

School Board of Levy County

# Bronson Middle/High School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Bronson Middle/High School

8691 NE 90TH ST, Bronson, FL 32621

<http://www.levy12.org/schools>

## Demographics

**Principal: Curtis Gaus**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	<b>Black/African American Students</b> Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (45%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Dustin Sims</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/27/2020.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement**

Adults will model professionalism as they nurture and challenge students to meet career goals. Students will engage in an environment of mutual respect and academic focus while preparing for future success. Unified, we will accomplish this mission.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement**

Adults and students will interact respectfully in an academically challenging environment.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gaus, Curtis	Principal	Principal Gaus will continue to emphasize bell-to-bell instruction, engaged learners, standards based instruction and higher level questioning techniques by instructional staff through informal or targeted walkthroughs and formal observations of instructional staff. Principal Gaus will also coordinate all safety policies with the assistance of the SBLC Coordinator or School Safety ensuring that all state statutes are carefully executed. Principal Gaus will also manage the daily operation of Bronson Middle High School.
Putnam, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	As the Math representative on the School Leadership team, Ms. Putnam will provide the other math teachers on campus instructional support to ensure they are delivering standards-based instruction, assistance with research-based instructional strategies, and provide technology support for the Canvas LMS.
Barber, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	As the AVID Site Coordinator, Ms. Barber will organize the monthly AVID Instructional strategies professional development sessions. She will be the point of contact for the AVID District Director.
Bray, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Bray will continue to emphasize bell-to-bell instruction, engaged learners, standards based instruction and higher level questioning techniques by instructional staff through informal or targeted walkthroughs and formal observations of instructional staff. Assistant Principal Bray will preside over the weekly Student Wellness Committee Meetings where the mental and physical well-being of students will be discussed and problem-solved in a collaborative manner.
Welch, Karen	Instructional Coach	Dr. Welch will work on ensuring that instructional staff know the standards that their subject area requires be taught and that they have strategies for releasing learning to the students. Dr. Welch will also model direct instruction and proper planning with targeted teachers at least two times monthly.
Thornton, Nicole	Guidance Counselor	Dr. Thornton will counsel individual students according to their IEP and will also support targeted student groupings for deeper progress monitoring in regards to graduation, proficiency and making learning gains.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Miller, John	Dean	Dean Miller will work individually with teachers in monitoring behavior plans with fidelity and developing classroom management plans. They will also begin to train in the restorative practice model with full implementation as a long term goal. Most training will be done with principal, but further outside training may be required. Dean Miller will also share the responsibility of running our PBIS program.
Foshee, Genny	Guidance Counselor	Ms. Foshee will counsel individual students according to their IEP and will also support targeted student groupings for deeper progress monitoring in regards to graduation, proficiency and making learning gains. Ms.Foshee will also provide assistance with the testing process.
Smith, Marcia	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Smith will work on various items that will steer the school in the direction that is needed to improve the school grade and to retain accreditation from the state. Ms. Smith will also be the advisor to any Career Tech or Agriculture related initiatives. Ms. Smith will also run our monthly club day.
Schuler, Sherrie	Teacher, K-12	As the Social Science representative on the School Leadership team, Ms. Schuler will provide the other Social Science teachers on campus instructional support to ensure they are delivering standards-based instruction, assistance with research-based instructional strategies, and provide technology support for the Canvas LMS.
O'Steen, Caryl	Teacher, K-12	Ms. O'Steen is the Intensive Reading teacher for the middle school. She will be responsible for tracking the progress of the students on Tier 3 reading interventions. She will work with the middle school teachers to assist with developing content-based reading lessons, so they are complimenting her efforts with struggling readers.
Garreau-Jones, Carolyn	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Garreau-Jones will work on various items that will steer the school in the direction that is needed to improve the school grade. Ms. Garreau-Jones will also be the point of contact for any science related initiatives.
Beauchamp, Judy	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Beauchamp will work on various items that will steer the school in the direction that is needed to improve the school grade. Ms. Beauchamp will also be the point of contact for any elective course related initiatives.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Curtis Gaus

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

29

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (45%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Dustin Sims</a>



<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**Early Warning Systems**

**Current Year**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	99	82	77	81	72	67	586
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	28	19	13	12	22	16	121
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	38	27	15	14	21	6	133
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	23	17	11	3	21	4	91
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	9	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	25	25	14	16	0	0	103
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	23	22	19	15	7	1	109

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	18	11	13	8	13	5	79

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	11	12	1	1	2	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	11	10	3	5	6	51

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 8/18/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	95	79	76	73	88	41	565
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	21	13	9	14	26	9	109
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	14	18	4	0	49
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	39	29	21	28	26	8	190

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	80	66	48	62	68	33	440

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	95	79	76	73	88	41	565
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	21	13	9	14	26	9	109
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	14	18	4	0	49
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	39	29	21	28	26	8	190

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	80	66	48	62	68	33	440

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	43%	0%	56%	36%	0%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	0%	51%	44%	0%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	0%	42%	40%	0%	44%
Math Achievement	49%	0%	51%	39%	0%	51%
Math Learning Gains	51%	0%	48%	42%	0%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	0%	45%	31%	0%	45%
Science Achievement	57%	0%	68%	46%	0%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	0%	73%	60%	0%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

### Grade Level Data

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	40%	41%	-1%	54%	-14%
	2018	36%	35%	1%	52%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	32%	37%	-5%	52%	-20%
	2018	28%	41%	-13%	51%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	36%	36%	0%	56%	-20%
	2018	35%	48%	-13%	58%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				

<b>ELA</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
Cohort Comparison		8%				
09	2019	36%	50%	-14%	55%	-19%
	2018	40%	40%	0%	53%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
10	2019	52%	50%	2%	53%	-1%
	2018	29%	38%	-9%	53%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2019	33%	45%	-12%	55%	-22%
	2018	31%	41%	-10%	52%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	56%	55%	1%	54%	2%
	2018	43%	56%	-13%	54%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		25%				
08	2019	15%	29%	-14%	46%	-31%
	2018	27%	38%	-11%	45%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
08	2019	30%	43%	-13%	48%	-18%
	2018	30%	44%	-14%	50%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	77%	66%	11%	67%	10%
2018	62%	58%	4%	65%	-3%
Compare		15%			

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	61%	72%	-11%	71%	-10%
2018	56%	73%	-17%	71%	-15%
Compare		5%			
<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	64%	68%	-4%	70%	-6%
2018	57%	66%	-9%	68%	-11%
Compare		7%			
<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	44%	57%	-13%	61%	-17%
2018	30%	44%	-14%	62%	-32%
Compare		14%			
<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	62%	53%	9%	57%	5%
2018	46%	48%	-2%	56%	-10%
Compare		16%			

**Subgroup Data**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	29	43	35	37	42	26	58	57		82	
ELL	19	58	73	35	33						
BLK	32	43	46	32	41	30	35	55			
HSP	37	46	47	37	41	29	46	47		90	
WHT	45	54	48	54	55	38	64	71	77	84	45
FRL	40	49	48	46	46	19	52	66	79	77	46

<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
SWD	28	42	27	28	33	23	25	36		36	
ELL	9	43		7	43						
BLK	28	31	20	22	22	23	8	57		80	
HSP	33	44	39	25	42	41	42	64			
WHT	38	46	47	45	45	28	51	57	57	66	47

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
FRL	34	42	39	37	40	31	43	59	42	66	42

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	665
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	97%

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

**English Language Learners**

Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

**Asian Students**

Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

**Black/African American Students**

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Data from 2018-2019 showed 8th grade math has having the lowest performance with 15% of the students scoring proficient on the 8th grade math FSA. In 8th grade the high

achieving students are enrolled in Algebra 1 Honors and they take the Algebra 1 EOC. Since there are no high-achieving student in that testing group the average will be lower than the rest.

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

Data from the 2018-2019 showed 8th grade math having the greatest decline from previous the previous year's score. In 2018, the percent scoring proficient was 27. The percent scoring proficient in 2019 dropped to 15%. The factor contributing to the decline would be the same as in the previous question.

**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**

Data from 2018-2019 showed 6th grade math with largest gap between the school average and the state average. BMHS scored 22% lower in this data component than the state average. Statistically, 6th grade students struggle with the transition between elementary school and middle school.

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

The percent of students scoring proficient on the 10th grade ELA FSA went from 29% in 2018 to 52% in 2019. There was a schoolwide focus on reading strategies to help improve the scores. In addition, the ELA teachers met with the reading coach on a regular basis to discuss student data and develop common lessons to improve student achievement.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

According to the EWS data, 51 students are classified as being retained more than two years. The retention rate of students is the area of most concern, and will be an area of focus for improvement this year.

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

1. Improvement in schoolwide reading proficiency is our highest priority this year.
2. Improving 6th - 8th grade math proficiency.
3. Improving learning gains in the lowest quartile in math and reading
4. Improving the ESSA Federal Index of African-American students to above 41%

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



## #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** 6th - 8th grade math is the area of focus for improvement. Ensuring the student have a solid mathematical foundation in the middle school will set them up for success as they progress into higher level high school math courses.

**Measurable Outcome:** In 2019, the 6th, 7th, and 8th grade math achievement percentage was 40%,32%, and 36%, respectively. BMHS will improve their 6th - 8th grade math achievement percentage to 50% in all grade levels on the Math FSA by the end of the 2021 school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Curtis Gaus (curtis.gaus@levyk12.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** BMHS math teachers will use data from I-Ready Math diagnostic and benchmark assessments to identify the students who have gaps in their math knowledge. Teachers will develop student groups based on the data gathered from the diagnostic and benchmark testing. The teachers will conduct small-group instruction a minimum of two times per week to provide prescriptive learning based on the students' instructional needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Small group instruction allows the teachers to target their instruction based on the needs of the students. According to data collected from the I-ready diagnostic testing, 38% of 6th - 8th grade students are at least 2 grade levels behind in math. By grouping students based on their area of need, teachers can design prescriptive lessons to address these gaps in learning.

### Action Steps to Implement

Lead math teachers will participate in monthly Math Cadre Meetings to analyze student data, unpack standards into teachable chunks, align curriculum with the test item specs.

**Person Responsible** Curtis Gaus (curtis.gaus@levyk12.org)

Teachers will conduct data chats with students to develop short-term goals, analyze progress, and monitor students.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Bray (jennifer.bray@levyk12.org)

Teachers will participate in professional development to help them design prescriptive lessons based on the data provided in the diagnostic and benchmark assessments.

**Person Responsible** Curtis Gaus (curtis.gaus@levyk12.org)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** In 2019, the ESSA Federal Index for African-American students was 39%. It is critical that all subgroups of our student population show gains and are successful. The overall success of a school is dependent on how well it provides additional support and resources to student subgroups. When all subgroups are achieving success, it will benefit the entire school.

**Measureable Outcome:** BMHS will improve the ESSA Federal Index for African-American students to 41% by the end of the 2020-2021 school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Curtis Gaus (curtis.gaus@levyk12.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** BMHS Lead/AVID Site team will conduct a root cause analysis to identify the possible causes of the achievement discrepancy for African-American students. In addition to the evidence-based strategies that will be used to improve the all students, the Lead/AVID site team will utilize the following strategies to improve the achievement of African American students:  
 1. Encourage all teachers and staff to create an atmosphere of high academic achievement for African-American students.  
 2. Increase the personal relationships with African-american students to ensure instruction is culturally relevant and teachers are able to identify an address misconceptions.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** In order to improve the overall federal index of the African-American students, identification of areas of improvement that are not already included in the School Improvement Pan will be identified and strategies will be developed for improvement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Create a list of students in the African-American subgroup, and Identify the areas within the federal index that can be improved.

**Person Responsible** Genny Foshee (genny.foshee@levyk12.org)

Students in the African-American subgroup will be monitored in the monthly PST/MTSS meetings to review and measure short-term math and reading goals and/or revise strategies for individual improvement.

**Person Responsible** Curtis Gaus (curtis.gaus@levyk12.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**Increasing reading achievement is always a priority for schoolwide improvement. All teachers will use research-based reading strategies in their instruction to ensure students are understanding information they read and they can articulate the central idea and author's purpose for writing informational text. The strategies to be used to increase schoolwide reading achievement are as follows:**

- 1. The AVID Site/Lead Team will conduct monthly faculty professional development on AVID/Literacy Instructional Strategies.**
  - A. Establish how the critical reading process is utilized in their individual content areas.**
  - B. Identify strategies to support vocabulary, pre-reading, interacting with the text, and extending beyond the text for specific content areas.**
  - C. Focused note-taking - Strategize ways to incorporate purposeful note-taking into instruction to achieve the desired learning outcome.**
- 2. Schoolwide Focus on Vocabulary**
  - A. A list of explicit academic vocabulary will be created, distributed, and posted in each class. Teachers will use common academic vocabulary across disciplines.**
  - B. Vocabulary will be taught in context with the lesson, and the teachers will provide students information regarding words with multiple meanings based on the context.**
- 3. Increase the use of higher-order thinking and questioning to increase reading comprehension**
  - A. Utilize Costa's level as a basis of inquiry in content-area classrooms in order to deepen students' level of knowledge and comprehension.**
  - B. Construct questions and/or statements and assess their use of Costa's level of thinking in order to elevate levels of student inquiry and critical thinking in their classrooms.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

BMHS School Advisory Council will be comprised of representatives of each stakeholder groups (parents, student, community, teachers and staff). The SAC will meet monthly to discuss the school's mission, action plan, progress towards school improvement goals, and expenditure of school house funds. The council is the deciding factor in the majority of school-based decisions.

BMHS has expanded its successful PBIS program that was started several years ago, by updating the school-wide positive branding with new signage, classroom posters, and staff shirts that illustrate the school's PBIS core values of Excellence Ambition Goals Leadership Enthusiasm/Perseverance Respect Integrity Dignity Equality. The teachers worked together to develop a common classroom expectation matrix for consistently managing classroom behaviors and a consistent teacher response to those behaviors. In addition, the teachers worked to implement a common positive behavior system that includes a combination of extrinsic and intrinsic motivational strategies. This consistency will provide a less confusing atmosphere on campus with regards to student expectations.

The PBIS program has been extended outside the classroom in extra-curricular activities. All of the sports teams have implemented a positive reward behavior system that encourages athletes to do the right thing and be a positive influence on their peers.

The faculty will participate in a parent/family engagement professional development session provided by Dr. Steven Constantino to provide the teachers and staff practical steps to engage families in their child's education.

The goal of the administrative staff will be to boost teacher and staff morale by recognizing those members who go above and beyond their normal duties. The BMHS Football team has implemented a teacher of the week program where they will recognize one teacher on game day and provide the teacher with the opportunity to participate in game-day events with the team.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

<b>Part V: Budget</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>