Space Coast Junior/Senior High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Space Coast Junior/Senior High School

6150 BANYAN ST, Cocoa, FL 32927

http://www.spacecoast.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.

Ensure that every student graduates from Space Coast college, career, or military ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Provide each student with every opportunity to succeed.

PRIDE: Prepared to learn. Respect for school and community. Integrity. Dedicated to safety. Engaged 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
Flora, Joseph	Principal	
Barna, Laura	Assistant Principal	
Baldridge, Jocelyn	Instructional Coach	
Oconnor, Fran	Dean	
Leonard, Prishonda	Dean	
Williams, Amy	ELL Compliance Specialist	

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.

School stakeholder involvement is a crucial component in the development and implementation of our school improvement plan. School data is reviewed with department chairs and the goal setting process begins. Their feedback is used to help narrow down larger, more broader goals, into specific measurable objectives. The specific goals are then shared with staff members during a beginning of the year faculty meeting. Student feedback is then obtained through various student interest groups. The first group consists of SCHS's Student Government Association. The second group the data is shared with is our Pit Crew. New this year, the Pit Crew is a program we are piloting to aid in the support of our students with disabilities. Goals are then shared with two parent/community groups. The first is our School Advisory Council. The second stakeholder group is our Parent Leadership Team.

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))

Each year the School Improvement Plan is reviewed with stakeholders and data from all school reporting categories are discussed. Data is reviewed regularly throughout the year with stakeholders not just as SAC meetings but Open House, Orientation Meetings, and registration meetings. Progress monitoring data from FAST assessments is shared with stakeholders in numerous ways. Individual teachers have data chats with school administration and literacy coach. Students data from FAST assessments is reviewed in the form of data chats with teachers and literacy coach. Individual FAST student data is shared with parents as well.

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 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	26%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	49%
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)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) 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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	48	32	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	0	57
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	3	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	6	23
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	43	77
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	59	103
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	34	43	77

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	18	15	33

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	10	11	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	12	23

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	70	47	249
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	40	166
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	40	130
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	99
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	62	307
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	33	245
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	

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	56	64	300

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	52	25	221
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	20	186

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	70	47	117
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	40	74
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	40	68
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	21
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	62	125
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	33	90
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	

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	56	64	120

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	52	25	77
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	20	71

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*	47	43	50	46	52	51	45		
ELA Learning Gains				46			39		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			30		
Math Achievement*	54	34	38	50	40	38	45		
Math Learning Gains				52			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			29		
Science Achievement*	50	59	64	55	37	40	59		
Social Studies Achievement*	60	63	66	68	44	48	70		
Middle School Acceleration	65			66	43	44	54		
Graduation Rate	89	87	89	84	63	61	90		
College and Career Acceleration	80	72	65	61	66	67	51		
ELP Progress	64	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	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	509
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	89

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	609
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	84

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	44			
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	59			
HSP	58			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	57			

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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	23	Yes	3	2
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	41			
HSP	53			
MUL	49			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	49			

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	47			54			50	60	65	89	80	64
SWD	21			28			26	45	42	57	7	
ELL	36			54			27				4	64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39			41			33	41	91	78	7	
HSP	42			45			51	55	55	70	7	
MUL	41			47			44	63	69	95	7	
PAC												
WHT	50			57			53	62	64	79	7	
FRL	40			47			43	53	55	75	7	

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	46	46	35	50	52	46	55	68	66	84	61	
SWD	18	33	28	24	41	47	26	41	36	68	29	
ELL	18			27								
AMI												
ASN	64	80										
BLK	35	38	19	22	42	46	36	44		71	60	
HSP	44	42	37	54	56	33	54	65	70	87	40	
MUL	40	41	41	40	48	44	40	62	56	82		
PAC												
WHT	48	47	36	53	52	48	59	70	67	85	64	
FRL	41	42	32	44	48	42	50	62	56	77	49	

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	45	39	30	45	36	29	59	70	54	90	51	
SWD	20	25	17	19	27	28	31	46	25	83	26	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	82	50		67	50							
BLK	37	38	35	25	24	11	30	44	40	93	36	
HSP	48	43	20	41	36	29	59	60	47	89	56	
MUL	45	39	37	41	38	40	53	59	57	100	45	
PAC												
WHT	44	39	30	47	37	30	61	74	54	88	53	
FRL	40	37	32	39	31	26	51	67	48	84	43	

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	54%	54%	0%	50%	4%
07	2023 - Spring	50%	53%	-3%	47%	3%
08	2023 - Spring	50%	52%	-2%	47%	3%
09	2023 - Spring	49%	56%	-7%	48%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	68%	58%	10%	48%	20%
08	2023 - Spring	50%	38%	12%	55%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	42%	48%	-6%	44%	-2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	56%	51%	5%	50%	6%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	47%	50%	-3%	48%	-1%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	54%	61%	-7%	63%	-9%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	69%	-1%	66%	2%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	62%	-12%	63%	-13%

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.

Geometry EOC scores have shown a decline, with 38% of students scoring a Level 1 achievement. Overall, our Geometry scores decreased from 51% achievement level to 47%. This is more than the district and state averages.
Reading continues to remain a focus as PM3 scores are only slightly above the state average. All grade levels did increase in proficiency level, except for 9th grade Reading that had a decrease of 3%

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

Science and Social Studies have shown the greatest decline from the prior year. Specifically, Biology had a decrease of 12%. Social Studies overall proficiency decreased by 11% from the prior year and US History decreased by 12%.
Advanced Placement proficiency decreased 11% from the previous year, going from 45.7% to 34.3%. More focus needs to be on promoting our Advanced Placement courses and providing opportunity for students to take AP courses.

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.

Proficiency levels for students with disabilities (SWD) in reading and math continues to be an area of concern. Overall, Social Studies and Science achievement have decreased from previous years. This data shows a need to focus on providing additional instructional support to students within the classroom focused on content standards and gaps in learning.

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

Middle School and College and Career acceleration continues to improve from previous years. College and career acceleration had a 19% increase. Graduation rate also increased from 84% to 89%. This was due to increased individualized scheduling and progress monitoring of students through our Guidance department.
Besides Geometry, Math proficiency levels all increased from the prior year with 8th grade having the biggest increase from 21% proficiency to 50%.

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

Two areas of concern from the Early Warning Systems (EWS) show that 125 students on the ELA assessment in 7th and 8th grade scored a Level 1. We also had 71 students that have been retained two or more times. These are focus areas for this school year.

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

1. Literacy across all curriculums to increase reading proficiency levels.
2. Increased and intensive progress monitoring for those students with multiple retentions.
3. Increase graduation rate by monitoring deficient seniors and providing opportunities through FANG and credit retrieval options.
4. Supporting students with disabilities through support facilitation within the master schedule.
5. Progress monitoring and timely remedial support for ELL students.

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

#1. 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.

73% of our 7th & 8th graders participated in the Youth Truth Survey (YTS) this past school year. The survey showed several areas of opportunity for growth. In the area of Engagement, only 25% of the students perceived themselves as engaged with their school and education. In regards to School Culture, only 10% of the students believe that their school fosters a culture of respect and fairness. In the areas of Belonging & Peer Collaboration, only 26% of the students feel welcome at their school and have collaborative relationships with their classmates. In the area of Relationships, only 22% of the students feel they receive support and personal attention from their teacher.

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

Our goal is to grow in the areas of Positive Culture and Environment. Our plan is to increase by 5% in the areas of Engagement, School Culture, Belonging & Peer Collaboration and Relationships.

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

Our administrative team will visit classrooms and provide feedback on best practices to increase student engagement. The Middle School Houses function on a reward point system that encourages peer relationships. The administrative team will also be more visible, provide additional support and overall be more active at building relationships with students and staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Fran Oconnor (oconnor.frances@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.)

We will achieve this through best practices such as differentiated instruction, small group instruction, reciprocal teaching, specific learning targets and goals, progress monitoring tools building relationships with students and parents. The middle school was also divided into houses to promote engagement, Belonging & Peer Collaboration. As a team, we will celebrate student success every quarter to further build relationships and a positive school culture. Students will meet with mentors to establish support systems and personal relationships with staff.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These specific strategies all focus on building relationships between students and staff. Best practices in the classroom, ensure student engagement, and provide opportunities for all students which leads to student success. Students who are successful have a sense of belonging and have better school relationships.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. 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.

According to the Parent Survey, parents provided feedback that they would like increased communication with their child's teacher. One specific question was, "How often does your child's teacher communicate with you about your child's progress?". The results were 27% stated their child's teachers NEVER communicate with them; 3% stated DAILY; 11% stated WEEKLY; 24% stated MONTHLY; and 34% stated ONCE/TWICE per year. We want to build a rapport with our parents. We want our parents to feel comfortable and confident that they can communicate with their child's teacher and obtain information as needed.

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

On the 2024 Parent Survey, we will decrease the NEVER communicate to less than 5%, and increase the WEEKLY communication to 50%. We will do this by increasing parent communication between teachers and parents by encouraging teachers to increase communication by making personal phone calls to parents, sending personal text messages, increasing FOCUS messages, and by posting weekly newsletters.

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

This will be monitored by teachers sharing their weekly newsletter updates, and offering teacher Professional Development courses on how to effective communicate with parents. We will also communicate with parents about using text apps so that they don't have to share their personal phone numbers, but can still communicate effectively with parents.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Prishonda Leonard (leonard.prishonda@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.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented is using technology to communicate with parents, and to to do this often and early. This has been deemed to be effective in increasing teacher-parent communication.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for using this strategy is that if we increase our teacher-parent communication, our student achievement will increase.

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.

Teachers need to create communication tools. These tools can be in the form of a newsletter, FOCUS messages, emails, updated classroom websites, or emails to the parents.

Person Responsible: Prishonda Leonard (leonard.prishonda@brevardschools.org)

By When: Teacher-parent communication will be monitored bi-weekly.

#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.

On the 2023 Parent Survey, parents were also asked "What type of parent engagement resources would you use if they were provided at your school?" 72% of parents stated that they would attend Academic Support sessions to get materials to use at home; 46% of parents stated that they would attend sessions about technology; 23% said that would attend trainings on how to be more involved with the school; 23% said they would attend workshops on managing behaviors at home; and 30% said they would attend workshops on Mental Health resources. We want Space Coast Jr. Sr. High to be a place where parents not only feel welcome, but we want them to be able to rely upon the school to be help them find resources to support their children's learning at home.

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

Space Coast Jr. Sr. High hopes to offer parents the opportunity to attend informational nights. We will offer an Academic night and a workshop for families on Mental Health. We hope to have an average of 30% of our families to attend.

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

We will monitor this by the parent sign-in sheets at the Academic and Mental Health workshops.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Prishonda Leonard (leonard.prishonda@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.)

This will evidence-based intervention will be implemented by planning Academic informational nights where parents can learn about resources that they can use to help their students at home, and informational nights that address Mental Health concerns in students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for choosing this strategy is that if you teach the parents how to help their students at home, this will increase student achievement.

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.

Plan academic informational nights.

Person Responsible: Prishonda Leonard (leonard.prishonda@brevardschools.org)

By When: We will plan one academic night before the end of the first semester.

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

SCHS students with disabilities continue to perform below the federal index. In 2021-2022, SWD had an overall proficiency rate of 36% which was a 4% increase from the previous year.
In 21-22 ELA proficiency for SWD sat at 18%
In 21-22 Math proficiency for SWD was 24%

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

SCHS's students with disabilities still lags 4% points below pre-covid numbers and 5% points below the federal index. This year, the goal is to continue the growth displayed the past two years and to reach 41% proficiency for the SWD subgroup.
Specifically, SWD will reach an overall proficiency of 40% in ELA and overall proficiency of 50% in Math.

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

In the 23-24 school year, SWD will be monitored through the use of FAST progress monitoring data. Data will be pulled by school administration and shared with staff member during grade level meetings. Case managers will also have access to this data and will assist in remedial strategies to close achievement gaps. In addition, parents will receive notification of student deficiencies and be provided with ways students can receive remediation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joseph Flora (flora.joseph@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.)

Department meetings will be one of the main catalysts for driving professional development and support for staff members as they work together to closing the achievement gap. In September's department meetings, staff will view a video on how to effectively use scaffolding as tool for provide support for students with disabilities. After viewing the video, staff will then discuss possible implementation plans for increasing the use of scaffolding supports. In October, Department meetings will focus on the use of explicit instruction and then in November, Department meetings will include strategies for promoting active student engagement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All three school improvement intervention strategies are considered high leverage practices to promote greater support for students with disabilities. These evidence based interventions are strategies that have been promoted by our district's Student Services Department.

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.

1. On-going data analysis on student performance data.
2. Dissemination of FAST data to include data chats with teachers, students, and case managers.
3. Professional development on high leverage teaching strategies.
4. Review of implementation plan.

Person Responsible: Joseph Flora (flora.joseph@brevardschools.org)

By When: Data review - Sep/Jan Department Meeting PD - Sep/Oct/Nov Review Department Implementation Plan - Sep/Oct/Nov Case Manager Data Review - Quarterly

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

In the 21-22 school year, our ELL students had a 23% proficiency rate as measured by the federal index. As SCHS does not have a high number of ELL students, the 23% proficiency rate was determined based off of student performance in ELA and Math only.

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

In reviewing PM 3 data from last school year, ELL students in ELA did not achieve a proficiency score of 3 or higher. The goal for 2023-2024 school year is to have 50% of ELL students achieve a 3 or higher. In math, 50% of ELL students grades 7 and 8 scored a level 3 or higher. In the 2023-2024 school year, our goal is to get 75% of ELL students scoring a 3 or higher.

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

SCHS's ELL coordinator and assistant principal, will monitor performance on FAST progress monitoring data. ELL student performance will be discussed monthly at regularly scheduled administrative team meetings and at guidance department meetings. Each ELL student will be assigned a case manager as well.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Prishonda Leonard (leonard.prishonda@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 staff members will be provided with a toolkit of resources for supporting ELL students. Individual ELA/ Math teachers of ELL students will be required to attend a quarterly training on strategies to improve ELL proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Providing training to staff members with strategies to target improved literacy proficiency amongst our ELL students will narrow the scope and provide targeted support. Assigning a case manager to each individual student will provide students with access to one specific individual who can serve a check-in for that particular student.

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.

Provide staff with digital toolkit of resources - Aug
Assign case manager to each ELL student - Sep

Provide quarterly training to ELA/Math ELL teachers - Oct
Monitor performance data - Jan
Provide additional academic support - yearly ongoing

Person Responsible: Prishonda Leonard (leonard.prishonda@brevardschools.org)

By When: Action steps will be ongoing and monitored by Dean, Literacy Coach and ELL Contact.

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).

Space Coast's leadership team meets at the beginning of the year to review teacher allocations and align them with student needs. Additionally, resources such as ESE student/teacher schedules are examined to benefit the maximum number of students and ensure a high quality education with appropriate support.

The secondary ELA and secondary math resource teachers meet with our teachers to help them analyze data and develop a plan of action. In addition, the resource teachers conduct walkthroughs with the administration to provide feedback to improve instructional practices.

The district also provides support for our students with disabilities. New ESE teachers participate in several professional develop sessions to increase the effectiveness of their support for our ESE students. We also have the support of our ESE support specialist and behavior analyst as needed for our students.

Our ELL students are provided supports from each of their teachers as well as through the district. Teachers are trained in how to differentiate for ELL students and how to provide instructional accommodations. In addition, all ELL students have access to the program Imagine to help them with their language acquisition.