

St. Johns County School District

Beachside 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
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

Beachside High School

200 GREAT BARRACUDA WAY, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-bhs.stjohns.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.

Create your own current while we swim together.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Be bold, be brave, ride the wave.

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
Bergamasco, Greg	Principal	Direct and manage instructional program and supervise operations and personnel at campus level. Provide leadership to ensure high standards of instructional service. Oversee compliance with district policies, success of instructional programs, and operation of all campus activities.
Altick, Mollie	Assistant Principal	Responsible for assisting the Principal with leadership, direction, supervision, operations and accountability at Beachside High School.
Sirak, Ryan	Assistant Principal	Responsible for assisting the Principal with leadership, direction, supervision, operations and accountability at Beachside High School.
Stone, Kendra	Magnet Coordinator	Responsible for coordinating the college readiness programs and academies at Beachside High School.
Higgins, Kendall	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach is a highly qualified educator who is knowledgeable about curriculum and instruction and is able to increase student learning by fostering instructional excellence throughout the building. The coach will engage in the delivery of professional development, including observing teachers, coaching and modeling instructional and assessment strategies, and providing feedback that ensures effective instruction and student learning.
Livingood, Johnathan	Dean	The Dean promotes positive behavior expectations throughout the school and administers student discipline consequences in accordance with the district's disciplinary policy.
Hurst, Diane	Dean	The Dean promotes positive behavior expectations throughout the school and administers student discipline consequences in accordance with the district's disciplinary policy.
Swope, John	Assistant Principal	Responsible for assisting the Principal with leadership, direction, supervision, operations and accountability at Beachside High School.

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.

Beachside High School will host monthly School Advisory Council meetings where school leadership, teachers and staff will meet with families, businesses and community leaders to discuss how to better improve Beachside High School. During the meetings we will determine what areas should be included on the school improvement as well as vote on how to implement strategies for improvement.

SIP Monitoring

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

The School Improvement plan will be regularly monitored for effectiveness by looking at attendance as well as test score data. Data monitoring is being conducted in PLC groups within the department, and the multi-tiered support system. The information gathered from the data will then be utilized to determine the effectiveness of the school improvement plan and other smaller focused intervention strategies. If the data indicates that we are not meeting our goals, then we will discuss options of how to revise the school improvement plan during a future School Advisory Council meeting.

Demographic Data

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	34%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	5%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	
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)	
School Grades History	
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	0	
One or more suspensions	0	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	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	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	0	303
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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) Updated (pre-populated)

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

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

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

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

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

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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*		74	52		74	56
ELA Learning Gains		64	52		60	51
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile		52	41		50	42
Math Achievement*		69	41		73	51
Math Learning Gains		59	48		58	48
Math Lowest 25th Percentile		48	49		55	45
Science Achievement*		84	61		86	68
Social Studies Achievement*		85	68		88	73
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress						

** 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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Graduation Rate

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

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)

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												

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
WHT												
FRL												

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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	70%	73%	-3%	50%	20%
09	2023 - Spring	75%	70%	5%	48%	27%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	78%	-6%	50%	22%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	67%	-1%	48%	18%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	86%	3%	63%	26%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	79%	82%	-3%	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.

Our lowest performance at Beachside was students with disabilities English Language Arts FSA scores. 33% of students with disabilities received a 3 or higher while 73% of students overall received a 3 or higher on the English FSA.

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

Beachside High School's first year was 2022-2023. Therefore, we are unable to determine which data component showed the greatest decline from the previous year.

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 state average is 50% level 3 or higher for all students taking the English Language Arts FSA. 33% of the students with disabilities at Beachside High School scored a 3 or higher. Beachside aims to close the achievement gap with its students with disabilities to get closer to the state average.

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

Beachside High School's first year was 2022-2023. Therefore, we are unable to determine which data component showed the greatest decline from the previous year.

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

One of the potential areas of concern was a relatively low attendance rate for our 11th as well as 10th graders with 29.76% of 11th graders being absent for 10% or more school days.

Another area of concern is the 10th grade students showing two or more indicators is 16.37%. Indicating that we may have a smaller group of students that may need some intervention services.

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

1. Building a positive school culture.
2. Helping our at-risk students with a focus on students with special needs.
3. Transformational leadership and staff retention.

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.

Beachside High School is in its footing stages of development. Establishing and maintaining a strong and good school culture is vital to the success of our students academically and socially.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Beachside High School would like to have at least 65% of our student body participating in or attending extracurricular activities, clubs, or sport.

Monitoring:

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

During the Needs Assessment Survey students will be asked if they participate in activities outside of school.

MTSS data will show an increase in student attendance as well as reports that are given.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Greg Bergamasco (greg.bergamasco@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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 are holding student led club interest meetings, where students can show interest in clubs and then find a teacher that can sponsor the club.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Participating in extracurricular activities builds teamwork, communication, relationships, and a sense of belonging, all of which help students to develop socially and be successful in school. Participation in extracurricular activities demonstrates the importance of community involvement. All of which are vital to a newer school and organization.

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.

Beachside High School is going to build the school culture by allowing students multiple opportunities to get involved in extracurricular activities.

We will also encourage school culture through by sharing our school mission and vision statements to foster growth.

Person Responsible: Greg Bergamasco (greg.bergamasco@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Within the first quarter students will have an opportunity to be a part of a club fair to get involved at Beachside High School.

#2. 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.

One of our lowest performing subgroups is students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Beachside High School is going to aim to have 45% of students with disabilities show learning gains for the upcoming school year.

Monitoring:

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

ELA will have progress monitoring by use of FAST Progress monitoring, FSA, and SAT/ACT. Math will have progress monitoring using District Common Assessments, EOC, PAST, ACT/SAT.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ryan Sirak (ryan.sirak@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Strategies will include Math & ELA support teachers, small group instruction, FAST Progress Monitoring, and Delta Math. Teachers will also be utilizing the PLC model to help identify and assist students that are in need of additional help.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teams that operate using the PLC model, collaborate and align standards and review data which will increase student achievement.

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.

Within the PLCs from each subject the team will:

1. Analyze data from district and state assessments.
2. Develop a Smart goal of which standards are key for each course.
3. Establish the best practices and methods to teach the most important material as well as develop common summative assessments.
4. Share common assessment data to identify where students succeeded or did not reach desired achievement.
5. Develop a plan for what to do when students do not master the material.

Person Responsible: Kendall Higgins (kendall.higgins@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: PLC Data will be checked by the end of each quarter.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning**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.

With a new school it will take a community of leaders that allows for all parties to have an opportunity to allow the school to grow. As students and teachers have opportunities to truly take ownership of aspects of Beachside High School, the overall culture would improve.

There are several new teachers in the building and we want to ensure the best instructional practices are being conducted in the classroom through the utilization of PLC groups by subject area. We want all teachers participating within the PLC group to feel empowered as a leader to share new ideas; with the overall goal of enhancing student learning while targeting our at risk students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Beachside High School would like to have 40% of our teacher body expanding their roles, taking leadership positions.

Monitoring:

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

Surveys will be completed throughout the year as well as during the needs assessment survey to inquire about teacher and student leadership as well as overall participation in activities that relate to Beachside High's vision as a school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Greg Bergamasco (greg.bergamasco@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Building shared vision is the core of transformational leadership improvement. Beachside High School plans to expand the understanding and embodiment of its new mission and vision statement among our faculty, staff, and students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In transformational leadership, the principal's role shifts toward fostering a collective vision and motivating members of an organization to achieve extraordinary performance.

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.

Clear vision is created and communicated by the principal.

Principal delegate ownership of curriculum coordination, supervision, evaluation, instruction, student

programs, etc. to their staff.

Proactive focus on culture-building.

Person Responsible: Greg Bergamasco (greg.bergamasco@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Beachside High School would like to have more teachers start to take leadership positions within the first semester of school.