

Brevard Public Schools

Space Coast Junior/Senior High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 22 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 28 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Space Coast Junior/Senior High School

6150 BANYAN ST, Cocoa, FL 32927

<http://www.spacecoast.brevard.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Joseph Flora C

Start Date for this Principal: 1/7/2020

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2019-20 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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 49% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (57%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard 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.

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.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 22 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Space Coast Junior/Senior High School

6150 BANYAN ST, Cocoa, FL 32927

<http://www.spacecoast.brevard.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>High School 7-12</p> | <p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>55%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>27%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
| Grade | | B | B | B |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://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.

Ensure that every student graduates from Space Coast college, career, or military ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Provide each student with every opportunity to succeed.

PRIDE: Prepared to learn. Respect for school and community. Integrity. Dedicated to safety. Engaged in learning.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Bachman, Gregory | Assistant Principal | Student Behavior & School Climate |
| Flora, Joseph | Principal | Instructional and Operational Leader |
| Papczynski, Peter | Assistant Principal | Curriculum Contact & ESE Coordinator |
| Williams, Jennifer | Assistant Principal | Operations Contact & School Culture |
| Felker, Stephanie | Assistant Principal | Student Behavior & School Climate |
| Baldrige, Jocelyn | Reading Coach | Literacy Coach & MTSS coordinator |
| Humphrys, Carrie | Other | Director of Specialized Educational Programs |
| Zinger, Melinda | Other | Coordinates and Facilitates all State and District testing for all students |
| Mila, Tina | Other | Ensures compliance in Exceptional Student Education population. |
| Williams, Amy | School Counselor | Works with our English Language Learners |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 1/7/2020, Joseph Flora C

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

91

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,571

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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 | 326 | 265 | 261 | 273 | 250 | 195 | 1570 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 33 | 27 | 29 | 30 | 13 | 178 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 32 | 24 | 17 | 10 | 3 | 126 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 19 | 11 | 16 | 10 | 1 | 82 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 38 | 18 | 24 | 13 | 7 | 148 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2021 Level 1 FSA ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 65 | 52 | 69 | 48 | 14 | 314 |
| 2021 Level 1 FSA Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 59 | 73 | 73 | 64 | 14 | 344 |
| | 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 | 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 |

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 | 87 | 68 | 69 | 59 | 45 | 8 | 336 |

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 | 70 | 42 | 17 | 38 | 38 | 2 | 207 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 12 | 11 | 25 | 27 | 2 | 108 |

Date this data was collected or last updated
 Wednesday 9/15/2021

2020-21 - 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 | 0 | 287 | 268 | 259 | 288 | 258 | 153 | 1513 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 18 | 18 | 28 | 16 | 7 | 129 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 28 | 32 | 31 | 16 | 5 | 138 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 26 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 3 | 7 | 15 | 3 | 1 | 47 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 26 | 33 | 42 | 35 | 11 | 197 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 10 | 29 | 34 | 18 | 10 | 165 |

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 | 60 | 20 | 38 | 38 | 19 | 4 | 179 |

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 | 22 | 3 | 13 | 24 | 15 | 4 | 81 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 18 |

2020-21 - 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 | 0 | 287 | 268 | 259 | 288 | 258 | 153 | 1513 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 18 | 18 | 28 | 16 | 7 | 129 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 28 | 32 | 31 | 16 | 5 | 138 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 26 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 3 | 7 | 15 | 3 | 1 | 47 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 26 | 33 | 42 | 35 | 11 | 197 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 10 | 29 | 34 | 18 | 10 | 165 |

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 | 60 | 20 | 38 | 38 | 19 | 4 | 179 |

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 | 22 | 3 | 13 | 24 | 15 | 4 | 81 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 18 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 55% | 59% | 56% | 56% | 58% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 50% | 52% | 51% | 54% | 53% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 42% | 40% | 42% | 46% | 44% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 63% | 48% | 51% | 57% | 50% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 62% | 49% | 48% | 54% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 53% | 45% | 45% | 47% | 43% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 58% | 66% | 68% | 65% | 67% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 76% | 70% | 73% | 76% | 70% | 71% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 58% | -3% | 52% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 57% | 63% | -6% | 56% | 1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -55% | | | | |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 62% | -4% | 55% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -57% | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 59% | -5% | 53% | 1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -58% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 68% | 62% | 6% | 54% | 14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 43% | 10% | 46% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -68% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 53% | -6% | 48% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 69% | 66% | 3% | 67% | 2% |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 76% | 74% | 2% | 71% | 5% |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 73% | 71% | 2% | 70% | 3% |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 59% | 61% | -2% | 61% | -2% |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 65% | 60% | 5% | 57% | 8% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The tools used to progress monitor students throughout the school year are below.

MAP

ReadingPlus

| Grade 7 | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 40 | 47 | 46 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 34 | 49 | 44 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 63 | 67 | 57 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Civics | All Students | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 42 | 40 | 37 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 43 | 37 | 36 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15 | 21 | 12 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 55 | 50 | 35 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 37 | 39 | 37 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 34 | 26 | 34 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17 | 14 | 16 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 49 | 46 | 44 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 10 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 45 | 50 | 36 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 34 | 26 | 34 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17 | 14 | 16 |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 52 | 44 | 35 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | |

| Grade 11 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 33 | 20 | 16 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| Grade 12 | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | 33 | 50 | 50 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Students With Disabilities | | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | English Language Learners | | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 20 | 25 | 17 | 19 | 27 | 28 | 31 | 46 | 25 | 83 | 26 |
| ASN | 82 | 50 | | 67 | 50 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | 38 | 35 | 25 | 24 | 11 | 30 | 44 | 40 | 93 | 36 |
| HSP | 48 | 43 | 20 | 41 | 36 | 29 | 59 | 60 | 47 | 89 | 56 |
| MUL | 45 | 39 | 37 | 41 | 38 | 40 | 53 | 59 | 57 | 100 | 45 |

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| WHT | 44 | 39 | 30 | 47 | 37 | 30 | 61 | 74 | 54 | 88 | 53 |
| FRL | 40 | 37 | 32 | 39 | 31 | 26 | 51 | 67 | 48 | 84 | 43 |
| 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 18 | 42 | 40 | 31 | 50 | 44 | 25 | 45 | 27 | 81 | 36 |
| ELL | 30 | 50 | | 9 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | 53 | 35 | 49 | 51 | 30 | 47 | 63 | 69 | | |
| HSP | 49 | 51 | 55 | 49 | 65 | 59 | 56 | 67 | 25 | 85 | 61 |
| MUL | 49 | 46 | 42 | 68 | 62 | 40 | 62 | 70 | 71 | 96 | 48 |
| WHT | 58 | 50 | 41 | 66 | 63 | 55 | 59 | 79 | 54 | 85 | 57 |
| FRL | 49 | 47 | 42 | 59 | 60 | 52 | 53 | 69 | 49 | 79 | 51 |
| 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 19 | 40 | 41 | 32 | 48 | 48 | 29 | 53 | 29 | 77 | 5 |
| BLK | 39 | 50 | 41 | 43 | 45 | 35 | 59 | 58 | | 90 | 39 |
| HSP | 49 | 53 | 44 | 46 | 46 | 48 | 50 | 70 | 40 | 96 | 50 |
| MUL | 51 | 55 | 39 | 49 | 50 | 36 | 53 | 75 | 50 | 82 | 71 |
| WHT | 59 | 55 | 49 | 60 | 57 | 50 | 68 | 78 | 62 | 84 | 60 |
| FRL | 49 | 49 | 42 | 51 | 50 | 44 | 57 | 71 | 55 | 79 | 45 |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 50 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 548 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 94% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 32 |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 62 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 38 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 50 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |

| White Students | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Federal Index - White Students | 51 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 45 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

From progress monitoring data, the trend that is most evident is a decrease in scores across all grade levels in the MAP testing for Math. The most significant drops come in 8th, 10th, and 11th grades with all three decreasing by an average of 18 percent. ESE subgroup scored below 20 percent achievement in all ELA progress monitoring on ReadingPlus with a displaying no significant gains over the course of three progress monitoring assessments.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on both progress monitoring and state assessments, Grade 7 Math, Grade 8 Math, Algebra and ELA course 7 through 10 demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. Grade 7 Math FSA scores dropped 16 percent. Grade 8 Math dropped 40 percent. Algebra dropped 16 percent. All 7 through 10 ELA FSA scores dropped by an average of 12 percent.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing factors to this need for improvement is based on multiple factors. Student attendance, lack of professional development throughout the year, and inconsistency in teacher collaboration. New actions needing to take for this school year include an increased focus on attendance tracking - supporting students who miss instructional time due to being quarantined, quality professional development provided to teachers by administration and district, and weekly professional learning committees on Thursdays between teachers with common courses.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on progress monitoring, the senior cohort showed the most improvement in the MAP testing rising from 33 percent on the fall assessment up to 50 percent achievement on the winter and spring assessments.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Contributing factors to this improvement was the emphasis of getting seniors to graduate as part of the school's mission. Ensuring the senior students were progressing and making strides to pass and achieve the required math credits to graduate. Consistent meeting with senior students and providing needed assistance in the areas of most need for their success. Remedial after school support in the form of credit recovery and boot camps aimed to strengthen student's math skills prior to taking their Algebra EOC.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

In order to accelerate learning at Space Coast, we will focus on determining the key concepts and skills that the students are missing and follow through with three actions to close those gaps in learning. First we will prioritize those standards that are needed to build a foundation in course content. We will then put an emphasis on building background knowledge and vocabulary within those standards, which will increase student comprehension within the grade-level text. Lastly, we will use intentional scaffolding within those priority standards, using the background knowledge and vocabulary to scaffold from less complex text to more complex text through intentional planning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The professional developments opportunities this year for our teachers is focused on Professional Learning Committees and BEST instructional strategies for increased student engagement. Teachers have been placed into groups of 3-4 with common courses/subjects. At these weekly meetings, teachers are collaborating on instructional delivery, priority standards and assessment creation. The monthly professional developments are focused on implementing instructional strategies that lead to increased achievement and are tied to our evaluation rubric. Professional learning communities will provide the structure and support to discuss and implement the practices learned during professional development.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Administration will attend weekly PLC meetings within their departments to help guide the conversations and review practices being used within the classroom. Daily walk-throughs in classrooms will also take place in order to see actions occurring from the weekly PLC meetings, followed up by continuous feedback and coaching to help teachers grow in the profession.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students with disabilities achievement data in school years 2018 & 2019 in ELA achievement was 18% and 19% respectively. Support Facilitation and learning strategies sections have increased twofold from SY 2021 to SY 2022. Through support facilitation and learning strategies, ESE student achievement on the ELA FSA will increase to 40% in SY 2022.

Measurable Outcome: Through support facilitation and learning strategies, ESE student achievement on the ELA FSA will increase to 40% in SY 2022. ESE teachers will work through Support Facilitation to regularly review student performance data (summative and formative assessment data) to ensure that growth is occurring throughout the school year.

Monthly review of ESE student's academic progress in addition to reviewing data from regularly from Read180, will support our efforts to monitor student performance.

Monitoring: Classroom observations by school administration every two weeks, teacher PLC groups will meet weekly, student progress monitoring will occur multiple times throughout the school year to measure the growth of the students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Peter Papczynski (papczynski.peter@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Deliberate scheduling of students has taken place to ensure that interventions to support IEP goals are being provided in the General Education Setting. Greater levels of support facilitation, more learning strategies courses and additional social emotional classes have been scheduled this year to meet the needs of our students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By implementing more targeted interventions, Space Coast ESE students will see significant growth this school year. Support Facilitation allows students to be included in instruction in the least restrictive environment via support from both the classroom teacher and ese teacher pushing in. In addition, curriculum in the learning strategies classroom is developed to support the needs of the students to increase literacy skills.

Action Steps to Implement

Staffing changes were made to ensure that adequate instructional units are devoted to ESE during the scheduling process.

Person Responsible Peter Papczynski (papczynski.peter@brevardschools.org)

During the master scheduling process, ESE students were scheduled into learning strategies as well as support facilitation sections to ensure that wrap-around services can be provided.

Person Responsible Peter Papczynski (papczynski.peter@brevardschools.org)

ESE support facilitators review all ESE students' IEPs for the class to ensure that supports and accommodations meeting the standards of Best Practices for Inclusive Education are being provided to meet the students' needs

Person Responsible Tina Mila (mila.tina@brevardschools.org)

During weekly PLC meetings, teachers will discuss student assessment data to drive Best Practices for Inclusive Education instruction.

Person Responsible Peter Papczynski (papczynski.peter@brevardschools.org)

ESE case managers, support facilitation teachers, and learning strategies teachers work in conjunction to progress monitor ESE students.

Person Responsible Tina Mila (mila.tina@brevardschools.org)

Learning strategies teachers received summer training on support student needs.

Person Responsible Tina Mila (mila.tina@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Space Coast Jr/Sr HS saw a drastic decrease or no change in every state tested subject from School Year 2019 to School Year 2021 except for Civics and Biology. In order to stop regression, and increase achievements beyond pre-pandemic achievement levels across all content areas, we will begin implementing Professional Learning Communities in each content area to ensure that teachers are delivering rigorous grade-level curriculum to all students by intentionally focusing on standards based instruction.

Measurable Outcome: Content area PLC Groups will meet weekly to discuss instruction. To begin, the PLC groups will focus on standards-based instruction and pacing. Additionally, assessment data will be reviewed within the PLC groups to measure the efficacy of lessons so that teachers can discuss targeted interventions. As a result of the implementation of PLC groups, Space Coast Jr/Sr High School will see 10% increases in all state-tested content areas.

Monitoring: Evaluating administrators work to schedule the weekly PLC meetings with the groups that they oversee. Administrators will sit in and help facilitate the meetings and view student work samples, assessment data and lesson plans. Additionally, each PLC team will submit meeting minutes to document the progress and process. These weekly meeting minutes are tracked and recorded through a google form.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Peter Papczynski (papczynski.peter@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implementation of weekly subject-area PLC group meetings to collectively work to ensure that standards-based instruction and assessment is occurring regularly at Space Coast Jr/ Sr HS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research illustrated in "Learning By Doing, A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work" written by DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, Many and Mattos takes a deep dive into the PLC Process in instructional settings. Much of the research outlined in the book explains how student achievement is positively impacted when effective PLC groups regularly meet with a focus on student learning as the central theme.

Action Steps to Implement

Content-specific PLC groups were created by school administration in conjunction with department chairs.

Person Responsible Peter Papczynski (papczynski.peter@brevardschools.org)

During Pre-Planning, all instructional staff participated in a 7 hour professional development focused on the purpose of PLC's, what they will look like at Space Coast, and unpacking priority standards for the first several weeks.

Person Responsible Peter Papczynski (papczynski.peter@brevardschools.org)

PLC groups meet every Thursday morning during protected time to discuss standards-based instruction and student achievement. Meetings are focused on standards alignment, curriculum implementation and instructional strategies learned during professional development.

Person Responsible Peter Papczynski (papczynski.peter@brevardschools.org)

Evaluating administrators will participate in PLC meetings ensuring quality and and gradually release responsibility to the groups.

Person Responsible Peter Papczynski (papczynski.peter@brevardschools.org)

Each quarter, student assessment data will be disaggregated to help drive instruction across all grade levels and courses.

Person Responsible Carrie Humphrys (humphrys.carrie@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: For grades 7-10, FSA achievement scores dropped by an average of 12 percent. Literacy is critical to student achievement as it impacts learning across all subjects. In order for students to fully access all content from all courses, literacy skills need to be at or above grade level. Space Coast will continue to focus on literacy and its impact on student achievement across all grade levels.

Measurable Outcome: With a specific emphasis on literacy (reading, writing, and speaking) and its purposeful use across all core classes, we will increase our ELA achievement by 10%.

Monitoring: Frequent feedback to teachers and quality conversations in professional learning committee meetings on best practices in the classroom to help enhance lessons and increase rigor. For the 2021-2022 school year, administration will conduct frequent observations through all core subjects to provide support, feedback, and coaching. Administration will also meet with teachers in professional learning committees to oversee conversations and ensure lessons are aligning with curriculum. This year, a new textbook was adopted for English and Reading courses. Administration is working with teachers to implement these new resources with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joseph Flora (flora.joseph@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: To increase student literacy we want students to interact with grade-level text by improving text management strategies. New text resources that we have in middle school called Amplify allows teachers to monitor students as they annotate text digitally, not only giving them practice in this much needed skill. As a school, We recognize annotation as a critical skill to increasing literacy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This evidence-based strategy for annotation is being used from Fisher & Frey's PD Resource Center for Close & Critical Reading: Student Success with Complex Text. An important component for literacy is the ability to identify central themes from text. by improving students annotating skills more frequently., students will be able to comprehend texts, and identify/use details in support of their literacy of grade-level text. Since we have an increase in resources with the digital technology, Amplify, these skills are being taught more readily than previous years.

Action Steps to Implement

All students from grades 7-11 will be progress monitored three times throughout the 2021-22 school year through the Reading Inventory(Read 180). This data will be shared with the students and their ELA and ILA teachers to review student strengths and needs. This data will help improve best teaching practices within the classroom and provide students with feedback in order to set goals and action steps to get on or above grade level.

Person Responsible Jocelyn Baldrige (baldrige.jocelyn@brevardschools.org)

As a school, we will monitor student progress through the Read180 application. Our literacy coach will be able to check progress and provide remediation to students in need of more support in literacy.

Person Responsible Jocelyn Baldrige (baldrige.jocelyn@brevardschools.org)

Our administration and literacy coach will lead and support all ELA and intensive Reading Professional Learning Committees.

Person Responsible Joseph Flora (flora.joseph@brevardschools.org)

Administration and the school literacy coach will facilitate the implementation of new curriculum with fidelity in both ELA and Intensive Reading classrooms via observations and classroom walk-throughs, while providing meaningful feedback and coaching to enhance best teaching practices.

Person Responsible Joseph Flora (flora.joseph@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

After reviewing and comparing discipline data from SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, our primary school concern that we plan to monitor this year is tobacco use. Our secondary area of concern which we believe is a significant underlying reason for high tobacco use is students being out of area. This year we have focused on all students committing to the Viper Pride agreement. Part of the pride agreement includes being dedicated to safety and engaged in learning. Following these two commitments, specifically, should in turn have a positive effect on our discipline data particularly in the two above mentioned areas. Being involved in the learning environment and keeping students engaged through each class period is a priority we have placed on our staff. We are actively and intentionally vocalizing the pride agreement daily with the students, as well as continually discussing the dangers of tobacco particularly through vaping devices. Additionally, we have implemented strategies for monitoring areas on our campus through our campus monitor, incorporating strong guidelines for when students can be out of class and the process to do so, and upgrading our security cameras throughout the campus that can be accessed and monitored more frequently. We plan to meet monthly to review the discipline data and make adjustments based on the data as needed.

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.

The main component for building a positive school culture and environment is through student voice.

96% of our 9-12 grade students and 82% of our 7-8 grade students took the Youth Truth Survey (YTS) this past school year. According to the survey, we had several areas that had room for growth. As a staff, we have begun focusing on Building Relationships with the belief that will positively affect the other categories such as Belonging & Peer Collaboration and Culture. 11% of 9-12 grade students and 28% of our 7-8 grade students voiced a positive for the question: How many of your teachers make an effort to understand what your life is like outside of school? Only 37% of our 9-12 grade students and 33% of our 7-8 grade students responded positively to the following question: When I'm feeling upset, stressed, or having problems, there is an adult from school who I can talk to about it. As a faculty, we want our students to feel safe while they are at school and have a minimum of one adult with whom they feel they can talk to. Our first week back to school was centered on building relationships with the students. The first day bell scheduled was altered to give students a time to reflect and talk with their 5th period teachers about the first day back. Teachers focused more on ice breakers and less on syllabus and procedures.

Parent Voice:

135 of our 7-8 grade parents responded to the BPS Middle School Parent Survey. 85% of those parents felt welcome at Space Coast. 261 of our 9-12 grade parents responded to our BPS High School Parent Survey. 86% of those parents felt welcome at Space Coast. Parents top three choices for meetings that they would participate in include:

Middle School: Dual enrollment/Advanced Placement courses, FASFA/Bright Futures/Financial aid options, Transition to high school

High School: Planning for college and career, College financial aid (FASFA/Bright Futures/scholarships), Graduation and promotion guidelines

Parents feedback from both surveys addressed the need for more specific target audience for meetings. Parents also stated that they prefer email and text as their primary options for information. As a school we have been working to improve our communication with parents with Black Board Connect being our primary means of reaching parents through emails and texts. We continue to try and update our information so that more people are reached through those platforms.

Teacher Voice:

83% of our teachers took the Insight Survey this past school year. The highest ranked category by our teachers was in School Operations and our lowest ranked category was in Professional Development. During pre-planning, we began our Professional Development series with a strong focus on relationships based off our YTS data. We will also be modeling strategies that teachers can use to improve student achievement. Another area we identified as an Administration team is Observation and Feedback. Administrators will be using an online form to give immediate and specific feedback to our teachers with an emphasis on being in one to two classrooms per day. Teachers receive an email immediately with the feedback with specific ties to the IPPAS rubric.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Joseph Flora is the principal and leader of the school.

Stephanie Felker is the assistant principal and runs the social media account for Space Coast sending out useful information to all stakeholders and celebrating all the success going on in the school

Keri Weeks is the PIE Coordinator, who builds meaningful connections with businesses helping build community between the school and local business partners.

Carrie Humphrys, the Academies Director, gets student voice and creates clubs/activities based on student

input.

Greg Bachman, assistant principal, leads the culture team made up of teacher leaders in the school to create celebrations and build a sense of community within the school between students and teachers. SAC Committee is made up of parents, community members, teachers and students, discussing current issues within the school