Space Coast Junior/Senior High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 7/1/2016

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
2018-19 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%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: A (66%)
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 was approved by the Brevard County School Board on 12/17/2019.

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

Space Coast Junior/Senior High School

6150 BANYAN ST, Cocoa, FL 32927

http://www.spacecoast.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 7-12	No	48%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Brevard County School Board on 12/17/2019.

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.

The mission of Space Coast Junior/Senior High School is to engage all students in activities designed to promote critical thinking and decision-making while emphasizing the educational values of rigor, relevance, responsibility, and relationships.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Space Coast Junior/Senior High School is to develop educated, informed citizens ready to contribute to a global society.

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
Flora, Joseph	Principal	As Principal Mr. Flora serves as the Instructional and Operational Leader of the school.
Quinlan, Pete	Assistant Principal	Curriclun and school climate
Johnson, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Facilities and School Climate
Felker, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	Student Behavior and School Climate
Lenhart, Jake	Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	306	264	309	311	203	201	1594
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	8	24	25	19	13	122
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	36	57	42	18	9	186
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	38	70	49	39	32	240
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	55	65	69	39	30	309

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	30	44	74	60	37	25	270

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	12	10	20	33	28	9	112
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	9	12	6	2	35

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
94

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 9/16/2019

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	36	23	31	45	29	3	167
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	34	30	29	20	13	171
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	20	24	28	12	1	108
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	64	59	55	31	10	300

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	76	61	63	66	31	10	307

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	55%	59%	56%	54%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	52%	51%	52%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	40%	42%	42%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	63%	48%	51%	57%	48%	49%
Math Learning Gains	62%	49%	48%	45%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	45%	45%	35%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	58%	66%	68%	63%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	70%	73%	69%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	306 (0)	264 (0)	309 (0)	311 (0)	203 (0)	201 (0)	1594 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	33 ()	8 ()	24 ()	25 ()	19 ()	13 ()	122 (0)
One or more suspensions	24 (0)	36 (0)	57 (0)	42 (0)	18 (0)	9 (0)	186 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	12 (0)	38 (0)	70 (0)	49 (0)	39 (0)	32 (0)	240 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	51 (0)	55 (0)	65 (0)	69 (0)	39 (0)	30 (0)	309 (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
07	2019	55%	58%	-3%	52%	3%
	2018	46%	56%	-10%	51%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	57%	63%	-6%	56%	1%
	2018	63%	65%	-2%	58%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
09	2019	58%	62%	-4%	55%	3%
	2018	55%	60%	-5%	53%	2%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
10	2019	54%	59%	-5%	53%	1%
	2018	59%	61%	-2%	53%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
07	2019	68%	62%	6%	54%	14%
	2018	56%	62%	-6%	54%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	53%	43%	10%	46%	7%
	2018	39%	41%	-2%	45%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	47%	53%	-6%	48%	-1%
	2018	57%	55%	2%	50%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	69%	66%	3%	67%	2%
2018	70%	67%	3%	65%	5%
Compare		-1%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	76%	74%	2%	71%	5%
2018	77%	73%	4%	71%	6%
Compare		-1%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	71%	2%	70%	3%
2018	74%	70%	4%	68%	6%
Compare		-1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	61%	-2%	61%	-2%
2018	56%	62%	-6%	62%	-6%
Compare		3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	60%	5%	57%	8%
2018	66%	60%	6%	56%	10%
Compare		-1%			

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	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

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	14	27	26	23	29	24	37	29		67	58
ELL				20							

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
BLK	34	40	33	21	26	11	48	47		93	69
HSP	56	58	30	46	36	19	51	64	50	88	70
MUL	58	51	30	56	51	38	59	68		94	73
WHT	55	52	46	61	46	41	67	72	61	87	57
FRL	49	51	46	50	44	33	54	64	48	81	56

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	60
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	655
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	49
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	57
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	59
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	61
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	55
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.

ELA lowest 25%. While being the lowest performance indicator, it is fairly flat from year to year and consistent with statewide performance.

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

Science fell more than any other indicator. Last year the science department experience turnover with the lost of several experienced teachers who were replaced with newer teachers. This turnover particularly impacted Biology and 8th grade science, the subjects that have the most impact on the science accountability scores.

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.

Science again had the greatest gap compared to the state average for the same reasons as its decline relative to prior years.

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

Math Learning gains.

The science department experience greater stability in personnel from prior years and placed a higher emphasis on identifying and remediating learning gaps than had been done in prior years.

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

More than 20% of 9th graders have failures in either ELA or math. Nationally, this early warning indicator correlates extremely high with future dropout rates.

Nearly 10% of our student population has attendance rates consistent with failure to due absences.

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

1. ELA - All grades
2. ELA - lowest 25%
3. Algebra
4. ELL -
5. ESE

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA - ALL GRADES
Rationale	While there were great gains in 7th and 9th grade FSA/ELA scores, the overall progress of the school declined in proficiency (-1% point), learning gains (-4%points) and lowest 25% (-4 % points) creating a large impact on our school grade. With reading and writing being the foundation of success for all areas, a significant emphasis needs to be placed in this area.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Given an emphasis on data analysis using a collaborative inquiry model, students in grades 7-10 will improve their reading and writing as evidenced by a 2% point increase at EACH grade level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sylvia Mijuskovic (mijuskovic.sylvia@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Collaborative inquiry is a research-based process in which participants come together to examine their own educational practice systematically and carefully using techniques of research.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This leadership has utilized Peter DeWitt's research on Collective Efficacy as a foundation to improve student achievement. Collaborative inquiry is one of the last elements that will support this framework.

Action Step	
Description	1. Provide PD on Collaborative Inquiry model that will allow teachers to have a more robust way of analyzing data and developing best practices in the classroom. 2. Create an Classroom Walkthrough plan for teachers to observe each others' practices. 3. Continue the development and administration of formative common assessments in all areas to help identify student gaps in learning with enough time to remediate and provide interventions, 4. Encourage the continuation of learning targets to help student own their learning and provide teacher clarity. 5. Continue assisting teachers with the use of higher order questioning in classroom discussions and assessments in order to mirror FSA style assessment.
Person Responsible	Sylvia Mijuskovic (mijuskovic.sylvia@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	LOWEST 25% ELA
Rationale	A four year review of this data indicates there has been steady growth ranging from 39% to 42% to 46% in the past three years. This past year, however, there was a drastic drop of 4% points indicating a need to review the school's reading program.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Given an emphasis on reading skills and inquiry in reading, students in grades 7-10 who comprise the lowest 25% of the school will improved their reading skills as evidenced by a growth of 3% in the lowest 25% scores on the 2020 FSA/ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sylvia Mijuskovic (mijuskovic.sylvia@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Reading as inquiry is a strategy that students can utilize to gather information about a topic from several sources. Teachers design an "I-chart" that allow students to fill in as they read on listen to several resources on the topic.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	INQUIRY is fundamental to reading. When a person reads he is gathering and processing information; and this is inquiry. A reader who raises questions, builds hypotheses, reads and processes data, and tests findings to determine validity is actively involved in inquiry.
Action Step	
Description	1. Meet with District Reading Resource Teacher to develop an action plan for our reading program. 2. Identify PD needs for the department reading as inquiry. 3. Have District Reading Resource Teacher and Literacy Coach observe and give feedback as well as model lessons. 4. Utilize the Literacy Coach to conduct/support teachers with data chats to help students identify their areas of need. 5. Offer after school tutoring for students needing extra interventions.
Person Responsible	Melissa Johnson (johnson.melissa@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	MATH - ALGEBRA
Rationale	While this year's data indicates significant growth in the math area, (6% points in proficiency and learning gains with 10% points in lowest 25%) a drill down of this analysis indicates that Algebra continues to be an area of concern. One could say that this is due to the top math student taking Algebra at the middle school level, but further examination shows that this percentage of students is smaller than it should be.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Given an emphasis on inquiry math, students in Algebra classes will improve their math skills as evidenced by a 5% point gain in the 2020 EOC Algebra scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sylvia Mijuskovic (mijuskovic.sylvia@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using inquiry to teach math where students explore the answers as opposed to the traditional way of teaching math where teachers teach a step by step approach without any understanding of why.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	An analysis of data has indicated that while students might be learning the material as evidenced by their class grades, there is a discrepancy in state assessment scores because the EOC is assessing student in a different fashion than how they are being taught.

Action Step	
Description	1. Participate with North Area Principals in the Algebra Cohort PD plan where teachers meet bi-monthly to be trained on new teaching practices where lessons are modeled by District Resource Math Teacher. Teachers then get to observe each other and provide feedback on the implementation of the strategy. 2. Utilize the MAPS progress monitoring program to assess the progress of students. 3. Have the Math/Science coach utilize MAPS data to provide teachers support in best teaching practices. 4. Implement an Algebra boot camp a week before the PERT/SAT testing to offer students the opportunity to review material needed for Algebra 1 graduation requirement. 5. Offer tutoring after school for students needing additional assistance.
Person Responsible	Pete Quinlan (quinlan.peter@brevardschools.org)

#4	
Title	ELL - ELA/MATH
Rationale	Traditionally, Space Coast has never had a subgroup of ELL students. With a change in the community along with a change in the definition of who is considered ELL for ESSA, this has now become a priority.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Given an emphasis on ELL learners, students classified ELL will improve their reading and math skills as evidenced by a minimum of 41% of these students demonstrating proficiency in their ELA and FSA/EOC state assessments for 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sylvia Mijuskovic (mijuskovic.sylvia@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilize small group instruction and collaboration to assist ELL students with understanding and breaking down complex text.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	ELLs need to be given frequent, extended opportunities to speak about content material and work through complex texts in English with small groups of classmates.

Action Step	
Description	1. Provide teachers with training on new ESSA definitions for ELL. 2. Have teachers identify ELL students in their classes to properly monitor their progress. 3. Include subgroup information on progress monitoring system to adequately track this subgroup during the year. 4. Provide teachers with training and resources on strategies to assist ELL learners. 5. Monitor use of collaborative group work during classroom walkthroughs.
Person Responsible	Pete Quinlan (quinlan.peter@brevardschools.org)

#5	
Title	ESE - ELA/MATH
Rationale	Space Coast houses one of the largest ESE populations in the District including four special units; two supported units - middle school and high school as well as two EBD units also middle school and high school. Traditionally, the students in the self-contained units tend to progress slowly as evidenced by the need to keep them secluded from the mainstream. The delivery of instruction in these units needs to be revisited. Additionally, teachers need to be more in tune with ESE labels, what they mean and what strategies work best for each disability.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Given an emphasis on ESE learners, students classified ESE will improve their reading and math skills as evidenced by a minimum of 41% of these students demonstrating proficiency in their ELA and FSA/EOC state assessments for 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sylvia Mijuskovic (mijuskovic.sylvia@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilize small group instruction and collaboration to assist ESE students with understanding and breaking down complex text.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Forming small groups of two or three students within the class grouped according to their level can help with personalizing the teaching while not sacrificing class instruction time while allowing for peer teaching support.
Action Step	
Description	1.Guide teachers through a data analysis activity using Performance Matters to help teachers identify the student achievement by subgroups. 2. Provide teachers with training on ESSA requirements. 3. Have teachers identify ESE students in their classes to properly monitor their progress. 4. Include subgroup information on progress monitoring system to adequately track this subgroup during the year. 5. Provide teachers with training and resources on strategies to assist ESE learners. 6. Monitor use of collaborative group work during classroom walkthroughs. 7. Hire an additional counselor who will focus on ESE students and their progress.
Person Responsible	Melissa Johnson (johnson.melissa@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).

In addition to the goals and action plan identified in this section, teachers will continue to build upon other areas of Collective Efficacy which include common assessment, teacher clarity and student interventions.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA - ALL GRADES				$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0302 - Space Coast Jr/Sr High School	Other		$10,000.00
			Notes: Tutoring all CORE areas			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: LOWEST 25% ELA				$20,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0302 - Space Coast Jr/Sr High School	Other		$20,000.00
			Notes: Purchase additional technology to support curriculum implementation of resources.			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: MATH - ALGEBRA				$9,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0302 - Space Coast Jr/Sr High School	Other		$9,000.00
			Notes: Support North Area Algebra Cohort and other PD opportunities			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELL - ELA/MATH				$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESE - ELA/MATH				$7,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0302 - Space Coast Jr/Sr High School	Other		$7,000.00
			Notes: Purchase of PAR to complete a unit to hire an additional counselor.			
					Total:	$46,000.00