Satellite Senior High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Satellite Senior High School

300 SCORPION CT, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

http://www.scorpnet.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.

Satellite High School, a professional learning community, will create and maintain an academic and interdependent atmosphere through on-going self reflection and personal improvement, teaming, measurable and attainable goal-setting, student-centered learning, and collaboration among all stakeholders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Satellite High School students will graduate with the academic excellence and intellectual curiosity necessary for college success, career readiness, character development, responsible citizenship, and life-long learning.

School Leadership Team, 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
Pruett, Robert	Principal	Serves as an instructional leader, collaborates with all stakeholders, supports students and teachers, analyzes data on an ongoing basis and strives for student learning.
Bombriant, Kelly	Assistant Principal	Serves as an instructional leader, collaborates with all stakeholders, supports students and teachers, analyzes data on an ongoing basis and strives for student learning.
Booth, William	Assistant Principal	Serves as an instructional leader, collaborates with all stakeholders, supports students and teachers, develops corrective strategies for student needs, analyzes data on an ongoing basis, supports facilities and usage and maintains facilities and strives for student learning.
Sobke, Jay	Dean	Serves as an instructional leader, collaborates with all stakeholders, supports students and teachers, develops corrective strategies for student needs, analyzes data on an ongoing basis and strives for student learning.

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.

Stakeholders are involved in developing the SIP through feedback during our SAC meetings and faculty meetings.

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))

The SIP will be monitored and revised as necessary through feedback during faculty meetings, planning days, department meetings and SAC meetings.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	20%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	21%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
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)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	72			70			69		
ELA Learning Gains	59			60			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45			48			44		
Math Achievement*	68			65			69		
Math Learning Gains	75			39			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66			36			47		
Science Achievement*	83			73			82		
Social Studies Achievement*	82			79			87		
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate	95			94			94		
College and Career Acceleration	71			67			72		
ELP Progress									

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	716
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	95

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	46			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	51			
HSP	67			
MUL	81			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	63			

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)

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	72	59	45	68	75	66	83	82		95	71	
SWD	27	37	34	31	52	54	59	41		88	40	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	92	73										
BLK	54	40		60								
HSP	62	54	27	56	71		86	75		97	73	
MUL	75	67		71	82		82	89		100	83	
PAC												
WHT	73	60	46	70	76	65	83	82		94	72	
FRL	60	53	41	53	66	59	74	72		91	60	

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	70	60	48	65	39	36	73	79		94	67	
SWD	29	41	31	26	30	31	38	42		97	47	
ELL	42	27										
AMI												
ASN	80									100	80	
BLK	58	55		31								
HSP	55	45	35	54	39	50	61	70		97	63	
MUL	84	74		64	46		81	88		100	44	
PAC												
WHT	72	61	48	68	40	35	75	80		94	68	
FRL	53	50	43	50	28	25	60	65		85	53	

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	69	53	44	69	61	47	82	87		94	72	
SWD	29	32	35	34	39	25	70	70		86	43	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	83	70		91								
BLK	42	38	30	62				70				
HSP	65	56	58	71	58		74	88		90	61	
MUL	70	56	60	63	92		69	85		81	94	
PAC												
WHT	70	52	41	69	60	46	84	88		95	73	
FRL	58	46	47	60	58	58	72	88		81	46	

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

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.

Satellite High School's lowest performing students are our students with disabilities. When you look at both the ELA and Algebra 1 data you will see that we have dropped with both of these categories. Our percentage of SWD that took the ELA test and passed with a level 3 or higher dropped from 24% (21-22 SY) to 22% (22-23 SY). Our percentage of SWD that took the Algebra 1 test and passed with a level 3 or higher dropped from 15% (21-22 SY) to 9% (22-23 SY). Some contributing factors for this low performance could be that the testing platform for both of these tests have changed.

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

Our 10th grade ELA scores had the greatest decline for the 22-23 SY. Our students went from 72% passing with a 3 or higher to 67% passing with a 3 or higher. Our students had a complete change for how they were tested, which could be a contributing cause for this decline. Students were tested 3 times in the school year and may not have realized how big the impact was for the final test. This is a new mindset for our students who generally had only one ELA assessment during the school year.

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.

When we look at our student data as a whole and compare it to the state average, we beat the state average every time. However, if you look at our SWD averages and compare that to the state average you will see that our 10th grade ELA average is 22 points below the state average. The state average for 10th grade ELA is 346 and our SWD average is 324. I know the biggest difference this past school year was how the test was given. Our students were not used to a progress monitoring style test with the final test having the biggest impact on our data.

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

The data that made the most improvement was with the Algebra 1 data. Our students went from 44% passing with a 3 or higher to 50% passing with a 3 or higher. Some of the contributing factors include: using MAP data to identify students academic deficiencies, implementing MAP data to remediate student learning, collaboration among teachers during common planning and department meetings, and EOC bootcamps.

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

N/A

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

Our highest priorities for this upcoming school year are:
1 - ELA
2 - Algebra 1
3 - SWD in ELA and Algebra 1

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.

Our Youth Truth survey data shows that only 28% of our 11th graders and 44% of our seniors feel that "My school has helped me understand the steps I need to take in order to apply to college."

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

Our goal is that 35% of our 11th graders and 52% of our seniors will feel that we have helped them understand what steps they need to take in order to apply for college.

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

We will monitor this area of focus through the Youth Truth Survey and feedback from students when they meet with their counselors.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@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 are going to host parent nights that focus on college applications, senior year preparation (including graduation requirements) and career opportunities after high school.

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

Preparation is the key to success and preparing for success in college and careers needs to start as early as possible. High-quality college and career guidance programs help make students and families feel they have information, options, and the power to choose what is right for the 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.

Navigating your Senior Year - Parent and student event

Person Responsible: Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: End of August

School counselors meet with individual students to talk about navigating their senior year, courses needed to graduate and to talk about their next steps after high school (college or career).

Person Responsible: Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: End of the first semester this will be complete - in the spring the counselors go into the 9th grade CRD classes to set up their 4 year plan.

Accelerated Programs Night - Students and families come to learn about the benefit of the accelerated programs available here at Satellite HS.

Person Responsible: Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: January

Early College - Dual Enrollment Night - Students and families come to learn about going to EFSC while they are in high school.

Person Responsible: Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: January

FAFSA Night - Students and families come and fill out the FAFSA application

Person Responsible: Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: February

Trade Brigade Fair - Students who are interested in a trade school (firefighting, police, HVAC...etc) can come and meet with the representatives for this program.

Person Responsible: Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: End of December

#2. 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.

SWD at Satellite High School struggled this past school year when it came to the ELA state testing and the Algebra 1 testing. SWD passing these tests with a level 3 or higher in ELA went from 24% (21-22 SY) to 22% 922-23 SY). SWD passing these tests with a level 3 or higher in Algebra 1 went from 15% (21-22 SY) to 9% (22-23 SY).

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

Satellite High School plans to improve the Algebra 1 and ELA percent passing with a level 3 or higher for our SWD by 5%.

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

The planned outcomes will be monitored in the following ways.
* Administrative walkthroughs that prioritize tested subject teachers. This process will include feedback with teachers, prioritizing student engagement, instructional rigor and making instructional changes based on classroom formative assessment.
* Analyzing ALEKS and FAST data and quarter grades during planned professional development/planning days with literacy coach and assistant principal of curriculum.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@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.)

Small group instruction during class - ESE teachers conducting small groups during class.

Common planning for subject area teachers and ESE teachers - building the master schedule around SWD, while allowing time for collaborative planning for teachers.

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

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is that SWD need targeted instruction/support during class. The criteria for selecting this strategy include IEP Focus reports, implementation of classroom accommodations, and implementation of testing accommodations.

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.

Create a walk through schedule and walk through tool, that prioritizes 9th and 10th grade English classes, intensive reading classes and Algebra 1 classes. The literacy coach, Rebecca Kamlet and administrators will follow the walk through schedule and discuss their observations during a weekly meeting. Teachers and administrators will meet for feedback meetings.

Person Responsible: Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout the school year until May testing begins.

Organize and implement a professional development/planning day for the 9th and 10th grade English teachers, intensive reading teachers and Algebra 1 teachers. The PD/planning day will have two main foci: (1) Collaboration between the teachers to look at data and plan for student engagement. (2) Plan for questioning that will support student engagement.

Person Responsible: Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: After each state or district benchmark assessment.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

Satellite High School's ELA scores show that our percentage of students who passed with a level 3 or higher has dropped this past year by 2% for our 9th grade students and by 5% for our 10th grade students. 73% (21-22 SY) of our 9th grade students passed the ELA test with a level 3 or higher and that dropped to 71% for the 22-23 SY. 72% (21-22 SY) of our 10th grade students passed the ELA test with a level 3 or higher and that dropped to 67% for the 22- 23 SY. Our overall percentage of SWD that passed the ELA test with a level 3 or higher went from a 24% (21-22 SY) to 22% (22-23 SY).

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

Satellite High School is planning on improving the ELA scores by 5%.

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

There are two different ways Satellite High School administrative team will monitor students' academic progress for the desired outcome. First, the administrative team will monitor students FAST Benchmark test scores. Second, the administrative team will monitor student engagement and instructional rigor by conducting walk throughs with feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@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.)

Instructional Feedback - Instructional feedback will include thoughtful information to improve student learning and take place after walk throughs or observations and they will be focused on student engagement, adapting instructional practices based on classroom formal assessments and implementing academic rigor.

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

Instructional feedback is one of the most impactful strategies to increase student learning. The criteria for selecting this strategy include receiving regular feedback that is concrete and specific. In more specific terms, instructional feedback must use goal-oriented communication and include clear performance standards.

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.

Create a walk through schedule and walk through tool, that prioritizes 9th and 10th grade English classes and the intensive reading classes. The literacy coach, Rebecca Kamlet and administrators will follow the walk through schedule and discuss their observations during a weekly meeting. Teachers and administrators will meet for feedback meetings.

Person Responsible: Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout the school year until May testing begins.

Organize and implement a professional development/planning day for the 9th and 10th grade English teachers and the intensive reading teachers. The PD/planning day will have two main foci: (1) Collaboration between the teachers to look at data and plan for student engagement. (2) Plan for questioning that will support student engagement.

Person Responsible: Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: After the first two FAST benchmark tests.

9th and 10th grade English teachers and intensive reading teachers conduct data chats with students after each FAST benchmark assessment.

Person Responsible: Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: 2 weeks after each FAST benchmark assessment.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

Satellite High School math data showed improvement when it comes to the percentage of students who passed the Algebra 1 test with a 3 or higher. During the 21-22 school year there was 44% of students passing with a 3 or higher. During the 22-23 school year there was an increase to 50% of the students passing with a 3 or higher.

A deeper look at Satellite High School's math data will show you that during the 20-21 school year there were 56% of the students passing with a 3 or higher, so we still have some work to get back to that percent. When we look at our SWD we also see that our percentage of students passing with a level 3 or higher has dropped. The 21-22 school year there was 15% of SWD passing with a level 3 or higher and in the 22-23 school year that percentage dropped to 9%.

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

Satellite High School plans to improve the percent passing rate for the Algebra 1 test by 6%.

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

Satellite High School's administrative team will monitor benchmark tests that are provided through the ALEKS program twice a year and quarter grades to identify students' learning gaps and how to modify classroom instruction to address learning gaps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@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.)

Monitoring data will include data analysis which will allow for teachers to develop lesson plans that will address students' learning gaps.

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

The rationale for monitoring student data includes the opportunity to track students' learning and addressing learning gaps before high stake testing.

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.

Organizing and implementing a professional development/planning day for the Algebra teachers. The focus of the PD/planning day is twofold: (1) to collaborate on creating engaging lesson plans and formative assessments, and (2) ALEKS data analysis and using it to direct instruction.

Person Responsible: Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: Days will be planned after ALEKS test results are available for analysis.

Create a walk through schedule and walk through tool, that prioritizes Algebra classes. Administrators will follow the walk through schedule and discuss their observations during a weekly meeting. Teachers and administrators will meet for feedback meetings.

Person Responsible: Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout the school year until May testing begins.