Melbourne Senior High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Melbourne Senior High School

74 BULLDOG BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32901

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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. Reviewed 2023

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kirk, James	Principal	Responsible for all aspects of school operations, including curriculum, scheduling, budget, personnel, professional development, and school safety.
Williams, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Instruction
Meegan, James	Assistant Principal	Operations, Advanced Placement, Science Department
Kilmer, Cindylou	Assistant Principal	Junior and Senior class, IB Coordinator, CTE programs
Linde, Erik	Assistant Principal	Freshmen class, ESE coordinator
Perez, Tanya	Assistant Principal	Sophomore class, History Department
Conlon, Julie	Instructional Coach	Literacy coach, Reading

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Data review was conducted by teachers and staff who volunteered to contribute to the formation of the School Improvement Plan. We also used data from school climate surveys, such as Youth Truth for students, Insight for teachers and staff, and the BPS Parent Survey. The School Advisory Council will review the draft version of the SIP and provide input as well before it is submitted to the school district as a final document.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Melbourne High School will monitor the progress of students at regular intervals in all core content areas in 2023-24. In reading, Algebra, and Geometry there are also three district prescribed progress monitoring assessments given throughout the year. We will use data of student performance to guide our work and make adjustments as necessary to tier 1 instruction based on that information. In addition, school administrators will conduct frequent classroom walkthroughs and provide feedback to teachers about the efficacy of daily classroom instruction. We recognize that the SIP is a living document and should be amended if there is evidence that the strategies we are using are not working as intended. We will present evidence of student learning to the faculty throughout the year and adjust as necessary.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	33%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	32%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	79	61	52	35	227
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	109	130	78	32	349
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	53	95	48	14	210
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	36	88	77	33	234
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	139	134	90	41	404
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	76	91	40	21	228
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	124	110	103	1	338
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	116	152	109	41	418

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	28	55	38	9	130
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	35	55	38	9	137

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	327
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	292
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	244
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	379
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	266

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	53	43	50	61	52	51	57		
ELA Learning Gains				57			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			35		
Math Achievement*	39	34	38	37	40	38	42		
Math Learning Gains				44			28		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			23		
Science Achievement*	73	59	64	73	37	40	63		
Social Studies Achievement*	80	63	66	72	44	48	69		
Middle School Acceleration					43	44			
Graduation Rate	89	87	89	92	63	61	93		
College and Career Acceleration	72	72	65	69	66	67	76		
ELP Progress	71	57	45	71			71		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	89

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	665
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94
Graduation Rate	92

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	40	Yes	4	
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	48			
HSP	61			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	72			

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
FRL	58			

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
SWD	39	Yes	3	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	68			
BLK	48			
HSP	55			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	53			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	53			39			73	80		89	72	71
SWD	22			12			39	56		35	6	
ELL	42			39			70	87		43	7	71
AMI												
ASN	63			63			91	88		82	6	
BLK	38			20			50	58		45	6	
HSP	48			29			68	79		67	7	53
MUL	47			36			72	78		71	6	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	56			44			77	82		75	7	77
FRL	44			28			60	68		63	7	65

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	61	57	45	37	44	44	73	72		92	69	71
SWD	17	39	37	18	44	43	34	40		83	37	
ELL	39	52	44	21	61		56	41		100	50	71
AMI												
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	63
MUL	52	58	53	27	48	45	63	64		89	72	
PAC												
WHT	64	59	46	44	44	50	77	76		92	72	77
FRL	46	48	41	26	40	40	62	59		88	60	76

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	57	49	35	42	28	23	63	69		93	76	71
SWD	14	31	25	21	30	22	31	33		91	43	
ELL	33	51	45	26	31	21	42	44		100	67	71
AMI												
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	68
MUL	45	35	23	26	12	9	42	57		88	68	
PAC												
WHT	62	51	38	47	30	27	71	72		93	78	
FRL	42	40	33	27	21	23	48	57		86	68	65

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	61%	54%	7%	50%	11%
09	2023 - Spring	63%	56%	7%	48%	15%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	33%	51%	-18%	50%	-17%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	47%	50%	-3%	48%	-1%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	61%	11%	63%	9%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	62%	16%	63%	15%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Our students with disabilities (SWD) subgroup remains our lowest performing group on campus. Achievement in English, Algebra, Geometry, US History, and Biology declined during the Covid-19 pandemic and have slowly been improving. Unfortunately, the SWD subgroup remains lower than 41% of possible points earned on the federal ESSA index. In almost every area measured by the state, performance by SWD declined from 2018-19 to 2020-21 and then improved slightly in 2021-22. The only exception was math achievement which saw the percent of SWD at level 3 or greater at 21% in 2020-21 then a decline to 18% level 3 or greater in 2021-22.

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

Overall math achievement in Algebra I and Geometry with our SWD subgroup remains our most persistent problem. Math skills for nearly all subgroups were negatively impacted by the learning conditions during the Covid-19 pandemic. Many students who took Algebra I and Geometry between 2020-2022 learned their pre-algebra concepts under less than optimal conditions. Some of these students took math at the middle school level through E-Learning and were not well prepared for Algebra or Geometry when they arrived in high school. Most students who took math during this period had substantial gaps in their basic math skills that contributed to poor performance on state assessment. Other contributing factors include student engagement in math class. Students were more passive learners in class than they were actively engaged in learning math concepts. Students also needed more practice with both basic math skills and the types of questions that are found on the the state end of course exams.

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.

Overall performance in Algebra I had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. in 2021, 35% of Melbourne High students earned level 3+ on the Algebra I EOC compared to 49% in the state. In 2022, only 29% of Melbourne High students earned level 3+ on the Algebra I EOC compared to 54% for the state. Most recently, in 2023 Melbourne High had 33% of students earn level 3+ on the Algebra I EOC compared with 50% across the state. Although we had a 4% improvement in the percent of students earning level 3 or better, we were still 17% lower than the state. One positive note was that there were 6% fewer students who were level 1 in Algebra I in 2023 than the prior year.

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

Performance in Geometry and US History showed the most improvement from 2022 to 2023. Geometry had a 6% improvement in the percent of students earning level 3+, going from 41% to 47% on grade level. The percent of students in level 1 also dropped by 2%. US History also had a 6% improvement in the percent of students earning level 3+, going from 72% to 78% on grade level. Over the last three years US History has improved 10 percentage points in students on grade level, moving from 68% to 78%. That is the greatest gain of any subject area at our school. During that same time period the percentage of level 1 students has declined 7%. In 2023 only 8% of US History students earned a level 1 on their end of course exam.

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

Early warning systems data suggests two potential areas of concern:
1. Number of students in grades 9 and 10 who have failed either their English or Math class.
2. Number of students with two or more indicators present.

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

Priorities for the 2023-24 school year are:
1. Improve the proficiency of the SWD subgroup in reading
2. Improve the proficiency of the SWD subgroup in Algebra I and Geometry
3. Improve overall proficiency in Algebra I and Geometry
4. Reduce course failures in reading and math for 9th and 10th grade students

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The performance of our students with disabilities (SWD) subgroup remains the most persistent area of concern on our campus. Compared with other subgroups, our SWD have been the only one to earn less than 41% of total points possible in the Federal ESSA Index for the 10 areas that comprise our school grade. This trend has remained over the last three years. Performance in English/Reading, Algebra I, and Geometry are particularly concerning.

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

Melbourne High School will improve the proficiency of our students with disabilities subgroup to at least 41% of total points possible on the Federal ESSA index by May 2024.

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

Proficiency will be monitored once in the fall and once in the spring in English/Reading, Algebra I, and Geometry on district progress monitoring assessments. In addition, teachers will administer common formative assessments between the district progress monitoring assessments to gather additional data about student performance. Finally, school administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs and provide teachers with feedback on instructional practices used to improve student performance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Kirk (kirk.james@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Melbourne High School will examine state standards in English/Reading, Algebra I, and Geometry and identify the essential standards for each course. Teachers for these courses will provide depth of instruction on these essential standards and concepts during daily classroom instruction. Evidence based instruction will include:
1. Explicit instruction in vocabulary in English/Reading and essential math skills in Algebra & Geometry.
2. Scaffolding to include graphic organizers, use of context clues, and text annotation.

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

There are many state standards for each course. However, some standards appear more than others throughout the course and have an impact on student proficiency in the next course in the subject area. Research by Robert Marzano and Richard DuFour indicates that students actually learn more when educators prioritize course standards within the curriculum instead of teaching all of them as if they are equally important. By focusing on essential standards, teachers have the opportunity to develop depth of mastery on key concepts that increase student proficiency in the subject area. Within those standards, teachers should use proven instructional strategies to help SWD develop mastery. Explicit instruction and scaffolding are supported by studies that indicate they are effective strategies for SWD.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Prioritize essential standards in English/Reading.

Person Responsible: Julie Conlon (conlon.julie@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 30, 2023

Prioritize essential standards in Algebra I and Geometry

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

By When: September 30, 2023

Provide explicit instruction on key vocabulary in each lesson, including Greek and Latin roots when appropriate.

Person Responsible: Julie Conlon (conlon.julie@brevardschools.org)

By When: May 2024

Scaffold instruction through the use of graphic organizers, context clues, and annotated text to help students become more organized, active learners.

Person Responsible: Julie Conlon (conlon.julie@brevardschools.org)

By When: May 2024

Provide additional instructional support to SWD through a Learning Strategies course or from a push-in teacher inside the regular classroom.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Williams (williams.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 30, 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Overall performance in Algebra I had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. in 2021, 35% of Melbourne High students earned level 3+ on the Algebra I EOC compared to 49% in the state. In 2022, only 29% of Melbourne High students earned level 3+ on the Algebra I EOC compared to 54% for the state. Most recently, in 2023 Melbourne High had 33% of students earn level 3+ on the Algebra I EOC compared with 50% across the state. Although we had a 4% improvement in the percent of students earning level 3 or better, we were still 17% lower than the state. One positive note was that there were 6% fewer students who were level 1 in Algebra I in 2023 than the prior year.

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

Melbourne High School will increase the number of students on grade level for math by 5% by May 2023 as measured by the state Algebra I and Geometry end of course exams.

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

Algebra 1 and Geometry teachers will administer common formative assessments throughout the year to monitor student progress on course standards. In addition, our teachers will administer the district required progress monitoring exams three times per year. Teachers will utilize data from these assessments to make instructional decisions and identify students who require additional support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Kirk (kirk.james@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Algebra 1 and Geometry teachers will identify essential standards for their courses and prioritize them for instruction throughout the year. Prioritizing standards will provide teachers with clear focus for their limited instructional time and allow them to deeply teach the content. Algebra 1 and Geometry teachers will provide explicit instruction on each priority standard and provide frequent opportunities for students to practice with new concepts. Teachers will also scaffold instruction by using a gradual release model (I do, We do, You do) with their students.

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

Some standards appear more often than others throughout the course and have a greater impact on student proficiency in the next course in the subject area. Research by Robert Marzano and Richard DuFour indicates that students actually learn more when educators prioritize course standards within the curriculum instead of teaching all of them as if they are equally important. By prioritizing standards, teachers have the opportunity to develop depth of mastery on key concepts that increase student proficiency in the subject area. Within those standards, teachers should use proven instructional strategies to help students develop mastery. Explicit instruction and scaffolding are supported by studies that indicate they are effective strategies for students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Prioritize course standards in Algebra 1 and Geometry

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

By When: Quarterly throughout the school year.

Develop success criteria for each standard so that students can measure their progress toward proficiency

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

By When: Quarterly throughout the school year.

Develop learning intentions (objectives) for each lesson that are written in student friendly language.

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

By When: Quarterly throughout the school year.

Provide explicit instruction on each priority standard.

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

Utilize spaced practice to provide students with multiple exposures to a concept over several days and improve student understanding of content.

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Provide targeted feedback to students during practice, particularly about the process of their learning and not just the task assigned to them.

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Melbourne High leadership team reviews allocations, schedules and other resources to ensure all students receive high quality instruction.