Bayside High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Bayside High School

1901 DEGROODT RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

http://www.bayside.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.

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, 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
Zander, Holli	Principal	Oversees the running of the administrative teams and their individual objectives. Assesses teacher instruction to foster positive pedagogical growth.
Hughes, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Monitors and influences student behaviors throughout the school in her role as dean. 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.
Mederos, Vicky	Assistant Principal	Monitors and influences student behaviors throughout the school in her role as dean. Assesses teacher instruction to foster positive pedagogical growth.
Laham, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	implement the mentoring program for SWD, SAC chairperson

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.

The school leadership team as well as department heads, teachers and school staff are a part of the SIP development. Collaboration on the SIP is done through staff meeting activities, attending SAC meetings, and collected feedback from families and community members. Student input is collected through the Youth Truth survey as well as student focus groups.

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))

SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation through a variety of ways this year. Administration will utilize classroom walkthroughs on a regular basis. Professional Learning Communities meet during a three week cycle and submit their notes through a google form. Agendas and notes from the School Advisory Committee will be used to monitor effective implementation as viewed by the community and families that are a part of SAC.

The School Improvement Plan will be regularly monitored for evidence of impact through the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) Progress Monitoring 1-3 as well as the district math assessment for progress monitoring. PLCs will utilize student assessment data through formative assessments to also monitor for impact in a classroom setting.

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 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	51%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	51%
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)* 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: B
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	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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	

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	293
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	301
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	367
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	466
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	

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	

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	166
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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	

| 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	
Students retained two or more times	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*	34	43	50	46	52	51	40		
ELA Learning Gains				49			39		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			23		
Math Achievement*	29	34	38	26	40	38	27		
Math Learning Gains				34			25		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			27		
Science Achievement*	50	59	64	58	37	40	53		
Social Studies Achievement*	48	63	66	61	44	48	60		
Middle School Acceleration					43	44			
Graduation Rate	80	87	89	89	63	61	88		
College and Career Acceleration	71	72	65	64	66	67	60		
ELP Progress	67	57	45	54			57		

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	379
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	80

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	559
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	89

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	27	Yes	4	1
ELL	39	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	52			
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	57			

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%
FRL	50			

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	35	Yes	3	
ELL	38	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	49			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	46			

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	34			29			50	48		80	71	67
SWD	10			10			24	10		40	6	
ELL	22			29			52	16			6	67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26			20			34	39		67	7	75
HSP	30			34			50	36		74	7	63
MUL	38			21			47	47		74	6	

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
PAC												
WHT	40			32			57	57		73	6	
FRL	28			26			44	40		71	7	69

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	46	49	37	26	34	41	58	61		89	64	54
SWD	14	36	36	15	28	33	22	45		83	35	
ELL	16	34	29	11	35	33	32	35		100	43	54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	45	36	19	32	40	47	49		92	54	50
HSP	37	42	42	26	38	43	47	61		93	61	52
MUL	56	49		33	32		55	100		82	59	
PAC												
WHT	53	53	37	29	34	44	65	65		88	69	
FRL	38	44	36	21	32	35	47	54		86	60	50

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	40	39	23	27	25	27	53	60		88	60	57
SWD	13	25	19	11	25	26	22	41		87	34	
ELL	16	26	23	11	12	16	32	44		82		57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	35	20	17	23	22	31	41		93	58	46
HSP	31	31	25	25	23	33	47	45		84	49	61
MUL	51	54		39	41		72	60		78	71	
PAC												
WHT	47	42	27	31	26	26	63	73		88	63	
FRL	34	35	23	23	24	24	45	52		86	56	57

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	46%	56%	-10%	48%	-2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	18%	51%	-33%	50%	-32%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	37%	50%	-13%	48%	-11%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	49%	61%	-12%	63%	-14%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	47%	62%	-15%	63%	-16%

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.

During the 2021/22 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.

During the 2022/23 SY, Bayside continued to be below state averages in proficiency in all core content areas with 18.56% scoring Level 1 on the Biology EOC, 28.18% scoring Level 1 on the History EOC, 41.61% scoring Level 1 on the ELA FSA, and 73.11% scoring Level 1 on the Algebra EOC.

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

The state average of students passing the History assessment with a Level 3 or higher was 63%, Bayside's average was 47%, a decrease of 14% from the previous year.

Contributing factors may include teacher shortage due to absences which led to inconsistent instruction as well as the amount of students who are reading below grade level struggling with comprehension of the text and course specific vocabulary.

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.

Algebra 1 (Spring 2023) data reflects that 18% of students assessed score a Level 3 or higher compared to the district average of 51% (a difference of 33%) and the state average of 50% (a difference of 32%).

Contributing factors include that the majority of students who took the state assessment were in middle school during COVID taking Pre-Algebra virtually or in a hybrid class which could have caused discrepancies in instruction and comprehension of curriculum.

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

The ELA Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) average of students scoring a Level 3 or higher was 46%, compared with the district average of 56% (a difference of 10%) and the state average of 48% (a difference of 2%).

The use of READ 180 in Intensive Reading classes as well as incorporating it into Learning Strategies courses was a new course of action that was started mid year. The Literacy Coach provided professional development throughout the year as she modeled various strategies at faculty meetings and sent out monthly strategies to use in our classrooms. All teachers on campus are implementing specific literacy activities and supports to increase reading comprehension skills of all students as well. Feedback on literacy in all subject areas was provided by administration as part of the walkthrough observation as well. The ELA department had specific strategies and assessment data collected through PLCs for students not in Intensive Reading or Learning Strategies to further improve instruction.

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

Two areas of concern this year are the number of students who scored a Level 1 on the ELA and/or Math assessment and the students who have exhibited two or more early warning indicators already.

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

1. increasing achievement scores in the SWD
2. increasing achievement scores of the ELL students.
2. increasing student attendance

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 Students with Disabilities

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, 25% of Students with Disabilities were proficient in ELA in comparison to 2022 in which 46% of students were proficient in ELA in comparison to 40% in 2021.

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

In 2024, 50% of students with disabilities will be proficient in English Language Arts.

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

-Florida Assessment of Student Thinking progress monitoring is administered three times a year. All teachers review data and identify specific areas that need to be improved on.
-ELA teachers will collaborate on standards and instructional practices during PLCs to best meet the needs of SWD that are not in Intensive Language Arts and document their instructional plans, strategies, and data through PLC notes.
ESE teachers in Learning Strategies and teachers in Intensive Language Arts will support SWD in their classes as they reinforce academic standards through targeted lessons in READ 180
-Data Board Tracking with ELA department and Literacy Coach of 9th and 10th grade students who scored a Level 1 or 2 on FAST progress monitoring 1 and are not in ILA and are SWD, followed by data chats with each teacher.
-Walkthroughs and observations by administration

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Johnson (johnson.john@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.)

-SWD enrolled in Learning Strategies will receive additional lessons in Read 180 specifically targeted student weaknesses and allowed for targeted support. Students not enrolled in Learning Strategies will be provided additional academic support by the ESE teachers on a daily or weekly basis (per IEP academic support minutes). All teachers on campus are implementing specific literacy activities and supports to increase reading comprehension skills of all students as well.
- Monthly professional development will be provided by the Literacy Coach on specific reading strategies to support SWD in the regular education classes.
-Students will be invited to be a part of the school based mentoring program, Bayside Achievement through Mentoring (BAM) in which they will be mentored by community members and school staff to support literacy, attendance, and any discipline concerns.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Read180 literacy program will be taught with fidelity in our Intensive Reading classrooms and Learning Strategies classrooms specifically targeting student weaknesses and allowing for targeted support.

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.

Identify students in Learning Strategies classes and set up READ 180 for classroom use

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: September 10, 2023

Provide training to Learning Strategies teachers on how to facilitate READ 180

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: September 10, 2023

Create Professional Learning Community (PLC) submission form and PLC cycle schedule

Person Responsible: Jennifer Laham (laham.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 10, 2023

Create data tracking board

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: September 15, 2023

ensure that professional development on SWD is provided at every faculty meeting

Person Responsible: Holli Zander (zander.holli@brevardschools.org)

By When: monthly

Create observation form, observation feedback form, and observation schedule

Person Responsible: Holli Zander (zander.holli@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 30, 2023

Identify BAM mentors and match them with students in need

Person Responsible: Jennifer Laham (laham.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

By When: October 1, 2023

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

Instructional Practices for ELL students specifically related to ELA
In 2022, 16% were proficient in ELA in comparison to 2021 in which 16% of students were proficient in ELA in comparison to 17% in 2019.

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

In 2024, 50% of ELL students will be proficient in English Language Arts.

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

-This area of focus will be monitored through FAST progress monitoring that is administered three times during the school year.
-ELA teachers with the ELL English teacher will collaborate on standards and instructional practices during PLCs to best meet the needs of ELL and document their plans through PLC notes.
-Data Board Tracking with ELA department and Literacy Coach of 9th and 10th grade students who scored a Level 1 or 2 on FAST progress monitoring 1 and are ELL, followed by data chats with each teacher.
-Walkthroughs and observations by administration

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Johnson (johnson.john@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.)

-ELA teachers with the ELL English teacher will collaborate on standards and instructional practices during PLCs to best meet the needs of ELL and document their plans through PLC notes.
-ELL resource teachers will support students academic goals through small group instruction and support in all courses that require reading comprehension.
-The addition of an ESOL ELA teacher last year will continue to provide interventions through her language development classes as well as her ESOL ELA courses.
-Teachers will be provided professional development at monthly faculty meetings on how to provide layers of support in ELA to ELL students in all core courses.
-Students will be invited to be a part of the school based mentoring program, Bayside Achievement through Mentoring (BAM) in which they will be mentored by community members and school staff to support literacy, attendance, and any discipline concerns.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Walkthroughs by administration will be done to observe the fidelity of ELA strategies being taught in all classes.
Professional development will be provided by district ESOL resource supports throughout the year.
Instructional strategies are provided to the teachers by the guidance counselor that oversees ELL 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. |
| --- |

Identify students that are ELL and their supported levels

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: August 10, 2023

create classes for ELL English teacher

Person Responsible: John Johnson (johnson.john@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 10, 2023

Create PLC submission form and schedule

Person Responsible: Jennifer Laham (laham.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 10, 2023

Create data tracking board

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: September 15, 2023

ensure that professional development is offered at monthly faculty meetings on instructional strategies for working with students that are ELL

Person Responsible: Holli Zander (zander.holli@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 30, 2023

create observation form, feedback form, and observation schedule

Person Responsible: Holli Zander (zander.holli@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 30, 2023

identify BAM mentors and match them with students in need

Person Responsible: Jennifer Laham (laham.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

By When: October 1, 2023

#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.

The Early Warning Indicator that we will focus on is student attendance rates that are below 90%. 12% of our student population has attendance lower than 90%;91 9th graders, 62 10th graders, 48 11th graders, and 38 12th graders identified.

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

in 2023-2024 SY, student attendance will increase by 20%.

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

-Classroom teachers will track daily attendance in FOCUS.
-Daily passes out of class are monitored through Minga, administration will use MInga reports to look for trends to identify students who are skipping class or are out on passes for too long or too many times a day.
-two campus monitors are sweeping the hallways and bathrooms on campus throughout the day

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vicky Mederos (mederos.vicky@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 create a welcoming classroom environment for all students.
-Students can receive mentoring through the BAM program on campus also.
-School wide events and celebrations throughout the year such as dances, movies on the lawn, and Grad Bash to motivate students to stay off of the 'no go' list based on attendance and behavior
-BAM mentoring program

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Building trusting relationships with adults on campus increases at risk students attendance, as well as address academic concerns and/or behavior issues as trust increases. Schoolwide events help build school spirit and create a community environment.

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.

train teachers on the use of FOCUS and MInga

Person Responsible: Naim Torlak (torlak.naim@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 10, 2023

professional development training on how to create relationships with students and create welcoming environments during pre-planning

Person Responsible: Holli Zander (zander.holli@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 10, 2023

schedule of list of school wide events/celebrations for the 23-24 SY

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: August 30, 2023

Identify BAM mentors and match them with students

Person Responsible: Jennifer Laham (laham.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

By When: October 1, 2023

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 feedback collected through the Insight survey, Youth Truth survey and parent surveys, Bayside has created a Career and College Center to support students' pursuits after graduation. The program is facilitated by a guidance counselor and is available for all students. Students can receive information and support on searching careers, technical schools, colleges and universities, scholarships, and application support. Information sessions will be available for families and students as they navigate the opportunities available after graduation.

An ESE Resource teacher has been added to Bayside as well as creating the position of an ESE guidance counselor. The ESE Resource teacher is working with SWD that have BIPs and social emotional goals on their IEPs. (BPIE) She is also providing support to the ESE department by carrying a caseload of 40 plus students and reviewing IEPs prior to meetings. She is overseeing students with assistive technology as well as provide testing assistance for students with accommodations during class and state assessments.

The ESE Guidance counselor is working with students on creating a schedule that meets the needs of their services outlined in the IEPs. She is also counseling students that have that service on their IEPs. The counselor will work with ESE students to make sure credits are being met and assist students with college board testing information.

The Student Advisory Committee (SAC) continues to be an integral part of the School Improvement Plan and is active in having a voice on school funding. The school budget is presented and explained by our bookkeeper at one of the meetings. SAC funding is being used to award teachers classroom wish requests this year. Teachers will go through an application process and present to the board for voting.