

Santa Rosa County School District

# Gulf Breeze High School



## 2019-20 School 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>7</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Gulf Breeze High School

675 GULF BREEZE PKWY, Gulf Breeze, FL 32561

<http://www.santarosa.k12.fl.us/schools/gbh/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Daniel Brothers**

Start Date for this Principal: 10/1/2015

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grade</b>	2018-19: A
<b>School Grades History</b>	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: A 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Jeff Sewell</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Santa Rosa County School Board.

### 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**

The mission of Gulf Breeze High School is to achieve and maintain an academic community that fosters achievement for all students, regardless of ability and background. The teachers, students, administration, staff, parents, and community assume responsibility for the achievement and progress of each student. Ultimately, we must prepare our students to be problem-solving, creative, productive, and responsible citizens in an ever-changing world.

**Provide the school's vision statement**

We believe...

Student learning is the highest priority for our school and that clear goals and high expectations for student achievement should guide our curriculum and extracurricular activities.

The learning environment must honor academic achievement, innovation, diversity, and personal expression in a safe, respectful, and supportive manner. Our curriculum and the personal example we set should foster strong personal values in our students. A commitment to continuous improvement is imperative if our school is to keep pace with rapidly evolving technology and to continue to inspire our students to become confident, self-directed, life-long learners.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
	Principal	
Baker, Victoria	Assistant Principal	
Watts, Jon	Assistant Principal	
Keen, Patrick	Assistant Principal	

### 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

**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

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

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

Friday 7/19/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

**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
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	76%	67%	56%	75%	65%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	55%	51%	63%	55%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	45%	42%	56%	44%	44%
Math Achievement	74%	65%	51%	72%	63%	51%
Math Learning Gains	55%	49%	48%	52%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	45%	45%	53%	43%	45%
Science Achievement	95%	91%	68%	80%	70%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	84%	79%	73%	81%	80%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (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.

NOTE: 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
09	2019	77%	65%	12%	55%	22%
	2018	76%	61%	15%	53%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	75%	64%	11%	53%	22%
	2018	74%	65%	9%	53%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	86%	10%	67%	29%
2018	79%	69%	10%	65%	14%
Compare		17%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	78%	5%	70%	13%
2018	80%	78%	2%	68%	12%
Compare		3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	69%	73%	-4%	61%	8%
2018	67%	67%	0%	62%	5%
Compare		2%			



GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	76%	66%	10%	57%	19%
2018	74%	65%	9%	56%	18%
Compare		2%			

**Subgroup Data**

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	36	36	28	44	44	42		63		94	19
ASN	76	40		83	55						
BLK	33	28		67	69					85	45
HSP	82	72	64	72	52	42	100	58		100	61
MUL	69	64	56	67	60	60		71		100	68
WHT	77	58	45	74	55	44	95	87		97	67
FRL	65	52	38	61	56	51	83	81		92	45

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
SWD	43	50	52	44	30	25	63	39		91	19
ASN	81	62		70							
BLK	65	73	70	44	23		55				
HSP	65	62	54	66	48		68	73		100	52
MUL	60	56	40	66	48		70	75		100	74
WHT	77	64	56	74	54	59	82	82		95	68
FRL	69	60	57	64	48	49	72	77		88	54

**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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	699
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
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
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	64
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	70
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	68
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	70
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	62
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

Overall the lowest performance is Math Learning Gains of the lowest 25% at 46%. Over the course of the 18-19 school, GBHS had a large increase in student enrollment from outside of Florida, which led to challenges in identifying proper student abilities.

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

ELA Learning Gains of the lowest 25% showed the greatest decline from the prior year going from 56% in 2018 to 47% in 2019. A 9% decrease from the previous year. The 10th grade class had 24% students that were marked as the lowest 25% in the prior year which is a 2% increase from when they were 9th graders. A change in staff also created a challenge for the 10th grade students. An ELA teacher was on maternity leave for the second semester.

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

The greatest gap compared to the state average is the Science Achievement component. The state average for the Biology EOC was 67% and GBHS has an average of 96% which is a difference of 29%. GBHS transitioned in moving to 10th graders taking Biology. This caused a small number of students taking Biology in the 2018-2019 school year, with 5 honor classes and only 1 regular class. The 2019-2020 school year should see this gap close due to more students taking Biology and having more regular classes.

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

Science Achievement showed the most improvement going from 80% in 2018 to 95% in 2019. A 15% increase from the previous year. Last school year, GBHS transitioned in moving to 10th graders taking Biology. This caused a small number of students taking Biology in the 2018-2019 school year, with 7 honor classes and only 2 regular class.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

Although not required to complete EWS, GBHS places an emphasis and closely monitors attendance below 90% and students who score level 1 on statewide assessments.

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

1. Increase student proficiency on the ELA Learning Gains.
2. Increase Math Learning Gains of the lowest 25%.
3. Increase teacher effectiveness and understanding of Marzano Rubric tool used for teacher evaluations.
4. Increase focus of attendance as studies have shown that grades are directly linked to attendance.
5. Provide opportunities for students have have yet to meet state standardized testing standards for graduation via coordinate scores along with FSA and ECO retakes through out the year.

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Increase student proficiency on the ELA Learning Gains.
<b>Rationale</b>	The school data dating back to the 16-17 school year indicates the need for increased support with regards to ELA Learning Gains and Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%. There was a 5% drop in Learning Gains and 9% drop for the Lowest 25% in the 18-19 school year. The trend over the last three years show overall growth in the achievement of the Lowest 25%. A low of 44% in 16-17 to a high of 56% in 17-18 to a drop off of 47% in 18-19.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The intended outcome is to increase the overall ELA Learning Gains and the Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% to at or near 62%, which is the specified state standards..
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Danny Brothers (brothersd@santarosa.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	English teachers will be utilizing multiple evidenced-based strategies throughout the year with their students. The evidence-based strategy that will be focused on the most is Close Reading.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Close Reading is a strategy that has benefits across the curriculum. As all disciplines require reading, the ability to pick apart a text—and then put it back together for meaning is a skill that will help whether reading a word problem in math, reading about mitosis in biology, or reading a work of fiction—or later in life, reading a mortgage contract. Some resources we have used are titles like Close Reading in the Secondary Classroom by Jeff Flygare, Techniques of Close Reading, by Barry Brummet. Some 9th and 10th grade ELA teachers are attending a workshop on more techniques.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ELA members attend workshops</li> <li>2. Continue to encourage and model text annotation</li> <li>3. Use text-based evidence questions</li> <li>4. Analyze and interpret rhetorical strategies</li> <li>5. Continue to assign researched based essays</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Danny Brothers (brothersd@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%
<b>Rationale</b>	There was a 3% increase in overall Math Learning Gains from 52% to 55% in the 18-19 school year. However there was a drop in achievement for the Lowest 25%. That group went from 53% in 17-18 to 46% in 18-19, a 7% decrease.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The intended outcome is to continue to improve achievement in the overall Math Learning Gains with an increased focus on improving the achievement of the Lowest 25% by 2% to 48%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Danny Brothers (brothersd@santarosa.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Math Learning Gains covers two subject courses, Algebra 1 and Geometry. For Algebra 1, we have implemented double blocking the students identified as the lowest 25%. They have two math classes each day. In Geometry, teachers are using very detailed guided notes to address the needs of our lowest 25% students which takes the focus off organization deficiencies and lets the student focus more on content. Teachers are also using Geometry Nation to provide examples that closely resemble the types and level of difficulty of EOC questions.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	For Algebra 1 students in double block, they have Algebra 1A first period and Algebra 1B sixth period. They will have two math credits for the year and have double time in math class to correct deficiencies. This strategy is adapted from Okaloosa County where the evidence showed over a 11% increase in those passing the Algebra 1 EOC the first time. For Geometry students, the use of of helps keep students organized and allows more time for problem solving. Students will be able to draw directly on pictures, charts and graphs as they are included on the notes. Absent students will be able to have notes already filled in from the teacher.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Modeling, using manipulative to deepen understanding.</li> <li>2. Universal design planning</li> <li>3. Correlated test practice such as Geometry Nation and Algebra Nation</li> <li>4. Graphic organizers</li> <li>5. Detailed reviews utilizing the same format as EOC and using multiple styles of questions i.e. multi select, multiple choice, short answer, ect.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Danny Brothers (brothersd@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**#3**

**Title** Marzano Rubric for Observation  
**Rationale** Teachers are evaluated using this rubric and each teacher will benefit having a deeper understanding of rigorous instruction in the classroom.

**State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** The intended outcome is to have all instructional staff be rated as Effective or Highly Effective on their overall evaluation.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome** Danny Brothers (brothersd@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy** To increase the level to teacher effectiveness, teachers will be participating in Professional Learning Communities (PLC's).

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** The PLC process allows all teachers and members of the leadership team to focus on the business of collaboration with regard to a standards based curriculum that is data driven and allows teachers to utilize the common formative and summative process to drive instruction.

**Action Step**

**Description** 1. Attendance at PLC meetings and district or school-based in-services.  
 2. Provide selective content specific common planning and protect time for PLC collaboration.  
 3. Implementation of school-wide deliberate practice.  
 4. MyPD documentation  
 5.

**Person Responsible** Danny Brothers (brothersd@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)**

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)**

**Part IV: Title I Requirements**

**Additional Title I Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students**

**PFEP Link**

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

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services**

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another**

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact**

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations**

<b>Part V: Budget</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Increase student proficiency on the ELA Learning Gains.</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Marzano Rubric for Observation</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$0.00</b>