

Brevard Public Schools

Rockledge Senior High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	8
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Rockledge Senior High School

220 RAIDER RD, Rockledge, FL 32955

<http://www.rockledge.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.

Guided by input from students, staff, parents, and community, Rockledge High School aspires to provide a safe, inclusive, and student-centered learning environment which thrives on the free interchange of ideas.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Contributing Educational Excellence to our Community

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
Clark, Buster	Principal	
Rhyne, Kevin	Assistant Principal	
Perry, Sarah	Assistant Principal	
Stagman, Debra	Attendance/Social Work	
Beiderman, Kimberly	Reading Coach	
Reece, Courtney	School Counselor	
Navarrete, Paula	Teacher, K-12	
Figueuroa, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	
Smtih, Lori	Teacher, K-12	
Weaver, Marcus	Other	
Sandoval, Robee	Teacher, K-12	

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.

The writing of the school improvement plan is a continuous process at RHS. With the start of progress monitoring data last year meetings are held all year long looking at trends in new student performance data. Survey results are also used at various times throughout the year by school leadership. With monitoring of previous year action steps and goals, our leadership team takes into account new data and prepares to address end of year data through the writing of the new SIP goals. A SIP Writing Leadership Team meets regularly to look at new data and formulates a path to addressing new data while working to build continuity in our instructional goals from the previous year. As a SIP leadership team we gather

input from our faculty and staff through our departments as the primary vehicle to collect and disseminate our progress towards our goals with our faculty. We share our school improvement objectives, goals, and results with parents and community through the SAC team, our Principals weekly message, and our website.

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))

New data will be evaluated by the curriculum AP and Principal along with department chairs and and SIP writing team. Adjustments or corrective actions will be taken to address concerns as soon as they show in our data. We will also utilize data chats in EOC courses to ensure students are aware of their successes and have a clear understanding of expectations. ESE and ELL departments will also be a large part of this data process as they represent the largest group of students who need improvement.

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	54%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	50%
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: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	

DJJ Accountability Rating History
--

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*	33	43	50	51	52	51	50		
ELA Learning Gains				52			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			36		
Math Achievement*	26	34	38	28	40	38	27		
Math Learning Gains				31			19		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				30			18		
Science Achievement*	46	59	64	57	37	40	53		
Social Studies Achievement*	60	63	66	55	44	48	65		
Middle School Acceleration					43	44			
Graduation Rate	85	87	89	92	63	61	94		
College and Career Acceleration	71	72	65	70	66	67	60		
ELP Progress	58	57	45	36			52		

** 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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	379
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	85

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	541
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96
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	33	Yes	4	
ELL	32	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	2	
HSP	50			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	45			

2021-22 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	35	Yes	3	
ELL	29	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	93			
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	45			
MUL	46			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	43			

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)

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
All Students	33			26			46	60		85	71	58
SWD	19			18			28	37		28	6	
ELL	21			18			30	20			6	58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21			16			26	38		47	6	
HSP	30			24			42	50		71	7	57
MUL	40			38			56	67		80	6	
PAC												
WHT	42			30			59	72		79	6	
FRL	23			19			35	50		60	7	53

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	51	52	39	28	31	30	57	55		92	70	36
SWD	18	41	38	14	29	28	30	28		80	43	
ELL	15	36	28	11	26	18	0	43		80		36
AMI												
ASN	93	93										
BLK	31	44	38	14	17	25	35	31		93	56	
HSP	43	45	28	29	36	37	44	41		87	71	35
MUL	48	37	9	19	30		60	62		89	64	
PAC												
WHT	64	58	49	41	40	36	72	69		94	77	
FRL	41	45	37	19	26	31	45	45		88	60	36

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	50	44	36	27	19	18	53	65		94	60	52
SWD	9	26	26	11	18	11	19	28		77	20	
ELL	12	30	31	4	0		22	17		92	36	52
AMI												
ASN	77	70										
BLK	30	34	31	11	17	21	32	51		93	38	
HSP	46	43	36	20	14	7	47	61		94	66	55
MUL	52	59		21	19		48	62		86	52	
PAC												
WHT	60	47	37	40	23	19	69	75		95	74	
FRL	42	40	35	20	18	19	43	58		89	43	58

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	44%	54%	-10%	50%	-6%
09	2023 - Spring	45%	56%	-11%	48%	-3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	18%	51%	-33%	50%	-32%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	37%	50%	-13%	48%	-11%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	45%	61%	-16%	63%	-18%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	59%	62%	-3%	63%	-4%

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.

Algebra 1 scores dropped 9 points this year and is our lowest scoring component. Last year we saw a pretty large increase which could be an anomaly however our drop this year brings us to our lowest score in the last five years. The only contributing factor currently available would be that many of our incoming students are already taking Algebra 1 in middle school leaving only those students who are the most deficient in math skills to take algebra 1 in 9th grade. This can be the cause contributing to the fluctuation in yearly scores and this year's drop.

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

The component that showed the greatest decline from last year was Biology. Our Biology numbers dropped 9 points for the largest drop of all components. There is no comprehensive explanation for this drop.

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.

Again, data indicates that our largest gap compared to the state average is Algebra 1 with a 21 point deficit on the state average. This number is troublesome but also misleading in that this number is compared to ALL students taking Algebra 1 state wide and not just those students taking Algebra 1 in the 9th grade. In terms of trends, this was a drop from last years gap at -15 from state average, but is still above our lowest deficit of 25 points.

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

We saw great improvement from previous years scores in US History. After last years decline several steps were put into place to ensure that improvement. Those successful strategies will be used to help guide the decline in Biology.

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

Out of all of our EWS data two of the most concerning areas are the number of Freshman receiving a suspension and the number of freshman below 90% attendance. While the data in the number of course failures and level 1 students is also concerning, it is hard to educate students that aren't on campus.

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

1. Continued decline of ELA performance data
2. Decline in Algebra 1 numbers
3. Decline in Biology numbers
4. Subgroup Performance

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

Lowest strand for both 9th and 10th grade students was Prose and Poetry. Our second lowest strand was informational texts. We have identified these as critical because of their impact on student performance. Since this is our first year with this particular data its hard to tell if this trend will continue, but both areas have been part of our larger school wide literacy goals in the past, so seeing that they are continuing to be lower areas is concerning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We are hoping to raise not only our strand scores but the overall performance of student at or above achievement by addressing these concerns. We hope to show a 5 point increase in students performance in these strands.

Monitoring:

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

The Assistant Principal of Curriculum along with our reading leadership team, English department, admin team and SIP leadership team will be looking at Progress Monitoring data and reviewing the effectiveness of interventions, strategizing on new interventions to make immediate change.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Rhyne (rhyne.kevin@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.)

We are going to utilize two pronged approach to address our two needs and we will utilize various AVID strategies to do so. We are going to be working on content/academic/testing vocabulary and Costa's Levels of questioning along with materials from our Reading Coach and District Resource teacher to focus on ELA Academic Vocabulary. We are also going to be working on school wide interventions utilizing various AVID informational text strategies and approaches to give our content area teachers tools to address our concerns.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Because so much of Prose and Poetry relies on the students understanding of fictional literary terms, it is important to ensure that our students are not finding success because of lack of knowledge with the format and language of the test. Information suggests that students students are less familiar with some of the newer academic vocabulary. Content area literacy and informational texts have been a focus of our schoolwide ELA goals for some time now and a renewed effort to use the proven strategies of AVID will assist us in our endeavors.

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.

Identify areas/strands of Weakness in ELA

Person Responsible: Kimberly Beiderman (beiderman.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

By When: Start of school

Identify multiple strategies to address area of weakness utilizing AVID strategies. Utilize the AVID site to assist.

Person Responsible: Marcus Weaver (weaver.marcus@brevardschools.org)

By When: September

Utilize school wide Professional Learning Opportunities to familiarize staff/English Department with possible strategies in their classrooms.

Person Responsible: Kevin Rhyne (rhyne.kevin@brevardschools.org)

By When: Continuously all year long.

Look at Progress Monitoring Results and share results with all stakeholder groups for feedback and input.

Person Responsible: Kevin Rhyne (rhyne.kevin@brevardschools.org)

By When: After each Progress Monitoring time frame.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

It has been identified that according to downward trending data that an all hands on deck approach to Biology scores is needed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school expects to see a return to our previous years score after a 9 point drop in scores this past year.

Monitoring:

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

We will utilize common assessments to track and monitor progress of interventions and the biology EOC to gauge overall improvement and success of interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Rhyne (rhyne.kevin@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.)

We will be utilizing several different approaches to address our drop in Bio scores. Teachers will utilize common planning time to plan and pace classes together. They will have half day PLO with their district resource teacher to ensure understanding of standards and testing requirements. We will utilize common assessments to gauge performance and improvements.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our science department feels strongly that by working together as a team, collaborating on pacing, activities and instructions, getting additional support in understanding standards and utilizing common assessments to do it they will be able to better provide students with the academic environment they need to be successful on the EOC.

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.

Department and Chair work out a plan to address dropping BIO scores.

Person Responsible: Kevin Rhyne (rhyne.kevin@brevardschools.org)

By When: By start of school

Work with Resource teacher to identify strategies for the adults to improve instruction to improve academic outcomes.

Person Responsible: Kevin Rhyne (rhyne.kevin@brevardschools.org)

By When: September

Begin common planning meetings, ensure pacing and plan common assessments

Person Responsible: Kevin Rhyne (rhyne.kevin@brevardschools.org)

By When: Continuously throughout year.

Look at assessment data and develop strategies to address issues.

Person Responsible: Kevin Rhyne (rhyne.kevin@brevardschools.org)

By When: Continuously throughout the year

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

We have three different subgroups that we have identified as ATSI. Our English Language Learners are identified for being below 32%

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our measurable outcome for all of our ESSA Subgroups is to have each of them above the 41% threshold.

Monitoring:

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

The Assistant Principal of Curriculum along with our reading leadership team, English department, admin team, ESOL team, College and Career Specialist, AVID Coordinator and SIP leadership team will be looking at Progress Monitoring data and reviewing the effectiveness of interventions, strategizing on new interventions to make immediate change.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Rhyne (rhyn.kevin@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.)

For our ELL students we have put additional focus on planning and scheduling of our ESOL students. We have hired a full time ESOL teacher to further assist our students with language acquisition. We have spent additional resources in ensuring proper placement of students in classes and provided access to courses that would benefit ESOL Students. Additionally we have provided additional training to our staff on interventions and strategies to help all levels of ESOL students. These include strategies for the classroom as well as accommodations for students so that teachers can meet students where they are and build.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our data indicates that students will benefit from a more structured classroom environment where English Acquisition is the priority. Because of that we were able to hire a full time ESOL teacher to provide that additional language support. Our research also indicated a need to provide more training to our teachers so that they had more tools in their hands to provide our ESOL students proper supports. We also saw that our students would benefit from better scheduling and better placement in remedial courses to support them.

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.

Properly identify the students that need to be placed into the English for ESOL classes.

Person Responsible: Kevin Rhyne (rhyne.kevin@brevardschools.org)

By When: Start of School

Ensure that the teacher of the English for ESOL courses has the materials and training needed to ensure students are getting high quality instruction.

Person Responsible: Kevin Rhyne (rhyne.kevin@brevardschools.org)

By When: Start of school and ongoing support as needed

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

Our Students with Disabilities are identified for being below the federal index of 41%. Actually we have been below this threshold for 3 years. Last year we were at 35%, only three points above the additional threshold that would categorize this subgroup for ATSI monitoring.

Our Black students are identified as being below 41% as well. For this last school year this subgroup scored a 38%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our measurable outcome for all of our ESSA Subgroups is to have each of them above the 41% threshold. More specifically our goal is to reach 50% of our students in all groups at or above proficiency in all subject areas.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor in several ways. We will utilize standardized progress monitoring assessments to capture student progress in literacy and math skills. We will utilize student grade reports and early warning indicators for our struggling subgroups to identify progress or identify areas of need and work to address them.

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.)

For our Essa subgroups we will first work to insure proper placement of our students in the appropriate pathways. We will ensure that all of our students are being actively engaged in one of our various academic programs by identifying underserved populations and reaching out to find a program of interest. We will also create peer mentoring groups to engage our black male and female that are struggling and provide additional assistance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We have taken into consideration student input, parent input, and teacher input and have concluded that one of the biggest reasons for our subgroups low performance is a lack of connection to the school. Because of this we believe that better and more deliberate placement in academic classes, along with finding a connection to one of many programs and adult mentoring will have a positive impact on the culture of learning in our school. We also are believe providing a deliberate mentoring system in place to help our most at risk students will also have a positive outcome on our 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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.

It was identified by looking at discipline data and EWI data that our student population saw a large number of students getting in trouble for Willful Disobedience. We also saw from our student surveys that a large number of our students indicated that they were upset with how their peers spoke to adults on campus.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will see a decrease in the number of students being sent to the office for profanity, willful disobedience, or any discipline code where disrespect towards teachers is the cause of the referral.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor our discipline data point to ensure we are seeing our measurable outcome, however, we will also use our PBIS data to show an increase of students being nominated for positive behavior.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Rhyne (rhyme.kevin@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.)

We will be utilizing our system of Positive Behavior Intervention Supports to positively identify and support the targeted behaviors behaviors. We will also utilize the training aspect of PBIS to identify behaviors for teachers that help build positive relationships, reduce conflicts, and classroom management strategies to support positive student behaviors. According to our staff survey teachers indicated they wanted more information on what our school wide goals are and by identifying them.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We have found great success in positively impacting student behaviors on campus in other areas of concern by utilizing our PBIS program. As a result we are going to use this positive based approach to discipline to have an impact on this behavior indicator. We believe that by utilizing a positive approach to increase the positive interactions on campus we will see a more genuine and organic result.

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

#6. 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.

Math continues to be a low performing area for RHS. We currently only have 18% of our students taking Algebra 1 with us at or above proficiency which is the fourth worst score in the district.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal for this is to show a significant increase this year. We believe the district or state average is an achievable goal so we are looking to reach the 40% mark for students at or above proficiency

Monitoring:

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

We will utilize ALEKS progress monitoring as well as classroom assessments to gauge students understanding of the material and make curricular changes as needed to see more growth and address low areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Rhyne (rhyn.kevin@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.)

We are going to be utilizing our own district approved materials as our intervention and ensure they are being implemented correctly. We plan on using ALEKS for all Progress Monitoring and sessions of work in ALEKS as part of the teachers curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Because ALEKS is our progress monitoring tool and it provides guided remediation in the areas students perform low in we believe that this is the best tool available to aid our instruction towards remediation.

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).

Rockledge High's leadership team meets at the start of the school year to review teacher schedules, personnel, instructional materials, and technology resources to ensure alignment with needs of IEP's of Students with Disabilities, ELL and Gen Ed Students. The schedule of both ESE and GenEd teachers are aligned and maximized to ensure students get the highest quality of support. This includes scheduling for collaborative planning, core instruction, intervention and time on technology with support programs.

Additionally the following things are also aligned to support all students.

During pre-planning ESE teachers met to review IEP's of all students and ensure proper services.

DISTRICT RESOURCE TEACHERS/CONTENT SPECIALIST – plans XX per month with grade level teachers to include ESE/ELL teachers.

DISTRICT PEER MENTOR TEACHERS – plan, observe, collaborate with new teachers to ensure high quality instruction for all students.