

Brevard Public Schools

West Shore Junior/Senior 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

West Shore Junior/Senior High School

250 WILDCAT ALLEY, Melbourne, FL 32935

<http://www.westshore.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.

West Shore Junior/Senior High School, a center for excellence, creates a nurturing secondary learning environment (grades 7-12) that provides students with unique experiences for intellectual development, academic achievement, and preparation for life's work.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Excellence Achieved

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
Fleming, Rick	Principal	Overall school management: Personnel, compliance, budget, Instruction
Webb, Glenn	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule, curriculum and instruction, textbook inventory management
Halbuer, Catherine	Assistant Principal	Master Calendar, Facilities Management, school discipline

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.

West Shore Jr/Sr High School makes maximum use of three different surveys to gauge and assess student, staff, and parental perceptions on how our school is operating. The Insight (staff survey), the Youth Truth (student survey), and the annual parent survey supply valuable qualitative and quantitative data for us in planning for improvement. During our pre-planning week with teachers and staff each of these surveys is broken down by study groups of West Shore staff. Work groups are charged with the responsibility of looking for trends to be used as celebratory moments and areas for growth. These data combined with student assessment review become focal points in our overall school improvement process.

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 SIP is a living, breathing document that drives our overall instructional plan and is used as the vehicle for overall school improvement. Monthly SAC meetings are held to review, revise goals and objectives towards accomplishing these goals. FAST PM 1, 2, and 3 data are reviewed and discussed along with progress on survey goals founded during our survey review from the beginning of the year.

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 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	33%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	12%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) 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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	10	3	13	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	12	
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	4	4	
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	4	4	

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	8	2	26
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
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	1	0	1

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	3	2	9

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	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	8	2	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
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	1	0	1
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	1	0	1

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	3	2	5

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*	92	43	50	96	52	51	94		
ELA Learning Gains				75			74		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				77			77		
Math Achievement*	99	34	38	98	40	38	95		
Math Learning Gains				84			69		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				88			70		
Science Achievement*	95	59	64	92	37	40	91		
Social Studies Achievement*	98	63	66	99	44	48	98		
Middle School Acceleration	98			98	43	44	95		
Graduation Rate	100	87	89	100	63	61	100		
College and Career Acceleration	99	72	65	100	66	67	99		
ELP Progress		57	45						

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	97
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	681
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	92

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	1007
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	100

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	100			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	98			
BLK	91			
HSP	96			
MUL	95			
PAC				
WHT	98			
FRL	98			

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	87			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	94			
BLK	87			
HSP	91			

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%
MUL	87			
PAC				
WHT	92			
FRL	91			

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	92			99			95	98	98	100	99	
SWD	100			100							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	94			100			96	95	100	100	7	
BLK	94			100			80				3	
HSP	95			98			92	96	100	90	7	
MUL	85			98			93	100	100		5	
PAC												
WHT	92			98			96	99	98	100	7	
FRL	92			97			97	97	100	100	7	

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	96	75	77	98	84	88	92	99	98	100	100	
SWD	93	57		100	83			100				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	98	79	85	95	87		97	100	96	100	100	

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
BLK	93	71		100	85							
HSP	94	77	74	100	78	85	93	97	100	100	100	
MUL	96	70	67	95	79	70	87	100	95	100	100	
PAC												
WHT	96	74	77	98	85	91	93	99	98	100	100	
FRL	95	74	68	99	83	92	90	100	96	100	100	

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	94	74	77	95	69	70	91	98	95	100	99	
SWD	77	62										
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	95	79	81	96	73		91	100	97	100	92	
BLK	100	78		92	77							
HSP	91	75	74	94	62	67	85	100	94	100	100	
MUL	95	70		94	71		94	88	90			
PAC												
WHT	94	74	77	96	68	72	92	98	95	100	99	
FRL	95	76	85	94	67	68	81	100	90	100	100	

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	95%	54%	41%	50%	45%
07	2023 - Spring	94%	53%	41%	47%	47%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	91%	52%	39%	47%	44%
09	2023 - Spring	93%	56%	37%	48%	45%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	99%	58%	41%	48%	51%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	90%	48%	42%	44%	46%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	51%	48%	50%	49%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	50%	49%	48%	51%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	61%	38%	63%	36%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	69%	30%	66%	33%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	62%	34%	63%	33%

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.

After a comprehensive view of composite averages in the transition from FSA in 2022 to FAST PM3 in 2023 we noticed a slight dip in scores on 10th Grade ELA from 98 percent proficient in 2022- to 95 percent proficient in 2023. It could simply be the nature of the assessment being a bit different however we are monitoring for trend data as it was only a 1-year drop. We also had some staffing changes within that grade level that could have contributed as well. Additionally, we feel we did not market our parental surveys enough through our communications platforms as we saw a decline in response rates from in 477 in 2022 to 458 in 2023.

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

10th grade ELA proficiency from 98% in 2022 to 95% in 2023. Also, we noted a decline in the number of parental surveys completed from 2022 to 2023.

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.

West Shore is well above the state and district averages in all assessment categories however the biggest gap would be 8th grade ELA at 44% higher and 10th grade ELA being 45% higher. We believe that having changeover in staff within these grade levels contributed to the gap differential. Although we continue to have the highest parental survey return rate in the district compared to others, we feel we can increase this number by marketing the survey more within our media platforms. This feedback gives us a better idea of areas for improvement in our service to our community overall.

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

Geometry EOC showed us at 99% proficiency with 65% of students scoring at Level 5 in 2023. Common assessment and the use of Interactive notebooks is credited for these stellar results. Although we continue to have the highest parental survey return rate in the district compared to others, we feel we can increase this number by marketing the survey more within our media platforms.

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

NA

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

1. Increase the levels of 8th and 10th Grade ELA proficiency on FAST PM 3.
2. Increase the number of overall parental surveys completed.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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 capture positive school culture as a whole we have always held our parent surveys in high regard as a school. We use these data to reflect and review our practices to ensure we are making changes important to all stakeholders. For this purpose, we want to increase the number of parent surveys completed thus giving us a better picture of what and how our community thinks and how we are making changes to reflect opinion and suggestions.

Measurable Outcome:

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

West Shore we would like to increase the number of Parent Survey completions this school year from 458 in 2023 to 505 in 2024. These data are used to plan for overall school improvement and planning thus improving overall school culture.

Monitoring:

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

We will increase our marketing of the parent survey with the use of Peachjar, FOCUS phone messaging, school website, PTA Listserve, and our school newspaper to ensure parents have whatever platform they use as a source of information about the survey. We also receive regular completion data on the parent surveys during the Spring window and the principal will monitor this data to share with the School Advisory Council and market further the need for parents to complete the survey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rick Fleming (fleming.rick@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.)

We will continue a media blitz using PeachJar, PTA Listserve, school website, etc. throughout the completion window

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To improve overall school and community culture

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.

West Shore will use all media outlets to market parent survey during the window for completion. Peachjar, Website, PTA list serve, Facebook, School News paper, and FOCUS phone messaging service will be used to get the word out to our parents to complete the survey.

Person Responsible: Rick Fleming (fleming.rick@brevardschools.org)

By When: February-March 2024

#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.

At West Shore we have historically outperformed all district and most state schools in the previous ELA FCAT, and FSA proficiency levels. In 2023, however we dropped 3 percentage points from 98% in 2022 to 95% in 2023. It is important to our students and school community to continue the trend of leading the district and state in proficiency levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At West Shore we would like to increase the level of 10th grade proficiency on FAST PM 3 from 95% to 98%

so that we can continue to lead the district and county in overall proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

Through observation and feedback, walk-through data, review of PM 1 and 2 data, and regular meetings with instructional staff, the administrative staff will monitor and recommend needed professional development to achieve our goal of increasing our 10th Grade FAST PM 3 proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rick Fleming (fleming.rick@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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

Teachers will review 2023 10th grade ELA FAST PM 3 data and set student performance goals for 2024. Administrators will meet with teachers in pre-observation meetings in an effort to refine CMA goals based on these data. Strand, standards, and instructional objectives will be discussed and monitored by teacher and evaluating administrator. 10th Grade ELA FAST PM 1 and 2 will be reviewed by teachers and administrators in a formative review in planning for intervention if necessary.

Person Responsible: Rick Fleming (fleming.rick@brevardschools.org)

By When: Periodic intervention will occur throughout the 2023-2024 school year and primary focus/review will be given to September 2023 and January 2024 ELA FAT PM 1 and 2 assessments.

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus