

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

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

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 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 0 | 602 | 583 | 503 | 455 | 2143 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 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 | 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 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 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 | 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 TNTP 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 |