

Brevard Public Schools

Astronaut High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	0

Astronaut High School

800 WAR EAGLE BLVD, Titusville, FL 32796

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

Demographics

Principal: Krista Miller K

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Astronaut High School

800 WAR EAGLE BLVD, Titusville, FL 32796

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	57%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pride in community; Passion in learning.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Miller, Krista	Principal	Principal of the School and oversees daily operations with a focus on student achievement.
Cantaloupe, Lori	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Instruction
Russell, Jamie	Assistant Principal	Facilities and Operations with a focus on student achievement
Kohler, Eric	Assistant Principal	Student Discipline
Gahres, Cathy	Attendance/Social Work	Students in Transition, College and Career Readiness, Early Warning Systems Student Data
Gantenbein, Rebecca	School Counselor	
Muldowney, Monique	ELL Compliance Specialist	
Newman, Andrea	Reading Coach	
Rendina, Tracey	Math Coach	
Thomas, Batina	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/25/2015, Krista Miller K

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.*

2

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

68

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,093

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

7

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

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	337	311	237	208	1093	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	86	62	43	280	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	29	6	11	83	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	37	9	9	90	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	37	23	22	108	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	63	32	35	184	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	34	11	17	116	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	91	49	25	243	
Level 1 on 2021 FSA Math or EOC Alg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	116	47	30	288	

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	103	98	42	26	269

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	32	37	23	2	94
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	25	14	6	69

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/1/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	329	315	245	193	1082
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	8	15	9	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	24	22	6	121
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	57	41	14	171
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	67	29	10	136
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	46	56	43	219
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	46	40	37	164

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	105	88	58	24	275

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	18	8	44	32	102
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	2	14

2020-21 - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	329	315	245	193	1082
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	8	15	9	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	24	22	6	121
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	57	41	14	171
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	67	29	10	136
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	46	56	43	219
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	46	40	37	164

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	105	88	58	24	275

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	18	8	44	32	102
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	2	14

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				50%	59%	56%	41%	58%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	52%	51%	45%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	40%	42%	37%	44%	44%
Math Achievement				35%	48%	51%	45%	50%	51%
Math Learning Gains				46%	49%	48%	53%	46%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				32%	45%	45%	50%	43%	45%
Science Achievement				48%	66%	68%	44%	67%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				64%	70%	73%	57%	70%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2021					
	2019	53%	62%	-9%	55%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	48%	59%	-11%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

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
2021					
2019	45%	66%	-21%	67%	-22%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	62%	71%	-9%	70%	-8%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	22%	61%	-39%	61%	-39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	41%	60%	-19%	57%	-16%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Reading Plus was used for all grade levels, and Maps Growth was used for students in Algebra 1, Liberal Arts Math, Geometry, and Geometry Honors. Percentages below are based on all students in each category, and not the number of students who actually tested.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	106/36%	86/29%	73/33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47/28%	34/20%	30/18%
	Students With Disabilities	7/12%	4/7%	6/10%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	Na	NA	NA

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	94/38%	66/27%	63/26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46/30%	27/18%	18/12%
	Students With Disabilities	2/4%	2/4%	3/6%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	86/35%	35/14%	16/7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39/31%	19/15%	9/7%
	Students With Disabilities	4/10%	2/5%	1/3%
	English Language Learners	0	1/20%	1/20%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	62/25%	54/22%	26/11%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/19%	31/23%	18/14%
	Students With Disabilities	3/9%	5/15%	2/6%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	17	23	21	12	19	23	11	33		73	20
BLK	23	22	19	8	20	31	21	44		81	26
HSP	38	23	8	31	17		45	54		93	69
MUL	52	55		43	53		53	82		80	42
WHT	46	46	40	26	22	26	42	60		87	60

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
FRL	37	37	30	20	24	29	33	55		79	45
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	20	29	24	18	50		20	40		78	23
BLK	26	37	42	22	52		33	38		75	52
HSP	40	41	43	30	58		33	73		81	40
MUL	54	53	36	26	29		50	75		69	55
WHT	56	52	39	40	45	31	53	68		84	63
FRL	41	45	39	27	42	29	40	54		79	54
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	13	30	32	21	38		19	30		56	33
BLK	18	36	41	28	33		15	34		69	52
HSP	35	45		35	57		30	53		82	71
MUL	39	50		44	53		27	39		83	73
WHT	47	46	39	50	56	53	53	64		78	71
FRL	34	43	40	41	48	48	36	49		65	63

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	434
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	91%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
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	58
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	46
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

In 2019, 53% of our 9th graders were proficient in Reading/Writing while 48% of our 10th graders were proficient. At the beginning of the 2019-2020 school year, we had implemented targeted instructional practices in an effort to increase our proficiency, but we were not able to test to see if the practices worked. In 2021, our ELA proficiency dropped to 44% proficiency for 9th graders and 47% for 10th graders. We experienced a drop in % of students showing learning gains and our lowest 25% declined in the percentage showing learning gains as well. Finally, our percent proficient in Algebra and Geometry has declined, and as well as our overall learning gains.

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

Groups of students showing the greatest need are our students who are the lowest 25 percentile, our students with disabilities, and our African American students.

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

This year, we are focused on acceleration of the standards in an effort to increase student engagement. Through grade level standards focused instruction and materials, common formative assessments, and progress monitoring data chats with students and teachers, teachers will increase student engagement which will positively affect student achievement in all areas.

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

At Astronaut High School, we are most proud of our 2021 Graduation Rate as it is the highest it has been in a long time. Additionally, we only dropped 1% proficiency on the ELA for 10th graders,.

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

We continued to work through the IPST process, despite the Governor waiving the testing requirements, and we were able to ensure that our students received intervention strategies in both reading and writing. Our Literacy Coach pushed into classes to model writing instruction for students prior to testing, and she pulled groups of students to work on test preparation strategies as well. Finally, we were able to move one of our math teachers to the Math/Science Coach position where she was able to share data with her math team and help develop lessons based on the standards.

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

Teachers will utilize a common planning time to plan their standards based instruction, including a pre/post test for the purpose of sharing the standards data with students (and with each other), in an effort to give supports to the students who need it at the exact time that they need it. In the classroom, teachers will use the Focus Boards to explain the standard and learning target, as well as bring attention to the essential question that guides the lesson. Students will also use the Five Phases of Note-Taking, and Collaborative Strategies to interact with the standards, and to develop higher level thinking throughout the lesson.

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

To accelerate learning, our school will participate in professional development in the following areas. The AVID strategies of Focused Note-Taking, Focus Boards with Standards and Learning Targets posted for students as well as a collaborative strategy and a check for understanding that teachers will use in their Common Planning to discuss ways they can implement interventions at the right time for the specific students that need them. Students will keep track of their data in their AVID Notebooks, and they will have data chats with teachers and counselors throughout the semester as determined by the department.

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

Our counselors have worked diligently to make sure that students have met College and Career Readiness, and our Leadership Team has created a walk-through tool and schedule to support teacher growth.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student data has shown a decline in the number of students proficient in English Language Arts and Math. Our students need instruction that is standards driven, using appropriate strategies for student learning, and applying interventions/scaffolding when necessary, and they need to be aware of their own data as it pertains to the Learning Target. Through the use of pre/post tests, and formative assessments throughout the lessons, teachers will know what students need to clear up misconceptions. Finally, through the use of the Five Phases of Focused Note-Taking, and Collaborative strategies, students will engage with text and learn to summarize and apply their learning.
Measurable Outcome:	-0% of our teachers utilize FOCUS boards to drive instruction. 100% of our teachers will implement FOCUS Boards to drive instruction at the beginning, middle, and end of each period as evidence by walkthroughs. -Prior to this year common planning time was information and not part of the regular meeting schedule nor had any format to discussions. 100% of our teachers will participate in weekly common planning time as evidence by formal common planning minutes.
Monitoring:	We will use progress monitoring tools such as the pre/post test information in each course, as well as the benchmark assessment in English Language Arts/Reading and the MAPs Growth data. We will also use the coaching cycle with regular walkthroughs with measurable feedback.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Krista Miller (miller.krista@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Five Phases of Focused Note-Taking is the evidence-based strategy that we will implement this year to engage students in standards based instruction. Phase 1: Students will take notes based on the type of text that is being used. Phase 2: Students will process their notes in a way that allows them to chunk, organize, add to or delete new information. In Phase 3: Students connect with their notes by asking questions, writing connections across curriculum or personal information that relates to the learning. In Phase 4: Students summarize and reflect on their learning, using academic vocabulary to connect with the standards. In Phase 5: Students show what they know about the standard/Essential Question through Collaborative Strategies or projects. Finally students organize their materials and data in their AVID binders.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As we realize that our students need scaffolded, standards based instruction to accelerate their learning, we also understand that students have to know what is expected of them so they can meet the learning target set before them. Through the use of note-taking strategies and student/teacher data tracking, students will be able to self-monitor their learning as their teachers do.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide Professional Development on the use of Focus Boards.
2. Provide Professional Development on the Five Phases of Focused Note-Taking.
3. Provide Professional Development on Standards, Pacing Guides, Common Assessments by District Resource Teachers.
4. Provide Professional Development on the Walk-Through Coaching Tool being used in the 2021-22 school year.
5. Provide Professional Development on Student Data that pertains to each teacher.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Cathy Gahres-monitor early warning system students and all students with excessive absences.

Amanda Molina-working with students who need Social Emotional supports.

Renaissance Program: Positive approach to discipline in an effort to have students set goals for themselves and celebrate their achievements.

Restorative practices

Phone calls home for positive behavior on campus.

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.

Parent Survey Feedback: Parent Feedback:

The parent survey revealed a need and desire to participate in meetings that focus on planning for college and careers, college entrance resources (SAT/ACT), financial aid, and high school graduation requirements and options. We will provide face to face and virtual informational meetings hosted by our guidance and administrative team to better inform families on these "hot topics". Additionally we will push for 100% of our students, in collaboration with our guidance department and our families, to complete the FAFSA so that money is not the barrier between students and post-secondary opportunities. Additionally, parents continued to praise the communication using our Blackboard Connect site as means for weekly communication via phone calls and email. We will also enhance our Social Media presence including information and recognitions.

Teacher Feedback: 71% of our students took the Insight Survey which was the highest percentage of participation to date. We saw our greatest decline in the area of Professional Development, specifically in content areas. Last year all of our Professional Development was based on technology--Google Classroom, Zoom, online platforms--in order to facilitate eLearning. This year, our focus in professional development will be focused on our priority goals and objectives based on observations and see "what is needed" as to support schoolwide initiatives. A specific area that was consistently praised was the collaboration, albeit informal, that teachers were having with their departments. We formalized the process and provided time within their day (weekly) and meeting schedule (at least monthly) to build in common planning for all departments.

Student Feedback: Our student feedback showed that Academic Rigor significantly increased from previous years, specifically in the areas of my teachers not letting students give up when work gets hard, requiring explanations, and showing proficiency in class for a good grade. This is a direct result of the conversations we have during professional develop and faculty meetings of setting high expectations for all students. Our students can be success. Some students need scaffolding, others need support due to outside barriers, but if we set the bar high they will meet the expectation set by the teachers. The area that we most need improvement is in relationships and belonging. We know that going completely virtual in Spring of 2020, coupled with the eLearning option in 2021 as well as limited activities outside of the classroom due to mitigation protocols had a significant, negative impact on our students. We are reinstating Astro Hour which is an academic intervention and involvement time during the school day for all students to utilize. This will not only enhance relationships between students and teachers but also allow students to feel a sense of belonging to our school.

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

Students-Student Government Association

Teachers-Callie Williams-Social Media, Guidance Department-College 101, Administration-Feedback and Recognitions

Parents-School Advisory Council, CHAMP Mentoring Program

Community members/Business Partners-CHAMP Mentoring Program, Renaissance Program