

Brevard Public Schools

Melbourne Senior High School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	32%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (60%) 2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (63%)
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	ATSI
* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 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	33%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		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.
Revised 2016

Provide the school's vision statement.

Melbourne High School will prepare our students to succeed in the path they choose for their lives after graduation.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kirk, James	Principal	Leader of all school initiatives and functions, including budget, curriculum, personnel, facilities, athletics, community outreach, and communications
Barton, Keith	Assistant Principal	
Kilmer, Cindylou	Assistant Principal	
Linde, Erik	Assistant Principal	
Meegan, James	Assistant Principal	
Perez, Tanya	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

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

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

22

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

114

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,256

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

15

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

17

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	633	595	526	499	2253
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	94	65	69	327
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	102	46	32	292
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	83	58	26	244
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	57	59	49	220
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	76	74	35	286
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146	126	61	46	379
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	89	84	55	38	266

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	64	60	39	10	173
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	55	31	8	159

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/14/2022

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	624	590	572	448	2234
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	41	21	21	138
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	2	5	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	27	11	3	50
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	18	6	1	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	86	51	22	214
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	13	16	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	107	80	36	306
	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	14	25	11	3	53

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	34	70	61	9	174
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	36	21	6	80

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	624	590	572	448	2234
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	41	21	21	138
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	2	5	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	27	11	3	50
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	18	6	1	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	86	51	22	214
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	13	16	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	107	80	36	306
	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	14	25	11	3	53

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	34	70	61	9	174
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	36	21	6	80

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	17	39	37	18	44	43	34	40		83	37
ELL	39	52	44	21	61		56	41		100	50
ASN	66	64		33	40		88	72		100	79
BLK	36	41	40	22	39	33	53	70		94	50
HSP	56	54	39	34	41	40	63	58		93	61
MUL	52	58	53	27	48	45	63	64		89	72
WHT	64	59	46	44	44	50	77	76		92	72
FRL	46	48	41	26	40	40	62	59		88	60

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	14	31	25	21	30	22	31	33		91	43
ELL	33	51	45	26	31	21	42	44		100	67
ASN	74	46		50	36		85	86		96	96
BLK	32	35	30	34	22	20	39	64		90	50
HSP	44	51	38	33	27	22	44	53		96	73
MUL	45	35	23	26	12	9	42	57		88	68
WHT	62	51	38	47	30	27	71	72		93	78
FRL	42	40	33	27	21	23	48	57		86	68
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
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	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	665
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	68
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	48
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	55
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	57
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	64
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	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Achievement levels in 9th grade ELA have improved over the last two years from 59% to 62% level 3 or higher. Similarly, achievement in 10th grade ELA have improved from 57% to 59% level 3 or higher. Our data in mathematics shows a decline in Algebra I EOC scores from 35% to 29% level 3 or higher. More than half of our students scored a level 1 on the Algebra EOC in 2022. Geometry EOC scores showed a similar decline over the same time period from 43% to 41% of students scoring level 3 or higher. Our students with disabilities (SWD) remain the subgroup most in need of improvement. Although our SWD showed a modest increase in ELA level 3 or higher achievement, it was only from 14% in 2021 to 17% in 2022. In 2019, 25% of SWD were on grade level in ELA. During this same period from 2019-2022 less than half of our SWD made a learning gain in English.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Algebra I, Geometry EOC, and ELA achievement levels for our students with disabilities are the areas most in need of improvement. Only 20% of SWD were on grade level in math in 2019, compared to 21% in 2021 and 18% in 2022. The data shows that SWD have improved overall in learning gains. In 2019, 32% of SWD made a learning gain in math, compared to 30% in 2021 and 44% in 2022. There were similar learning gains for the lowest 25%. Learning gains for the lowest 25% increased from 23% in 2019 to 43% in 2022.

In reading, only 25% of SWD were on grade level in 2019 compared with 14% in 2021 and 17% in 2022. Learning gains in ELA have been inconsistent. In 2019, 43% of SWD made a learning gain in English, compared to 31% in 2021 and 39% in 2022. For the lowest 25%, learning gains dropped from 33% in 2019 to 25% in 2021 and improved to 37% in 2022.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

We cannot discount the effect that the Covid-19 pandemic had on student achievement over the last two years. Many students struggled with school attendance and academic engagement during that difficult period. It was difficult for our general education and our ESE teachers to provide the level of support necessary for our students to significantly improve their achievement levels in reading and math.

In order to help our SWD in reading and math in 2023, we are using more in class subject specific support in targeted subjects. These subjects include Algebra I, Geometry, 9th grade English, & 10th grade English. Our ESE teachers work in a support facilitation role in specific sections of these courses to provide additional instruction and learning strategies to the students in small groups. Additionally, we

are using progress monitoring data through the FAST assessments, Read 180, System 44, and classroom formative assessments to identify gaps in student learning and target lesson planning and instruction. Our goal is to target daily Tier 1 instruction to our students' greatest learning needs.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Learning gains for our lowest 25% was the most promising piece of data as described above. We also saw improvements in Grade 9 ELA, with 62% achieving a level 3 or higher. This is compared with 59% on grade level in the prior year. Similarly, we saw an improvement in Grade 10 ELA with 59% achieving an level 3 or higher. This is compared to 57% in the prior year. First time test takers in US History made a four point gain, rising from 68% in 2021 to 72% of students on grade level in 2022.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Classroom instruction was interrupted by the pandemic during the 2020-21 school year, with many students taking classes from home through "e-learning." The return to traditional, brick and mortar classroom instruction was likely the greatest contributing factor to the increase in learning gains for our SWD because they had consistent instruction and support from our teachers.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We must use progress monitoring data to identify and isolate student deficiencies in ELA and math and adjust instruction to address them. This may require teachers to adjust the scope and sequence of lesson plans and modify lessons to target students' needs. It will also be important for students to be involved in knowing their own data and where they need to improve.

Classroom strategies in ELA begin with exposure to grade-level text on a daily basis. Students must be engaged in reading, thinking (analyzing) about reading, and writing about what they are reading. Teachers should also work daily to improve students' vocabularies by exposing them to grade level fiction and non-fiction text. Across the curriculum, teachers must be deliberate about teaching vocabulary in the context of the lesson.

In mathematics, we must use our data to identify gaps in learning in Algebra I and Geometry. Our teachers should continue to provide instruction on grade level concepts while providing support for students' fundamental math skills. This will require teachers to plan carefully with their colleagues to address these needs. Math teachers will have to continually circle back to previous concepts to provide additional practice while teaching the grade level curriculum.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We are providing training on literacy strategies during our pre-planning week and are continuing to support teacher training during our monthly faculty meetings. Literacy training will focus on consistent use of grade level text, writing to explain and inform, and vocabulary instruction.

In mathematics we are supporting teachers with additional planning time, opportunities to observe each other, classroom walkthrough and feedback by administrators, and visits from the district math resource teacher.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We use the professional learning community at work model to sustain our school improvement efforts. This involves creating a guaranteed curriculum in each subject so that students have the same opportunities regardless of which teacher they have. Our PLCs write common formative assessments based on the curriculum to measure student progress. Teachers use the data from our common assessments and other progress monitoring data to determine the effectiveness of their instruction and make adjustments. We support these efforts with our master schedule by providing common planning time for teachers working in the same courses.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. 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 critical need from the data reviewed.

Over the last three years, our SWD subgroup has remained below 41% on the ESSA index. This is the only subgroup in our school that has consistently underperformed on the ESSA Index. Our students with disabilities (SWD) showed a modest increase in ELA level 3 or higher achievement last year, but it was only from 14% in 2021 to 17% in 2022. In 2019, 25% of SWD were on grade level in ELA. During this same period from 2019-2022 less than half of our SWD made a learning gain in English. In math, our SWD have had a maximum of 21% on grade level over the last three years. This data indicates that there are critical needs among this subgroup that should be addressed during the year.

Measurable

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

By May 2023, our SWD subgroup will increase the number of students on grade level in English Language Arts by 10% as demonstrated on the FSA ELA exam.

By May 2023, 50% of our SWD subgroup will demonstrate a learning gain in English Language Arts as demonstrated by the FSA ELA exam.

By May 2023, 40% of our SWD subgroup will score level 3 or higher on the Algebra I end of course exam.

By May 2023, 50% of our SWD subgroup will demonstrate a learning gain in mathematics as demonstrated by the Algebra I or Geometry end of course exams.

We will use FAST assessment, Read 180, System 44, and common assessment data in English to monitor student progress toward our goals.

Monitoring:

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

In math, we will use MAPS data and common assessment data to monitor student progress.

For both ELA and math, administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs to collect data on instructional strategies and provide feedback to teachers as we work together to improve outcomes for our SWD subgroup. We are also using the district math resource teacher to conduct observations in our Algebra and Geometry classrooms and provide feedback to teachers on curriculum and instructional strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Kirk (kirk.james@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented

English: We are focusing on literacy in our 9th and 10th grade classrooms. This will involve providing consistent opportunities for students to read and analyze grade level text, think about what they are reading, and write about what they are reading. This may be writing to explain or writing to inform the reader.

Math: We are focusing on improving our students' conceptual understanding in Algebra I and Geometry. This requires teachers to identify and teach essential course standards while providing support for math deficiencies that students have developed during the

for this Area of Focus. pandemic. in other words, we are attempting to accelerate student understanding of math concepts instead of spending time providing remedial instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

English: Literacy is the foundation of all learning and the core mission of our school. Our data shows that our SWD require us to focus on literacy in order to help more students become proficient on ELA standards. We developed this strategy in consultation with our literacy coach and English teachers. Further, this strategy is supported in the literature by researchers such as John Hattie in Visible Learning for Literacy.

Math: Our data shows that our SWD subgroup require strong Tier 1 instruction in the essential standards for Algebra I and Geometry in order to improve their understanding of concepts. We cannot do that by merely remediating the deficiencies students developed during the pandemic. We must provide consistent instruction on the standards while circling back to help students improve essential skills. This strategy was developed in consultation with the district math resource teacher.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Create a guaranteed curriculum in English and Math. This will be accomplished by teachers working in their subject area PLC to identify essential standards in their courses, review test item specifications, and curriculum materials to determine the scope and sequence of each unit and pacing throughout the semester.

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

2. Monitor student progress on course standards throughout the year. This will be accomplished by teachers using the progress monitoring tools provided to them. In English, teachers will use FAST, Read 180, System 44, and common assessment data. In Math, teachers will use MAPS and common assessment data.

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

3. Determine effectiveness of instruction. This step requires teachers in each subject to review the results of progress monitoring assessments within their PLC, determine which instructional strategies are working best, and modify instruction as necessary.

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

4. Provide timely support and intervention. We will push our ESE teachers into specific 9th and 10th grade English classrooms as well as specific Algebra I and Geometry classrooms. Their task will be to provide subject-specific support for our SWD subgroup inside the regular classroom.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

coming soon

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

coming soon