

Brevard Public Schools

Astronaut High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Astronaut High School

800 WAR EAGLE BLVD, Titusville, FL 32796

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Miller, Krista	Principal	Mrs. Miller leads Astronaut High School with a vision for excellence in ensuring that all students are college and career ready when they graduate. She regularly works with staff members to provide a positive learning environment where students work to their fullest potential. She monitors data with all stakeholders, provides professional development on AVID strategies, and manages the daily operations of the school.
Hanson, Jerry	Assistant Principal	Mr. Hanson monitors student behavior. He has purposeful conversations with students and families to increase positive behavior. He evaluates teachers and provides feedback to improve instruction and also to increase opportunities for students to earn industry certifications. Mr. Hanson leads the Collaborative Focus Group for College and Career Readiness. Mr. Hanson strives to create a positive and safe environment for both staff and students.
Cantaloupe, Lori	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Cantaloupe creates the Master Schedule based on students' ability to reach their highest potential. She regularly monitors data and communicates with stakeholders in order to promote success and opportunity. Working with the school counselors, she shares information and guidance to students and families regarding the graduation requirements. Mrs. Cantaloupe leads the Collaborative Focus Group for College and Career Readiness.
Russell, Jamie	Assistant Principal	Mr. Russell monitors student attendance and provides strategies for improvement when necessary. He communicates with stakeholders to promote safety and student success. He monitors student data and evaluates teacher instruction, providing meaningful feedback to increase student achievement. Mr. Russell leads the Collaborative Focus Group for Student Voice and Celebrations.
Doucimo, Todd	Instructional Coach	Mr. Doucimo monitors progress monitoring data for both English and Reading students, and supports teachers with resources necessary for student achievement. He also models instructional strategies related to the standards in both the English and Social Studies classrooms. Mr. Doucimo communicates with families and meets with students in small groups, providing test taking strategies.
Rendina, Tracey	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Rendina works with math and science teachers on instructional strategies and resources that improve student achievement. She works with students in small groups to increase their mathematical knowledge, and communicates with administration and families as needed.
Gantenbein, Rebecca	School Counselor	Ms. Gantenbein is the head of the counseling department. She regularly shares information with staff regarding community partnerships, student achievement, strength of programs, and interventions. She leads her team

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		in identifying students who qualify for different programs and courses, and has regular conversations with all stakeholders regarding graduation requirements.
Cerrato, Christina	Other	Mrs. Cerrato monitors student behavior. She has purposeful conversations with students and families to increase positive behavior. Mrs. Cerrato leads the Collaborative Focus Group for Student Voice and Celebrations as well as leads the "Every Child Known" initiative to improve students with multiple EWIs. Mrs. Cerrato strives to create a positive and safe environment for both staff and students.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The SIP was developed to include multiple stakeholders from administration, leadership team, AVID site team, teacher leaders, student surveys, and the School Advisory Council. Quantitative and qualitative data was evaluated to determine areas of strengths and growth to develop the implementation plan.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Evidence of Implementation

- Classroom walkthroughs
- Learning Walks (Peer to Peer)
- Data Team Meetings
- PLC's
- Agendas
- Read 180 progress monitoring (Reading)
- ALEKS progress monitoring (Algebra 1, Geometry, Algebra 2, MCLA)
- Student Data Chats
- Collaborative Focus Groups

Evidence of Impact

- Student Achievement
- Exit slips
- FAST PM 1, 2, 3
- ALEKS PM 1, 2, 3
- Student Panel Feedback
- Student, Staff, and Parent Survey Data

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	32%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	51%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	209
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	301
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	392
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	260
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	32	43	50	37	52	51	43		
ELA Learning Gains				41			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			34		
Math Achievement*	23	34	38	32	40	38	25		
Math Learning Gains				48			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			30		
Science Achievement*	40	59	64	51	37	40	40		
Social Studies Achievement*	54	63	66	52	44	48	58		
Middle School Acceleration					43	44			
Graduation Rate	83	87	89	86	63	61	86		
College and Career Acceleration	69	72	65	54	66	67	55		
ELP Progress		57	45						

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	301
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	83

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	483
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	86

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	4	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	2	
HSP	42			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	45			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	44			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	44			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	32			23			40	54		83	69	
SWD	20			15			18	35		43	6	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18			9			2	38		51	6	
HSP	34			10			38	31		58	6	
MUL	43			36			52	62		78	6	
PAC												
WHT	34			28			45	60		74	6	
FRL	28			22			34	44		62	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	37	41	37	32	48	45	51	52		86	54	
SWD	9	34	35	19	46	43	28	33		78	23	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22	40	38	15	36	48	18	45		76	25	
HSP	31	38	33	27	53	40	31	52		85	45	
MUL	47	52		32	43		63	81		82		
PAC												
WHT	40	41	37	40	52	52	58	50		89	61	
FRL	31	38	32	27	47	43	45	47		83	47	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	43	41	34	25	22	30	40	58		86	55	
SWD	17	23	21	12	19	23	11	33		73	20	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
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	
PAC												
WHT	46	46	40	26	22	26	42	60		87	60	
FRL	37	37	30	20	24	29	33	55		79	45	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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
10	2023 - Spring	47%	54%	-7%	50%	-3%
09	2023 - Spring	43%	56%	-13%	48%	-5%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	19%	51%	-32%	50%	-31%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	29%	50%	-21%	48%	-19%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	39%	61%	-22%	63%	-24%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	52%	62%	-10%	63%	-11%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Algebra 1 showed the lowest performance overall with 19% proficiency, as well as for our two high priority subgroups, Black students with a 10% proficiency rate and Students with Disabilities with a 11% proficiency rate. While this is the lowest performing component, it is an overall increase of 2% from the 2021-2022 school year.

More than half of our incoming 9th grade students accelerate and take Algebra 1 in Middle School and, therefore, their scores are not calculated into our school grade.

In 2021-2022, standards-based EOC questions were used as common formative assessments were used in Algebra 1 and Liberal Arts Math to modify Tier 1 instruction as well as Tier 2 instruction in small groups. These common formative assessments were not utilized last year due to new BEST standards and materials as well as lack of personnel. This process which proved effective will be used in both Algebra 1 and Geometry, coupled with Collaborative Study Groups.

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

Geometry showed the greatest decline from the prior years, as well as for our two high priority subgroups, Black students, and Students with Disabilities. In Geometry, only 6.4% of Black students showed proficiency and 8.4% of students with disabilities show proficiency.

50% of students tested in Geometry did not have a certified teacher for 5 months out of the school year. A non-certified substitute filled in with lesson plans provided by peers. Additionally, this is the first year that students did not have the opportunity for additional remediation and support in Liberal Arts Math. Upon completion of Algebra 1, regardless of performance, students were placed into Geometry as the next course of progression.

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.

Algebra 1 showed the lowest performance overall with 19% proficiency. This is a gap of 31% from the State average.

More than half of our incoming 9th grade students accelerate and take Algebra 1 in Middle School and, therefore, their scores are not calculated into our school grade.

In 2021-2022, standards-based EOC questions were used as common formative assessments were used in Algebra 1 and Liberal Arts Math to modify Tier 1 instruction as well as Tier 2 instruction in small groups. These common formative assessments were not utilized last year due to new BEST standards and materials as well as lack of personnel. This process which proved effective will be used in both Algebra 1 and Geometry, coupled with Collaborative Study Groups.

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

Our ESE subgroup demonstrated the most improvement at AHS in ELA. Our ESE subgroup increased their ELA achievement score from 9% in 2022 to 21% in 2023, a 12% increase.

During the 2022-2023 school year, our ESE students were provided with a significant increase in the number of teacher push-in sessions in their ELA and ILA classes. Students were provided with more frequent data chats in their ELA and ILA classes to review their progress and set reasonable learning goals.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance
Retentions

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

Provide professional learning on accessing data, conducting student data chats, using test item specifications, curriculum planning maps, and adjust instruction to meet individual student needs.

Provide professional learning on how to implement Collaborative Study Groups.

Provide professional learning on implementing AVID instructional strategies based on WICOR to engage all students.

Provide professional development on how to implement strategies gained during targeted Learning Walks (peer observations).

Increase Graduation rate through student exposure to College and Career (post-secondary) opportunities and pathways to success.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our Black and ESE subgroups historically have been below the ESSA Federal Index. In 2021-2022, while still below the ESSA Federal Index we saw a large increase in both subgroups - Black students increased 6% and ESE students increased 10%.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase overall ESSA Federal Index to 41% for Black students and Students with Disabilities.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress monitoring through FAST ELA and ALEKS assessment periods in August, December/January, and April to monitor growth and address learning gaps. (Todd Doucimo and Tracey Rendina)

Administrative walkthroughs/observations as well as Learning Walks (peer to peer) to provide feedback and growth opportunities for student engagement. (Administration/Teacher Leaders)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Krista Miller (miller.krista@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

All teachers will participate in professional learning with a focus on relational capacity to increase opportunity and measurable success for all students and each other. This learning will be applied to a program titled "Every Child Known" where students with multiple EWIs in the ESSA subgroups are identified and mentored by a staff member.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Utilizing the AVID Framework, AVID defines Relational Capacity as the connection among individuals that develops over time when interactions are built on respect, trust, and authenticity. When educators connect with students and colleagues, and students connect with peers, learning and confidence are activated among all on a campus. All three connections are instrumental in helping students grow to see their capabilities and find their own way. Students receive intentional support and mentoring in three major areas that help them become confident individuals who can successfully navigate life and career: rigorous academic preparedness, opportunity knowledge, and student agency. Teachers and other adults on a school campus play an important role in student success. To bring about this transformation, educators must: insist on rigor, break down barriers, align the work, and advocate for students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Identify students with multiple EWIs and assign each student a staff mentor.

Person Responsible: Christina Cerrato (cerrato.christina@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023

Train teachers how to mentor and build relational capacity so they can establish relationships built on respect, trust, and authenticity as well as educate teachers on the school and community resources for our students.

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

By When: August 2023

Model for teachers how to engage students in authentic learning through AVID strategies - WICOR - with a specific focus on collaboration.

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

By When: August 2023, ongoing

Staff will schedule regular check-ins with students.

Person Responsible: Christina Cerrato (cerrato.christina@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Training provided for teachers to identify students and their accommodations using either seating charts or roster methods.

Person Responsible: Lori Cantaloupe (cantaloupe.ori@brevardschools.org)

By When: August/September 2023

Services provided in core academic coursework to allow students to promote academic and social growth with non-disabled peers.

Person Responsible: Lori Cantaloupe (cantaloupe.ori@brevardschools.org)

By When: Weekly

Students track progress towards academic goals across all curriculums utilizing the Student Organizational Academic Resource sheet.

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

By When: Bi-monthly

Monthly meetings to review celebrations, barriers, and growth among mentors/mentees with peer collaboration.

Person Responsible: Christina Cerrato (cerrato.christina@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Student celebrations based on academic performance and behavioral growth through the Renaissance Program.

Person Responsible: Jamie Russell (russell.jamie@brevardschools.org)

By When: Quarterly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Given the 2022-2023 school data finding that 25% of students were proficient in Math and 45% of students were proficient in English Language Arts, instructional shifts and progress monitoring through student engagement is needed to accomplish the goal of increased achievement for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase overall Math proficiency to 35% (increase of 10%).

Increase overall ELA proficiency to 50% (increase of 5%).

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress monitoring through weekly standards-based EOC questions as well as ALEKS weekly and state monitoring periods in August, December/January, and April to monitor growth and address gaps. (Tracey Rendina)

Progress monitoring through FAST ELA monitoring periods in August, December/January, and April to monitor growth and address gaps. (Todd Doucimo)

Administrative walkthroughs/observations as well as Learning Walks (peer to peer) to provide feedback and growth opportunities for student engagement. (Administration/Teacher Leaders)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Krista Miller (miller.krista@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will participate in school based Collaborative Study Group (CSG) training to foster continuous improvement and engagement through students' reflection on their learning and the learning process. CSG's will also develop and deepen students' understanding through Socratic inquiry, and apply their new learning in order to enhance classroom performance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In addition to the academic benefits, successful Collaborative Study Groups (CSGs) also serve as an independent demonstration of increasing mastery and application of skills built and reinforced through WICOR strategies, including collaborative inquiry, note-taking, organization, collaboration, communication, and numerous other skills necessary for college readiness. Cornell's Center for Teaching Innovations research shows that educational experiences that are active, social, contextual, engaging, and student-owned lead to deeper learning. The benefits of collaborative learning include the development of higher-level thinking, oral communication, self-management, and leadership skills. Promotion of student-faculty interaction. Increase in student retention, self-esteem, and responsibility. Exposure to and an increase in understanding of diverse perspectives. Preparation for real life social and employment situations.

Both AVID and BEST standards focus on providing students with key cognitive strategies and skills that students need for college and careers. Both also emphasize development and refinement of student competence in Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading (WICOR), the key components

of curriculum in the AVID world, and naturally lead to professional development in the teaching of reading, writing, speaking, and listening, so that teachers have the opportunity to add to their cognitive toolkits in order to teach literacy skills effectively as they implement rigorous, higher-level thinking activities that help students address the challenges of expository reading and writing tasks.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Model and train teachers how to engage students in Collaborative Study Groups with set expectations.

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

By When: August 2023, Ongoing

Provide professional learning - Accessing progress monitoring data, accessing student data chats, test item specifications, curriculum planning maps.

Person Responsible: Lori Cantaloupe (cantaloupe.ori@brevardschools.org)

By When: 1st 9 weeks, ongoing

Support the implementation of Collaborative Study Groups within each content to increase student understanding of more rigorous work and mastery of standards through critical thinking.

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

By When: Monthly

Model and train teachers how to implement engagement strategies based on WICOR that foster school goals.

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

By When: Ongoing

Intentionally schedule collaborative planning sessions for core teachers using progress monitoring data, performance data, and test item specifications to guide planning and develop common standards-based tasks to identify areas of instructional and student growth. (EOC and FAST driven)

Person Responsible: Lori Cantaloupe (cantaloupe.ori@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Learning walks (peer observations) within the school one time per month to provide feedback, promote collaboration, and increase teachers' professional toolboxes to enhance instruction.

Person Responsible: Jamie Russell (russell.jamie@brevardschools.org)

By When: Quarterly

Implement student data chats based on progress monitoring to target small group differentiation and scaffold learning to meet all goals of implemented standards.

Person Responsible: Lori Cantaloupe (cantaloupe.ori@brevardschools.org)

By When: Fall 2023, Winter 2023, Spring 2023

Administration and instructional coaches will conduct walkthroughs with feedback specific to student engagement to drive instructional decisions and to highlight successes.

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

By When: Ongoing

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

After reviewing the Youth Truth student feedback data, the following questions were identified as areas of growth:

- The work that I do for my classes makes me really think. 3.14 (6th Percentile)
- Most of my teachers don't let people give up when the work gets hard. 3.04 (12th percentile)
- Students from my school treat adults with respect. 2.44 (12th percentile)

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase favorable responses as listed:

- The work that I do for my classes makes me really think. 3.64 (25th Percentile)
- Most of my teachers don't let people give up when the work gets hard. 3.54 (25th percentile)
- Students from my school treat adults with respect. 2.94 (25th percentile)

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Quarterly Student Panels to discuss and gain student perspectives related to rigor and student behaviors in the classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Learning walks where teachers provide develop two-way communication and feedback practices, observe learner-centered practices and bright spots in classroom environments, celebrate strengths, and identify trends to inform future support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Peer review puts faculty in charge of the quality of their teaching. Peer collaboration and review enables instructors to actively improve the quality of teaching in their own classroom and in their department. "Excellent teachers ...set out to inquire into their own practice, identifying key issues they want to pursue, posing questions for themselves, exploring alternatives and taking risks, and doing all of this in the company of peers who can offer critique and support. These are the habits of mind we expect, after all, in scholarly work, and we should expect them in teaching as much as in research." [England 1996] It is the responsibility of professional teachers to monitor the quality of the teaching in their departments and institutions.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Analyze Youth Truth Data to identify areas of celebration and growth within the data.

Person Responsible: Jamie Russell (russell.jamie@brevardschools.org)

By When: June 2023

Present data to faculty to gain buy in and understanding for student perceptions and to improve the classroom experience.

Person Responsible: Jamie Russell (russell.jamie@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023

Develop a Learning Walk tool for teachers to use and provide feedback and tools for improving their classroom instruction specific to academic rigor and classroom management.

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

By When: September 2023

Teachers will conduct Learning walks, schedule feedback meetings, and implement new practices in their classroom to improve student performance.

Person Responsible: Christina Cerrato (cerrato.christina@brevardschools.org)

By When: Quarterly

Student panels will meet to provide teachers with feedback and perceptions specific to academic rigor, culture, belonging, engagement, belonging and peer collaboration, and relationships.

Person Responsible: Jamie Russell (russell.jamie@brevardschools.org)

By When: Quarterly

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Astronaut's leadership team meets to review all funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated to all subgroups based on need.

*Professional Development in engaging all students through collaborative strategies.

*AVID Summer Institute training for all teacher groups.

*Every Child Matters - Early Warning Indicators

*College and Career Fairs

*HBCU College Fairs

*Success Strategies College course on campus

*College and Career culture across campus

*Go Higher, Get Accepted