

Brevard Public Schools

Melbourne Senior High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

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: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	32%
2019-20 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%)
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	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	32%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kirk, James	Principal	Lead instructional leader Works with stakeholders to set school improvement priorities Facilitates professional development Monitors school improvement implementation throughout the school year
Linde, Erik	Assistant Principal	Participates in formation of school improvement priorities Monitors implementation of school improvement plan Coaches and evaluates teachers
Conlon, Julie	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach Provides professional development for faculty and staff Connects faculty with literacy resources Conducts individual and small group instruction with students
Meegan, James	Assistant Principal	Participates in formation of school improvement priorities Monitors implementation of school improvement plan Coaches and evaluates teachers Facilitates the Advanced Placement program Directs facilities operations
Barton, Keith	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and instruction Directs exceptional student education program Participates in formation of school improvement priorities Monitors implementation of school improvement plan Coaches and evaluates teachers
Kilmer, Cindylou	Assistant Principal	Participates in formation of school improvement priorities Monitors implementation of school improvement plan Coaches and evaluates teachers Assists with our instructional program for students with disabilities
Perez, Tanya	Assistant Principal	Participates in formation of school improvement priorities Monitors implementation of school improvement plan Coaches and evaluates teachers

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, James K IR K C

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

109

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	32%
2019-20 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%)
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](#).

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	0	543	589	523	426	2081
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	54	28	20	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	6	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	66	38	23	218
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	48	0	0	101

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	4	2	4	0	10

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	12	64	37	5	118	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/30/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	

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

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	
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

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

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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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	
	(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.

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%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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
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%	0

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

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%	0

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 according to state assessment data. There was a small reduction in mathematics performance from 2018 to 2019. We made small gains in ELA achievement and lowest 25% achievement for our SWD from 2018 to 2019. However, these gains were not sufficient. Contributing Factors: Lack of in class, subject specific support for SWD in ELA and Math classes; few opportunities for preview or acceleration of key content and vocabulary in learning strategies classes.

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

African-American and Hispanic students experienced a decline in ELA scores. Contributing Factors: Inconsistent access to grade level assignments; lack of belief on the part of faculty in their ability to succeed; cultural relevance of curriculum in core content areas.

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. We were encouraged that our overall Algebra I proficiency improved by 9% over the prior year. We were also encouraged that the proficiency of our lowest 25% in mathematics improved by 4% over the prior year. Contributing Factors: faculty did not strictly follow Algebra Nation resource shown to improve math proficiency; inconsistent opportunities to wrestle with complex, grade level problems.

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 ESE services in ELA may have helped proficiency in these areas.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Course failures remain a concern overall because we know that most of our students fail classes because they have not submitted assignments rather than a lack of proficiency on course standards. This is an area that we must continue to refine with our faculty. We are also concerned about the number of students taking their classes from home during the pandemic who appear disengaged from the curriculum.

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 subgroups in reading and math.
3. Increase subject-specific classroom support for ESE students.
4. Provide consistent opportunities for students to access grade level assignments and curriculum.
5. Provide support for students who have chosen to learn from home during the pandemic.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Melbourne High School has not provided sufficient support for our ESE students over the last three years, as reflected in state assessment data. We recognize that more subject-specific classroom support is needed in order for our students to be successful. Further, we recognize that students must have consistent opportunities to wrestle with grade level content and assignments in order to grow toward proficiency on their course standards.
Measurable Outcome:	Melbourne High School will improve the overall academic performance of our ESE students from 38% of total points possible on the Federal Index to at least 45% of points possible.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Kirk (kirk.james@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase subject-specific support for ESE students by utilizing an support-facilitation model in English 1, English 2, Algebra I, and Geometry. ESE support-facilitation teachers will plan and teach with their general education colleagues in the regular classroom in order to provide additional support to our ESE student population.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	SWD often need more subject-specific support in the regular classroom in order to grow toward proficiency on course standards. Additional resources utilized this year will allow teaches to provide more differentiation to students, break classes into small groups as needed, and provide more individual attention. In addition, we plan to have our common unit lesson plans shared with our ESE Learning Strategies teachers so that they can preview and accelerate key vocabulary and concepts to ESE students before they see them in the regular classroom. Research by TNTIP indicates that consistent access to grade-level assignments may help students grow up to 7 months in comparison to their peers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Increase subject-specific support for ESE students in English 1, English 2, Algebra 1, and Geometry courses. Persons responsible: ESE teachers, General Education teachers. In process measure: Master schedule, classroom walkthrough data.
2. Apply a preview and acceleration model in Learning Strategies courses in order to help students assimilate key content. Persons responsible: Keith Barton, ESE teachers. In process measure: Master schedule, ESE teacher lesson plans, ESE student grades in English 1, English 2, Algebra 1, and Geometry.
3. Provide consistent opportunities for students to access grade-level assignments. Persons responsible: Administrative team, General education teachers. In process measure: Classroom walkthrough data
4. Provide support for ESE students learning from home during the pandemic by offering tutoring before school, after school, and virtually. Persons responsible: Administrative team. In process measures: Tutoring schedule

Person Responsible James Kirk (kirk.james@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Course failures at Melbourne High are mostly a function of the impact of missing assignments on students' grades. Most students who fail a course do so because they have not completed assignments rather than a lack of proficiency on course standards. In order to correct this deficiency our school must take the following steps:

- 1. Improve student engagement in the classroom by evaluating lessons and units of instruction where students tend to struggle.**
- 2. Determine how individual lessons and/or units of instruction can be revised to utilize instructional strategies that result in knowledge transfer.**
- 3. Revise assignments as needed in order to bring them to grade level.**
- 4. Make the students do the majority of the thinking required in the lesson during classroom instruction. Too often our teachers work harder than the students and do the majority of the thinking for them.**
- 5. Create a committee to review the district grade policy and how it is applied on campus. Discuss methods to reduce course failures by utilizing research based grading practices across the entire campus.**

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Melbourne High School works to create a positive culture and environment for our students, faculty, and staff through the following actions:

1. Creation of a family atmosphere on campus where all stakeholders feel valued.
2. Job-embedded professional development for teachers through the use of professional learning communities.
3. We make learning the priority mission of the school and use our professional learning communities to refine instructional practice for the benefit of our students.
4. Administer the TNTP Insight Survey to faculty to solicit their input about the culture and climate on campus. We use the results to make necessary adjustments to benefit our stakeholders.
5. Administer an annual BPS parent survey. We use the results of that survey to make adjustments as needed to customer service, technology, and reporting, and instructional delivery.
6. Administer the Youth Truth survey to our students to hear their input and their concerns about our campus. We use that information to make necessary adjustments to items such as classroom engagement, school safety, lessons and assignments, and opportunities for connection with the campus through clubs and athletics.
7. Inclusion of community members in the operation of the school through our School Advisory Council.

- 8. Host Open House and Parent Conference events for our families.
- 9. Host college application and FAFSA information events for our families.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00