

Brevard Public Schools

Satellite Senior High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Satellite Senior High School

300 SCORPION CT, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

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

Demographics

Principal: Robert Pruett

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 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)	21%
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: A (68%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (66%) 2014-15: A (76%)
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	N/A

* 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Satellite Senior High School

300 SCORPION CT, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

<http://www.scorpnet.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 PK, 9-12	No	19%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	22%

School Grades History

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

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.

Satellite High School, a professional learning community, will create and maintain an academic and interdependent atmosphere through on-going self reflection and personal improvement, teaming, measurable and attainable goal-setting, student-centered learning, and collaboration among all stakeholders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Satellite High School students will graduate with the academic excellence and intellectual curiosity necessary for college success, career readiness, character development, responsible citizenship, and life-long 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
Pruett, Robert	Principal	Serves as an instructional leader, collaborates with all stakeholders, supports students and teachers, analyzes data on an ongoing basis and strives for student learning.
Lundy, Courtney	Assistant Principal	Serves as an instructional leader, collaborates with all stakeholders, supports students and teachers, analyzes data on an ongoing basis and strives for student learning.
Thomas, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Serves as an instructional leader, collaborates with all stakeholders, supports students and teachers, develops corrective strategies for student needs, analyzes data on an ongoing basis and strives for student learning.
Cook, Doug		Serves as an instructional leader, collaborates with all stakeholders, supports students and teachers, analyzes data on an ongoing basis, support facility initiatives for safety and student learning, and strives for student learning.

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	389	381	340	268	1378
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	68	57	37	270
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	28	14	15	85
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	114	56	30	245
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	31	18	12	110

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	20	42	18	17	97

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	4	7	15	20	46
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	6	14

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

71

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/10/2019

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	59	62	55	64	240
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	18	22	17	86
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	41	36	31	140
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	19	19	16	71

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	56	51	56	54	217

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	69%	59%	56%	69%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	52%	51%	58%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	40%	42%	51%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	69%	48%	51%	74%	48%	49%
Math Learning Gains	61%	49%	48%	68%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	45%	45%	58%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	82%	66%	68%	78%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	87%	70%	73%	82%	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	389 (0)	381 (0)	340 (0)	268 (0)	1378 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	108 ()	68 ()	57 ()	37 ()	270 (0)
One or more suspensions	28 (0)	28 (0)	14 (0)	15 (0)	85 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	45 (0)	114 (0)	56 (0)	30 (0)	245 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	49 (0)	31 (0)	18 (0)	12 (0)	110 (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	66%	62%	4%	55%	11%
	2018	74%	60%	14%	53%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	70%	59%	11%	53%	17%
	2018	72%	61%	11%	53%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

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	81%	66%	15%	67%	14%
2018	78%	67%	11%	65%	13%
Compare		3%			

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	87%	71%	16%	70%	17%
2018	84%	70%	14%	68%	16%
Compare		3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	56%	61%	-5%	61%	-5%
2018	65%	62%	3%	62%	3%
Compare		-9%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	74%	60%	14%	57%	17%
2018	79%	60%	19%	56%	23%
Compare		-5%			

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	29	32	35	34	39	25	70	70		86	43
ASN	83	70		91							
BLK	42	38	30	62				70			
HSP	65	56	58	71	58		74	88		90	61
MUL	70	56	60	63	92		69	85		81	94
WHT	70	52	41	69	60	46	84	88		95	73
FRL	58	46	47	60	58	58	72	88		81	46
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	31	43	37	56	59		31	73		77	30
ASN	60										
BLK	33	30								87	46
HSP	63	57	45	74	66		77	86		85	61
MUL	67	61		96	94		79	75		86	63
WHT	76	61	55	77	64	61	78	85		91	70
FRL	67	62	48	68	62	52	72	74		78	59
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	27	44	44	35	50	42	50	52		81	31
ASN	64										
BLK	53	57		44							
HSP	61	59	50	73	62	46	78	86		84	62
MUL	62	63	62	62	67	70	78	79		95	50
WHT	71	57	51	76	69	59	80	81		94	69
FRL	60	57	52	65	62	50	75	68		86	51

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	678
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	81
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	48
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	69
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	74
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	68
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	61
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.

Our lowest data component was our ELA lowest 25th percentile with a 44%. In addition, our lowest 25th percentile in Math showed our second lowest score with a 47%. During the 2018-19 school year teachers collaborated and reflected upon data components linked to subgroups. They spent planning days truly understanding the data and discussing aligning instruction to support all students. This was a yearlong process in shifting our focus in the knowledge of data and differentiated instruction to support all students.

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

Our lowest 25th percentile in Math showed an achievement score of 47%. In comparison to the previous year (2018), this is a -18% difference. Upon further reflection, all subgroups in Math showed a decline in proficiency and/or learning gains with Students with Disabilities showing a -22

achievement percentage and -20 learning gain score. Our multi-racial subgroup showed a -33% in math achievement. Teachers spent time collaborating and reviewing data from the previous year and analyzing the given data. Though, data needs to be reviewed, discussed and linked to standards on an ongoing basis.

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.

Satellite High School is one of the top schools in the state. In saying this, our school displayed positive gains in all components compared to the state. However, our lowest 25th percentile in ELA and Math along with ELA learning gains was the closest to the state percentages. In comparison to other schools in the district, we tend to show the same declines in the majority of areas.

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

We are proud to state our Science Scores showed the biggest improvement in overall proficiency and in most subgroups. Science achievement saw a 14% increase overall and 39% increase in students with disabilities being proficient on the EOC. We went from one of the lowest Science ESE performances in the district to the highest based on gap percentages. The Science department collaborated with their district resource teacher, department head, administration in truly understanding their data, adapting their instruction to support all kids, providing support sessions and monitoring their students on an on-going basis.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, one potential area of concern is attendance rate, particularly as it relates to success within courses. Students with less than 90% attendance rate are often the ones who also experience low test scores or course failures. Satellite High School is focused on improving attendance rates of all students by communicating with those students and their families about where they stand and helping them find solutions for their attendance issues.

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

1. ESE Success linked to our lowest 25% in math and ELA
2. Math Proficiency
3. Increasing overall school learning gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ESE achievement levels
Rationale	Our student with disabilities (SWD) in both ELA and Math showed negative achievement levels and learning gains from the previous school year. SWD in ELA displayed a 35% learning gain score (-2 compared to the previous year). SWD in Math showed a 39% learning gain score (-20 compared to the 2018-19 school year) Though we implemented support facilitation in the 2018-19 school year, we still need to make improvements through our instructional approach, planning and research based support for all students. Our students with disabilities also make up about a quarter of our lowest 25%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	At the end of the school year, our FSA and EOC data will indicate a 5% increase in learning gains among students with disabilities as compared to the 2018-19 data components. ELA SWD learning gains will increase from 35% to 40% and Math EOC learning gains will increase from 39% to 44%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Courtney Lundy (lundy.courtney@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>First and foremost, we implemented the inclusive schedule process this year as we created our master schedule.</p> <p>Our evidence-based strategy and focus this year is standards based instruction linked to complex texts and high expectations for all students while differentiating instruction to support all students.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Based on John Hattie's research, teacher estimates of achievement is one of the highest impact influence on student learning and achievement with a 1.29 effect size. Our focus this year will be high expectations of all students. When providing high expectations teachers will provide grade level task, text and assignments. According to John Hattie and Achieve the core, students must work on grade level content (text) with supports like scaffolding in place. Student led supports and strategies (jigsaw) have a 1.2 effect size. Resources: John Hattie's Visible Learning for Literacy, Achieve the Core, Instruction Partner, Standards Institute. We believe with high expectations and grade level content with supports our learning gains will increase.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inclusive Scheduling 2. Professional Development with a focus in data and standards instruction with instructional supports 3. Collaboration among ESE teachers and general education teachers 4. Sharing best practices- Giving teachers time to observe another teacher's best practice 5. Administrative Feedback to teachers on an ongoing basis with a focus in instruction, teacher expectations of all students and grade level content.
Person Responsible	Courtney Lundy (lundy.courtney@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Math Proficiency
Rationale	A two year comparison of our lowest 25 percentile in Math shows a negative 18 decline in learning gains. Though, we are above the state percentage by 2 percentage points, this is a substantial decline for Satellite High School. In addition, our overall Algebra EOC scores are below the district and state average with a decline of -9 compared to SHS score in the 2018 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	At the end of the school year, our EOC Math data will indicate a 5% increase in learning gains among students in our lowest 25 percentile and in overall proficiency, as compared to the 2018-19 data components. In other words, math lowest 25% learning gains will increase from 47% to 52% and our proficiency score will increase from 56% to 61%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Courtney Lundy (lundy.courtney@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Our evidence-based strategy and focus this year is standards based instruction linked to ongoing progress monitoring of student's achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We believe with the right instructional elements, supports, student scheduling and progress monitoring our lowest 25% in Math will increase their learning gains. However, most importantly teachers will have to implement high expectations for all students with effective supports. John Hattie states with the right feedback and ongoing evaluation the effect size on student learning is .73. This is the zoned desire of student learning for a given year.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development with a focus in data and standards instruction with instructional supports 2. Sharing best practices- Giving teachers time to observe another teacher's best practice 3. Administrative Feedback to teachers on an ongoing basis with a focus in instruction, teacher expectations of all students and grade level content. 4. Ongoing Progress Monitoring and analysis- With the use of district and teacher formative assessment data, teachers will collaborate during department and CMA meetings and link instruction to the progress monitoring data.
Person Responsible	Courtney Lundy (lundy.courtney@brevardschools.org)

#3

Title	Learning gains for all students.
Rationale	A two year comparison of our learning gains in ELA and Math demonstrates declines in both areas and declines in learning gains for our lowest 25% compared to the previous year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	At the end of the school year, our EOC Math and ELA data will indicate a 5% increase in learning gains, as compared to the 2018-19 data components. In other words, math learning gains will increase from 53% to 58% and ELA learning gains will increase from 61% to 66%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Courtney Lundy (lundy.courtney@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Our evidence-based strategy and focus this year is standards based instruction linked to ongoing progress monitoring of student's strand and standards data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We believe with the right instructional elements, supports, and progress monitoring in Math and ELA our students will see learning gains in both subjects. According to John Hattie's research, progress monitoring and formative evaluation has the 3rd largest effect on student achievement out of 138 possible influences. John Hattie states with the right feedback and ongoing evaluation the effect size on student learning is .73. This is the zoned desire of student learning for a given year. In addition, formative assessment has a .90 effect size on student learning.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development with a focus in data and standards instruction linked to data obtained from ongoing classroom formative assessments. 2. Ongoing Progress Monitoring and analysis- With the use of district and teacher formative assessment data, teachers will collaborate during department, common planning, CMA meetings and link instruction to the progress monitoring data. 3. Sharing best practices- Giving teachers time to observe another teacher's best practice 4. Administrative Feedback to teachers on an ongoing basis with a focus in instruction, teacher expectations of all students and grade level content.
Person Responsible	Courtney Lundy (lundy.courtney@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).