Melbourne Senior High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Melbourne Senior High School

74 BULLDOG BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32901

http://www.melbourne.hs.brevard.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: James K IR K C

Start Date for this Principal: 9/10/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	32%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: B (60%) 2014-15: A (72%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Melbourne Senior High School

74 BULLDOG BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32901

http://www.melbourne.hs.brevard.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	29%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Melbourne High School is to inspire students to strive for excellence in all aspects of their lives, embrace learning as a pathway to success, and contribute to our society as responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

TBD

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kirk, James	Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602	583	503	455	2143
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	96	66	46	284
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	136	75	34	331
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	257	270	193	129	849

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	26	36	15	101
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	12	9	5	37

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
108

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/10/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	39	24	20	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	113	54	28	277

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	257	270	193	129	849

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	68%	59%	56%	68%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	52%	51%	59%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	40%	42%	49%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	56%	48%	51%	53%	48%	49%
Math Learning Gains	55%	49%	48%	51%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	45%	45%	38%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	80%	66%	68%	77%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	70%	73%	72%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	602 (0)	583 (0)	503 (0)	455 (0)	2143 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	76 ()	96 ()	66 ()	46 ()	284 (0)
One or more suspensions	10 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	86 (0)	136 (0)	75 (0)	34 (0)	331 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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

NOTE: 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
09	2019	66%	62%	4%	55%	11%
	2018	67%	60%	7%	53%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	69%	59%	10%	53%	16%
	2018	72%	61%	11%	53%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	80%	66%	14%	67%	13%
2018	76%	67%	9%	65%	11%
Compare		4%			

CIVICS EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	71%	4%	70%	5%
2018	74%	70%	4%	68%	6%
Compare		1%			

ALGEBRA EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	43%	61%	-18%	61%	-18%
2018	34%	62%	-28%	62%	-28%
Compare		9%			

GEOMETRY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	60%	-2%	57%	1%
2018	57%	60%	-3%	56%	1%
Compare		1%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	25	43	33	20	32	23	43	51		80	33
ELL	50	67	45	33	40		40			91	60
ASN	86	65		69	42		100	75		96	87

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
BLK	38	55	45	29	44	45	45	66		88	35
HSP	67	53	35	43	49	21	76	72		93	58
MUL	61	63	50	32	45		77	63		97	72
WHT	70	60	45	62	59	46	83	79		91	71
FRL	55	54	35	46	53	39	69	67		83	55

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	35	34	21	32	19	28	42		72	40
ELL	39	82	83	36			29	55		67	
ASN	79	76		67	60		90	92		92	100
BLK	49	61	50	29	39	27	45	69		76	52
HSP	73	64	67	51	50	47	72	71		86	65
MUL	70	62	64	61	57		68	86		90	50
WHT	69	59	52	53	44	37	78	75		90	73
FRL	58	56	57	44	40	29	64	64		77	60

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	18	38	36	19	36	37	43	40		82	40
ELL	28	43	40	31	50			36		92	50
ASN	73	71	60	62	59	46	92	68		100	78
BLK	38	41	35	33	42	42	54	53		78	59
HSP	64	54	43	42	47	30	70	55		97	50
MUL	66	57	47	51	44	14	81	76		100	66
WHT	71	61	52	56	52	41	79	75		92	64
FRL	58	53	40	41	42	36	66	61		85	49

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	702
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	62
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

We continue to struggle with our SWD in reading and mathematics. We also saw a slight reduction in ELA performance overall as compared to the prior year.

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

Our African-American and Hispanic students experienced a decline overall in ELA scores. We believe access to grade level assignments on a consistent basis contributed to this decline.

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 of our lowest 25% in mathematics.

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

SWD made gains in ELA, Science, and Social Studies. Focus on standards-based instruction combined with additional push-in services in ELA may have helped improve scores in these areas.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Course failures remain a concern, especially since we know that most of our students fail classes because they have not submitted assignments instead of a lack of course proficiency.

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

1. Increase academic growth for ESE students in reading and math
2. Increase academic growth for struggling students in reading and math
3. Increase classroom support for ESE students
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Support for struggling students
Rationale	Melbourne High has not performed well with ESE students over the last three years. We were recently placed on the state list for targeted support for this sub-group. We recognize that we need to provide more support for struggling students in both reading and mathematics.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Melbourne High School will improve the overall academic performance of our ESE students from 38% of the total points possible for that sub-group to at least 45% of points possible as measured in the 10 cells that count for school grade.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Kirk (kirk.james@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Increase push-in support for struggling students in both reading and math. Revise curriculum in Learning Strategies to adopt a preview/acceleration model. Improve student access to rigorous curriculum and grade level assignments
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Struggling students often need more in-class subject specific support in order to demonstrate academic growth. We plan to provide more support in English 1, English 2, Algebra, and Geometry by adding support-facilitation teachers and instructional assistants. These additional resources will allow the teachers to provide more differentiation to students, break classes into small groups, and provide more individual attention. In addition, we plan to have our common unit lesson plans shared with Learning Strategies teachers in advance so that key vocabulary and concepts can be previewed before the students see that information in the regular classroom. Research by TNTP (2018) indicates that consistent access to grade level assignments may help students grow up to 7 months in comparison with their peers. We recognize that students in our non-honors classes have less opportunity to access grade level assignments than our students in honors, AP, or IB courses.

Action Step	
Description	1. Increase push-in support in English and Math 2. Apply preview and acceleration model in learning strategies to help students assimilate key content. 3. Revise power hour policies to mandate students attendance if they are failing courses. 4. Increase access to grade level assignments in all core academic classes 5.
Person Responsible	James Kirk (kirk.james@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).