, reflection, and research for all students. Students will be expected to analyze complex texts in order to engage them in all aspects of literacy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students will be supported in critical reasoning, building a rich background knowledge, and developing a deep understanding of complex texts.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

A team of teacher leaders(8) and administration will be sent to the AVID Summer Institute to learn and acquire the training methods to effectively return back to campus and provide support to the faculty on implementation of AVID core strategies within their classrooms in order to increase learning gains.

Person Responsible: Catherine Webb (webb.catherine@brevardschools.org)

By When: AVID summer institute is was June 25-28.

The AVID site team will provide breakout sessions during preplanning week to review AVID site goals that were created at the summer institute and present the plan for school-wide implementation. The AVID site goals for the 23-24 SY will be implementation of AVID organizational strategies and interactive note-taking.

Person Responsible: Michael Gladden (gladden.michael@brevardschools.org)

By When: The AVID site team will provide breakout sessions during preplanning week to review AVID site goals that were created at the summer institute, present the plan for school-wide implementation and how it aligns to the school improvement plan goals for student achievement specifically in ELA.

Subject area departments will meet regularly to lesson plan, create common assessments, and review student data to make instructional changes if any, to support students' academic growth.

Person Responsible: Keith Barton (barton.keith@brevardschools.org)

By When: There will be a rotation of meetings for departments, data chats, and PLC meetings weekly throughout the academic year.

Administration will conduct weekly classroom observations to support teachers with instructional strategies and assist with implementation of the AVID instructional strategies: organization and note-taking strategies. Further professional development will be provided during faculty/PLC meetings.

Person Responsible: Keith Barton (barton.keith@brevardschools.org)

By When: Classroom observations will be conducted weekly and support will be provided year round as needed.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In order to rebuild a positive culture at EGHS, we sent a select amount of teacher to AVID Summer institute and learned about relational capacity and its impact on academic achievement. During our preplanning, we trained all teachers on relational capacity activities that could be implemented during the first week of school in order to start this process. Our goal is to build relationships with our students in addition to student-to student relationships. Furthermore, due to our suspension rates of our male African American ESE students, the state will be monitoring this subgroup. Therefore, we have designed an intervention to meet the needs of this subgroups and decrease the suspension rate.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will use the Youth Truth student survey as a benchmark and reference to compare the results of SY22-23 and SY23-24 for the indicator specific to relational capacity between students and teachers, as well as student to student. In the end, we hope to decrease referrals, approximately 1,018 for the offense of Out of Area by 15%. Due to our suspension rates of students over ten days, Eau Gallie will be monitoring and providing intervention to meet the needs of this group and decrease the suspension rate. To decrease the number of students suspended over ten days by 50%. While focusing on our African American, ESE subgroup, we plan to decrease the suspension rates of ESE African American students by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will conduct formal and informal observations. Student voice panels will be established twice a year to gain valuable student input. There will also be ongoing professional development to increase relational capacity in the classroom. Furthermore, administration will closely monitor the number of referrals that teachers are writing for students being out of area (as defined by skipping, leaving class without permission, being tardy, or being gone too long in the restroom). These statistics will be reviewed in the leadership meetings where problem-solving will occur.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mileah Briley (briley.mileah@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

AVID relational capacity is the degree of trust and level of safety between members of a group. In the educational context, this refers to the established level of trust and safety between teachers and students, as well as between students. The ultimate goal of developing a classroom/school high in relational capacity is that groups of students become self-directing, self-advocating, and self-monitoring, thereby actualizing their full potential.

PBIS creates schools where all students succeed, it is a framework for creating safe, positive, equitable schools, where every student can feel valued, connected to the school community, and supported by caring adults. schools support their student's academic, social, emotional, and behavioral success, engage with families to create locally-meaningful and culturally-relevant outcomes and use data to make informed decisions that improve the way things work for everyone.

The Evidence-based Strategy being used is a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Tier 2 Intervention. Tier 2 supports are provided to small groups of students with similar needs, offering more time and/or

detailed instruction on improving behavior through connecting and developing coping strategies to achieve desired outcomes. These are also considered PBIS Tier 2 strategies.

Restorative Practices will be utilized for select students. The restorative practice sessions may include but are not limited to: teaching replacement behaviors, small group instruction in appropriate responses, behavior contracts, and self-monitoring checklists.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using relational capacity to improve school culture is a strategic and holistic approach that recognizes the importance of positive relationships and effective communication within an educational institution.

Restorative Practices focuses on fostering a sense of community within classrooms to prevent conflict, and on reacting to misconduct by encouraging students to accept responsibility and rebuild relationships. Providing the opportunity for students to reflect on their behavior to make better decisions as a preventative measure should decrease disciplinary outcomes these students have encountered.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

A select amount of teacher and administration to AVID Summer institute and learned about relational capacity and its impact on academic achievement.

Person Responsible: Mileah Briley (briley.mileah@brevardschools.org)

By When: AVID Summer Institute, June 25-28.

During preplanning, all teachers will be trained by the AVID site team on relational capacity activities that can be implemented during the first week of school in order to start this process.

Person Responsible: Mileah Briley (briley.mileah@brevardschools.org)

By When: This will begin during preplanning and proceed throughout the year in order for teachers to build meaningful relationships with their students.

Counselors will create a Progress Monitoring Plan for students that will be referenced during small group reflective sessions as needed.

Person Responsible: Michael Gladden (gladden.michael@brevardschools.org)

By When: The monitoring plan will be created with school counselors and social within the first two weeks of school. Reflective conferences will begin in September.

Counselors will meet with students identified by the deans on a daily basis during lunch to engage in reflective conferences with students. School Counselors will engage in these restorative conferences to reduce repeated behaviors in and out of the classroom.

Person Responsible: Carrie Humphrys (humphrys.carrie@brevardschools.org)

By When: These restorative conferences will begin in September and run throughout the school year. Counselors will have rotating schedule every month with the school social worker.

The discipline data and reflective conference data will be reviewed monthly to analyze for patterns or trends to make appropriate changes to the support provided to students.

Person Responsible: Keith Barton (barton.keith@brevardschools.org)

By When: Review of school data will be monthly at leadership meetings.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Based on the data analysis, the school administration identified key areas that needed improvement. This included academic achievement, student engagement, special education services, and the need to enhance post-graduation possibilities. In Eau Gallie's case, funds were allocated to hire a College and Career Specialist and ESE push-in teachers to provide specialized support. Eau Gallie will engage in a continuous improvement cycle, using feedback from stakeholders, assessment results, and changing circumstances to refine and adapt strategies. This ensures that the school remains responsive to evolving needs. By following this process, Eau Gallie can effectively review improvement funding allocations, allocate resources based on needs, and implement targeted interventions to drive positive outcomes for their students.