

Brevard Public Schools

Satellite Senior High School



2020-21 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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	22
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: 6/10/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	21%
2019-20 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%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	No	20%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	20%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.
Hamed, David	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, supports facilities usage and maintains facilities and strives for student learning.
Connor, Jannette	Dean	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, supports facilities usage and maintains facilities and strives for student learning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/10/2020, Robert Pruett

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.*

0

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

74

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	21%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

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	360	410	342	298	1410
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	72	54	57	239
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	45	32	36	169
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	35	26	23	120
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	57	27	21	122
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	8	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	14	6	2	36
	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	0	0	43	51	29	28	151

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	3	29	14	19	65
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/14/2020

Prior Year - 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	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

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	
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

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

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

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
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
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	69
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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%	0
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%	0

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.

Due to the recent COVID quarantine periods, we do not have standardized scores for the 2020 school year. Based on our 2019 data components, our lowest data component was our ELA and Math lowest 25% percentile with a 44% and 47%. During the 2020 school year, FSA EOC teachers were provided with common planning, monthly professional development time, observation time within our school and at other schools. In addition, based on current CTE certification scores, we dropped 10%. This is a rough number as data is still being collected and reviewed.

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

Though our SAT, PSAT, ACT, MAP and Reading Plus data increased during the 2020 school year, we are still focused on the decline in our math learning gains and proficiency during the 2019 school year. 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 continue to incorporate data chats, progress monitor students and differentiate their instruction. This is still an area of focus, but due to our strategy shifts during the 2020 school year our MAP data scores increased each testing session.

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 proud of their student performance during the 2018-19 school year and the 2019-20 school year. We continue to top the district with our SAT, ACT, PSAT, MAP and Reading Plus scores. In saying this, our lowest 25th percentile in ELA and Math along with ELA learning gains was the closest to the state percentages (usually we are above the state average). 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?

During the 2019-20 school year, Satellite High School increased their ACT scores in all subject areas, led traditional High School in SAT scores, 60% of students showed an increase of MAP (Math) growth data from the first assessment to the second, our Reading Plus data ranked the top in the district for traditional schools and Advanced Placement pass rate increased to 69% with an increase in enrollments. It is hard to pick one area of improvement, but based on our 2019-20 data 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 student with disabilities. However, with no standardized test scores from the 2019-20 school year, I would say due to our teacher's collaboration, buy in, differentiated instruction for all students we saw improvements across the board.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Reflecting on our EWS data, we will continue to focus on our attendance rate. The data shows drastic improvement, but the data is skewed due to students working from home during the quarantine and not having to be in class at a certain time. In addition, due to the closure in the 2019-20 school year, we had many kids needing supports due to lack of participation in their classes during this time. They have checked the attendance button, but they were not engaged. We need to focus on social emotional interventions to support kids coming to school! Students with less than 90% attendance rate are often the ones who also experience low test scores or course failures.

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
2. Reading Proficiency for all students
3. MTTS- Social Emotional Supports and interventions to increase our attendance rate

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Out student's with disabilities (SWD) in Math showed negative achievement levels and learning gains from the 2019 school year. SWD in math showed a 39% learning gain score (-20 compared to the 2018-19 school year). Though, we focused on this area during the 2019-20 school year and saw gains through our progress monitoring data, we also saw our ESE students lose focus and endurance during the school quarantine period. Our students with disabilities made up the majority of our monitoring team's phone calls and extra needed support for tracking during this stay at home period.

Measurable Outcome: At the end of the school year, our Math EOC data will indicate a 5% increase in learning gains among student's with disabilities as compared to the 2018-19 standardized data components.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Courtney Lundy (lundy.courtney@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Firstly, our master schedule is an inclusive master schedule with a focus on scheduling student's with disabilities first. Though, we transitioned to block scheduling our Math EOC teachers all have the same planning, so they can collaborate and look to support all students.
We will continue to focus on standards based instruction linked to complex tasks and high expectations for all students while differentiating instruction to support all students.

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 Steps to Implement

1. Inclusive Scheduling- Our students with disabilities are scheduled first, then the master schedule is built around our exceptional education classes and supports.

Person Responsible Courtney Lundy (lundy.courtney@brevardschools.org)

2. Collaboration among ESE teachers and general education teachers- Common planning and planning days. Our ESE teacher and general education teacher not only work together in a support facilitation model, but they have the same planning time in an effort to provide feedback and collaborative discussions linked to supporting our students with disabilities.

Person Responsible Courtney Lundy (lundy.courtney@brevardschools.org)

3. Ongoing progress monitoring and administrative supports with accessing and using data to support instruction. MAP data will be used to access students on an ongoing basis. Teachers will work with administrators to determine instructional strategies and lesson plan focus areas to support the deficits displayed with each MAP administration.

Person Responsible Courtney Lundy (lundy.courtney@brevardschools.org)

4. Administrative feedback to teachers on an ongoing basis with a focus in instruction, teacher expectations of all students and grade level content. During feedback sessions, our administrative team will provide teachers with feedback on how to implement strategies and differentiate instruction to support students with disabilities in the classroom.

Person Responsible	Courtney Lundy (lundy.courtney@brevardschools.org)
---------------------------	--

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Out lowest 25% and students with disabilities showed negative achievement levels and learning gains from the 2018-19 school year data components. SWD in ELA displayed a 35% learning gain score (-2 compared to the previous year). During the 2020 school year students showed an increase on our Reading Plus progress monitoring data. However, many of our lowest 25% and ESE students were amongst our biggest needs for supports and interventions during the quarantine period.
Measurable Outcome:	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%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Courtney Lundy (lundy.courtney@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Firstly, as always our master schedule is an inclusive schedule where we schedule our students with disabilities and lowest 25% first. In saying this, we also add reading support in our Social Studies classes to provide additional reading strategies and instructional elements in each student's schedule. We will continue to focus on standards-based instruction linked to complex texts and high expectations for all students while differentiating instruction to support all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on John Hattie's research, teacher estimates of achievement is one of the highest impacts and influences 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.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Scheduling with Reading supports in multiple content areas- In order to create reading supports and instruction all year and through multiple content areas with our Level 1 and 2 students, we scheduled students into a Social Studies class with a certified Social Studies/ESE teacher and a Reading Endorsed/ESE teacher, as well as, we scheduled the same students into an English class with a an ESE/Reading Endorsed teacher. In addition, our literacy coach works with all teachers on how to implement reading strategies within the content area, differentiate instruction and support all students.

Person Responsible Courtney Lundy (lundy.courtney@brevardschools.org)

2. Collaboration among ESE teachers, Reading, English teachers and literacy coach- Common planning is built into the master schedule so teachers can work together to discuss shared students, how to support struggling readers and students with disabilities.

Person Responsible Courtney Lundy (lundy.courtney@brevardschools.org)

3. Administrative Feedback to teachers on an ongoing basis with a focus in instruction, progress monitoring and grade level content. The administrative team will complete walkthroughs and observations linked to feedback sessions. During feedback sessions, administrators will discuss Reading Plus data and instructional elements linked to reaching all kids. Administrators will provide teachers with strategy support

and lesson planning elements linked to data found in classroom formative assessments and Reading Plus data.

Person Responsible Courtney Lundy (lundy.courtney@brevardschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus	
Description and Rationale:	Based on our attendance trend data, our COVID supports log for students not participating and our observations, we have learned and observed how lack of attendance increases course failures and the need for social emotional supports.
Measurable Outcome:	Satellite High School will improve our student attendance rate through social emotional supports and interventions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jannette Connor (connor.jannette@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Develop and implement a multi-tiered framework to support social-emotional learning, behavior, and mental health across the school community.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A multi-tiered framework to support social emotional learning will help us support our students who are not attending class or not participating by providing them with equitable support in a safe learning environment! Through our support system, we will enhance teacher/ staff student relationships. Johns Hattie's data shows a .72 effect size linked to teacher-student relationships.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Enhancing our attendance policies and procedures will create a structured collaborative problem solving support plan. We will address our students social emotional supports and interventions by adhering to the Mental Wellness Pathways. Ms. Connor will be responsible for monitoring these processes. The Problem Solving Team (PST) will meet biweekly where at risk students showing attendance concerns will be examined by a team of professionals through implementing social emotional supports and interventions. The PST team is comprised of Dean Connor, guidance department, literacy coach, and school psychologist. During the PST meeting the team will determine if the student needs individualized MTSS intervention support. Students that show at risk factors for needing more structured individualized support will be invited to an Individualized Problem Solving Team (IPST) meeting. The members that are a part of this structured support include student, parent, school counselor, staffing specialist, and school psychologist.

Person Responsible Jannette Connor (connor.jannette@brevardschools.org)

2. Developing positive classroom practices to support attendance concerns will be a critical follow up step concluding PST and IPST team meetings. In developing positive classroom practices, the relationships we cultivate, build, and develop will be an essential step to implement in order for academic and behavior change to occur and attendance rate to improve. Ms. Connor will oversee processes and school counselors will make sure all teachers are aware of any social emotional supports and interventions that are in place for students. Creating safety plans and behavior plans alongside of teachers will also be included if necessary. Finally, home visits will be completed as necessary to help positively impact and support students and parents with attendance concerns. Dean Connor will be responsible for ensuring home visits take place. Excessive attendance reports will be run weekly to track what students we need to closely monitor and positively impact.

Person Responsible Jannette Connor (connor.jannette@brevardschools.org)

3. Providing restorative practices for attendance concerns are necessary action steps we will place dedicated focus on while improving our attendance rate through social emotional supports and

interventions. In holding parents and students accountable for going over the approved allotment of days missed, weekly letters will be sent home to parents and students if their missed days are being flagged as excessive. Through creating a system that warns parents and students of this concern we will create a supported environment that recognizes the needs of our students and their families. Should a student not adhere to the BPS attendance policy, they will be asked to attend a FA Hearing so that we can learn more about their families circumstances and ensure proper supports are in place. FA Hearings will be comprised of a committee which will include Dean Connor, school counselors, teachers, attendance clerk, student, and parent.

Person Responsible Jannette Connor (connor.jannette@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

n/a

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Satellite High School is dedicated to working with all stakeholders. Mr. Pruett has created a stand-out business partners community team. The community team meets with Mr. Pruett and the administrative team throughout the year to discuss and support school initiatives, concerns and highlights. Between our Business Partners Community team, our Business Partners supports, Sources of Strength organization and School Advisory Committee we are committed to providing a quality learning experience and positive environment for students and staff.

Based on our parent survey results 91.7% of parents feel welcome at Satellite High School. Parents provided positive feedback linked to our Advanced Placement courses, music program, community involvement and the dedication of our teachers. Parents stated we could improve in the area of communication linked to post secondary education. Based on our Youth Truth survey, students are in the 48th percentile for the feeling of belonging and peer collaboration at SHS, while we are 11th percentile for students feeling fully knowledgeable about post-secondary educational opportunities. In addition, the majority of students feel safe at school.

Based on our Teacher Insight survey our strongest focus area are peer culture (teachers having similar

priorities and providing examples of exemplar teaching) and School Operations. Teachers feel school leaders articulate a clear overarching vision that drives priorities, goals and decision making within the school. The focus area we will continue to improve is hiring teachers linked to our vision and mission and reviewing student work from classes to determine effectiveness of instruction. In other words, administration will collaborate with teachers to provide them with feedback linked to observations of student work samples.

Our guidance department's focus this year is to build relationships with parents and students to help with their success at the high school level and to help guide them in post-secondary educational decisions. We will hold a schoolwide College-Post Secondary opportunity day. Most importantly, we are focused on building positive one on one relationships with all students, families and stakeholders.

Satellite High School is committed to working with all groups and stakeholders to continue to implement Social Emotional curriculum through mental health instructional days and through our social emotional curriculum in our English classes. Our administrative team is focused on providing restorative practices to support students and their decision making. Schoolwide restorative practices and conscious discipline will reinforce instructional structures in which students are responsible, motivated, and highly engaged in the specific task at hand.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.