Astronaut High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Astronaut High School

800 WAR EAGLE BLVD, Titusville, FL 32796

http://www.astronaut.brevard.k12.fl.us/

Demographics

Principal: Krista Miller K

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2015

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (52%) 2014-15: A (65%)
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	TS&I

* 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

Astronaut High School

800 WAR EAGLE BLVD, Titusville, FL 32796

http://www.astronaut.brevard.k12.fl.us/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	55%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

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.

Astronaut High School will provide a safe, supportive learning environment that empowers students to become capable, independent, informed, and contributing citizens who can succeed in an ever changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pride in community; Passion in learning.

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
Cantaloupe, Lori	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum and Instruction
Russell, Jamie	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Facilities
Hanson, Jerry	Assistant Principal	Discipline
Miller, Krista	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	299	271	248	239	1057
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	18	18	16	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	25	21	20	121
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	72	66	58	230
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	58	58	26	201
Level 1 and 2 on Algebra 1 assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	64	59	15	163
Level 1 and 2 FSA Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	0	0	0	83

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	83	87	75	49	294

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	25	55	38	118
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	5	10	23

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
67

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 6/18/2019

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	
One or more suspensions	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	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	

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	50%	59%	56%	43%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	52%	51%	42%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	40%	42%	35%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	35%	48%	51%	40%	48%	49%
Math Learning Gains	46%	49%	48%	41%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	45%	45%	30%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	48%	66%	68%	46%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	64%	70%	73%	71%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	299 (0)	271 (0)	248 (0)	239 (0)	1057 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	34 ()	18 ()	18 ()	16 ()	86 (0)
One or more suspensions	55 ()	25 ()	21 ()	20 ()	121 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	34 ()	72 ()	66 ()	58 ()	230 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	59 ()	58 ()	58 ()	26 ()	201 (0)
Level 1 and 2 on Algebra 1 assessment	25 (0)	64 (0)	59 (0)	15 (0)	163 (0)
Level 1 and 2 FSA Math	83 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	83 (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	53%	62%	-9%	55%	-2%
	2018	39%	60%	-21%	53%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	48%	59%	-11%	53%	-5%
	2018	46%	61%	-15%	53%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

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	45%	66%	-21%	67%	-22%
2018	43%	67%	-24%	65%	-22%
Compare		2%			

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	62%	71%	-9%	70%	-8%
2018	56%	70%	-14%	68%	-12%
Compare		6%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	22%	61%	-39%	61%	-39%
2018	28%	62%	-34%	62%	-34%
Compare		-6%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	41%	60%	-19%	57%	-16%
2018	45%	60%	-15%	56%	-11%
Compare		-4%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	20	29	24	18	50		20	40		78	23
BLK	26	37	42	22	52		33	38		75	52
HSP	40	41	43	30	58		33	73		81	40
MUL	54	53	36	26	29		50	75		69	55
WHT	56	52	39	40	45	31	53	68		84	63
FRL	41	45	39	27	42	29	40	54		79	54

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	13	30	32	21	38		19	30		56	33
BLK	18	36	41	28	33		15	34		69	52
HSP	35	45		35	57		30	53		82	71
MUL	39	50		44	53		27	39		83	73
WHT	47	46	39	50	56	53	53	64		78	71
FRL	34	43	40	41	48	48	36	49		65	63

2017 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	10	29	25	16	30	31	24	30		62	25
BLK	19	28	33	26	34	21	15	38		67	67
HSP	29	35	14	39	38		40	77		76	69
MUL	26	17		40	26		36	80		80	
WHT	51	49	41	43	43	31	56	77		83	69
FRL	29	35	27	33	41	27	37	64		74	57

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	504
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	53
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 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.

The lowest performance level in 2018-2019 was Math which dropped from 45% proficiency to 35%. Consequently, our math learning gains dropped by 7% and our lowest 25th percentile kids dropped from 50% to 32% proficiency. In 2017-18, our learning gains in math increased 12% and the lowest 25% group increased from 30% to 50%.

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

The greatest decline was our lowest 25% math group. It has been our practice to place students who score level 1 or 2 on the FSA Math EOC in 8th grade in Algebra 1A and 1B in 9th and 10th grade. Ability grouping our students in math created an atmosphere that was not conducive to learning for all students. We also did not have formative assessments or means for progress monitoring, and we had one teacher in charge of all of the EOC courses, so we also did not have a collaborative teaching environment for the subject area.

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.

Our Science Achievement proficiency score was 48% in comparison to the state score of 68%. While our greatest gap is in the area of science, our scores actually increased by 4%, which could be a result of the AVID strategies and district science resource teachers that collaborated and modeled with our teachers last year.

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

ELA Achievement improved by 9%. Astronaut High School became an AVID School and worked diligently to increase the use of WICOR strategies across all disciplines. We focused on interventions and connected students to SAT and ACT prep sites as well. Additionally, we held curriculum nights to explain testing requirements to parents and students, along with other graduation information, and we took steps to create a culture of college and career readiness on our campus. Additionally, we used

Reading Plus benchmark assessments throughout the year to progress monitor in 9th and 10th grade English classes, and we used the full program in 9-12 Intensive Language Arts Classes. Small group instruction was given, especially to the lowest 25th percent of our students as well as with our African American students.

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

Course Failures reflect students not mastering standards, and they are an area of concern. Attendance can be a contributing factor to the course failure, but attendance can also be a result of the student shutting down when they feel defeated.

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

1. Increase student achievement in Algebra 1.
2. Continue working with our ESE and African American student populations to increase proficiency and maximize student potential.
3. Acceleration success.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increasing the achievement scores of Students with Disabilities and our African American students
Rationale	While we are working on increasing test scores across all areas and with all students, our Students with Disabilities and our African American student achievement gap are the greatest areas of need according to the ESSA Report and data trends on standardized state assessments for the last few years. In 2017-18, Astronaut High School had the lowest performing African American students district-wide at 18% proficiency in ELA. In 2018-19, the percent of African American students increased to 26% proficiency in ELA. In 2017-18, 13% of our Students with Disabilities were proficient in ELA, and in 2018-19 that number increased to 20%. Although we have made improvements with our African American student population and our Students with Disabilities, we realize that we have more work to do to close the gap. Increasing student expectations with teacher support is an essential component to achieving our goals.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the ELA proficiency for Students with Disabilities by 6% to 26%. Increase the ELA proficiency for African American students by 6% to 32%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Krista Miller (miller.krista@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Place students in classes that are appropriate to engage and challenge students, based on more than one year of data points. Engage and challenge students in grade level appropriate texts and tasks through the use of AVID strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The first step in creating a challenging and engaging culture in our school was to ensure that we used several data points to better place students in courses, instead of using teacher recommendations that were based on work habits or behavior. Once our students were more appropriately placed, as an AVID school, we have collective agreements on the high yield strategies that will benefit our students in the high school and college classroom. Having high expectations for our students, including our exceptional education and black students, we are giving them the tools as well as the structure to do well in the classroom. Through the monitoring of WICOR strategies by administration, and support by our Literacy Coach and District Resource Teachers, we are ensuring that the strategies are being taught with fidelity, giving students the best education possible to prepare them for success in the future.

Action Step	
Description	1. Place students in classes based on their maximum potential success based on assessment data and performance in current class. 2. Increase organization through the utilization of binders that will hold course contents across each grade level. 3. Use the 5-phase process of focused note-taking. 4. Utilize and model the structures of collaboration as tools to increase the rigor of the standards. 5. Include the use of our Literacy Coach to support students in grades 9-12 who are in the Intensive Language Arts classroom, as well as to monitor the data of our students on Reading Plus.

6. Emilee Floyd and Monique Muldowney will assist in pulling Reading Plus data to monitor intervention data.

7. Administration will conduct biweekly walk-throughs of classrooms with specific feedback and coaching to teachers to ensure the implementation of the Action Steps.

8. Identify students who are failing courses. Administration/Guidance counselors initiate a data chats and planned Astro Hour support with regular check-ins.

Person Responsible Krista Miller (miller.krista@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Increase student achievement in Algebra 1.
Rationale	In 2017-18, our students taking the Algebra 1 EOC scored at 38% proficiency, and in 18-19 our students dropped to 22% proficiency. Based on behavioral data, students enrolled in Algebra 1B, and sometimes Algebra 1, are typically the lower students in math, and these students have exhibited high levels of negative behaviors that resulted in lost instructional time for themselves and their peers. Students must be able to master grade level appropriate standards throughout the school year as evidenced by progress monitoring, A strong foundation in Algebra 1 is essential to be successful in any higher level math and for college readiness.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Proficiency in Algebra 1 will increase from 22% to 35% on the Algebra 1 EOC.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Krista Miller (miller.krista@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Engage and challenge students in grade level appropriate tasks through AVID strategies, including the five phases of note taking, questioning, and discussion of math in order to increase the conceptual math knowledge as well as the procedural aspects. Teachers will use progress monitoring tools to create small groups for tier 2 instruction, and work with a North Area Algebra cohort team to improve instructional practices.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students taking Algebra 1 in high school typically have difficulties with the concepts of math, and teachers spend most of their time addressing how to solve math problems. Consequently, teachers are not able to spend the necessary time on the conceptual part of problem solving as it pertains to math, the make up of the majority of the Algebra 1 EOC. With frequent progress monitoring, teachers will have the data they need to pull small groups and individual students for the purpose of targeting their weaknesses and provide standards based instruction to engage and support students in learning Algebra. Teachers will use AVID strategies, including organization, frequent visits of their notes for multiple purposes, student discussion of concepts and processes, to support the learning process.
Action Step	
Description	1. Utilize the curriculum map and resources for Algebra Nation with fidelity. 2. Participate in Feeder Chain professional development with district resource teacher that includes learning, modeling, and observing peers in targeted areas--Questioning/ Discussion, Student Driven Lessons, Error Analysis. 3. Develop small group, targeted lessons on Statistics modeled after "skills days" 8 times during the school year with 5 targeted Math teachers. Identify and close the learning gap for targeted students. Increase organization through the utilization of binders that will hold course contents across each grade level. 4. Use the 5-phase process of focused note-taking. 5. Utilize and model the structures of collaboration as tools to increase the rigor of the standards. 6. Administration will conduct biweekly walk-throughs of classrooms with specific feedback and coaching to teachers to ensure the implementation of the Action Steps.

Person Responsible Krista Miller (miller.krista@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Acceleration Success
Rationale	Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) has been the driving factor to provide instructional tools and resources to ALL students to graduate from high school college ready. While we have made conscious efforts to provide college level courses through Advanced Placement, student success rates on those tests have dropped. Additionally, industry certification scheduling and student outcomes have declined. As an AVID school, we must prepare students to thrive in post secondary opportunities.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Acceleration success of our graduating seniors will increase to 63% (5% increase)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Engage and challenge students in grade level appropriate texts and tasks through AVID strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	AVID is a research based system for preparing students for college and career. By giving our students the skills to be successful, they are prepared for taking Advanced Placement and Dual Enrollment courses that are more rigorous. They are also able to better prepare for industry certifications offered in our CTE courses that they are able to use post-secondary. Through deliberate instruction of the AVID strategies, our students are prepared for post secondary options.

Action Step	
Description	1. Students will be given open access to and guidance for enrollment in Advanced Placement and Dual Enrollment courses that meet the students maximum potential and post-secondary goals. 2. We will hold a family engagement night that targets students with Advanced Placement and Dual Enrollment potential to inform, provide support, and skills to be prepared. 3. CTE teachers will attend professional development for Industry Certifications and create PLC's with district support to build knowledge and skills to best prepare their students for industry certifications. 3. CTE teachers will utilize district adopted pacing guides and certification preparations with their students with fidelity as well as ensure all students are given maximum opportunities for testing. 4. Advanced Placement teachers will be trained in the College Board student and teacher portal to implement in the classroom. Additionally they will be trained via College Board Summer Institute and one-day workshops. 5. Use the 5-phase process of focused note-taking. 6. Utilize and model the structures of collaboration as tools to increase the rigor of the standards. 7. Administration will conduct biweekly walk-throughs of classrooms with specific feedback and coaching to teachers to ensure the implementation of the Action Steps.

Person Responsible   Krista Miller (miller.krista@brevardschools.org)

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).