Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

Name of School:

Melbourne High School

Area:

1

Principal:

James M Willcoxon

Area Superintendent:

Dr. Mark Mullins

SAC Chairperson:

John Yanas

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

The Melbourne High School community empowers students to strive for excellence and to
become lifelong learners.

Vision Statement:

Students of Melbourne High School will make a positive contribution to society; become
lifelong learners; and ethical, responsible, and articulate citizens, capable of living, working,
and achieving in a highly technological world.

Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

Data Analysis from multiple data sources: *(Needs assessment that supports the need for improvement)*

Melbourne High School's primary teaching focus for the 2012-13 school year will be to embrace those students who are in the lowest quartile of achievement, according to the 2011-12 FCAT/EOC data. As a result, the percentage of students reading below grade level is an area that must be addressed across the curriculum at Melbourne High School. With an increased number of students showing learning gains, we can expect that scores will increase across multiple spectrum's. In addition, ongoing progress monitoring data will be used to ensure that proficient students are showing continuous academic growth.

In spring 2012, the state instituted the FCAT 2.0 Reading test. The test is scored differently than previous years. Results from this new test show that Melbourne High School had 71% of our students reading on or above grade level on the FCAT Reading exam, a 2% increase from 2011. From 2008 – 2010, we scored in the low-to-mid 60's consistently, so we have continued to show improvement. With regard to our lowest 25% in Reading, we had 69% of our students show a learning gain in 2012. In both 2010 and 2011, we had 52% of our lowest 25% show a learning gain.

The state is now entering a period in which we will offer End-of-Course (EOC) exams, in lieu of the FCAT. The FCAT Science exam has been replaced by the Biology EOC, and FCAT Math has been replaced by the Algebra EOC and the Geometry EOC. The FCAT Writing exam does not count towards graduation. As a result of these exams being introduced without actually counting during their trial period, not all students have put forth their best effort. Some of these EOC exams are now just beginning to count towards graduation, so we should be able to start accumulating accurate data.

In 2012, Melbourne High School 12th grade students averaged 525 points on the SAT Reading score, as compared to 523 points in 2011. On the Writing portion, they scored 498 points in 2012 vs. 499 in 2011. Our students had the greatest gain on the SAT Math portion. In 2012, they averaged 526 points, as compared to 517 points in 2011.

On the 2011 ACT exam, our 12th grade students averaged 21.4 points for their Composite Score. This was an increase from the previous graduating class, who averaged 20.8 points.

Please bear in mind that, as a nation, we are moving towards the Common Core

Standards exams. This will allow for students in all states to be compared to each other starting in 2014-15. The impact of the Common Core Standards will loom large as this is perhaps the biggest shift in educational philosophy in the history of the United States. Much of the population will be significantly impacted by the implementation of the Common Core Standards in one form or another. The Common Core Standards will better prepare students for life after high school. The higher level thinking skills, writing skills, and other skills attached to the Common Core will be beneficial to all students.

Best Practice: *(What does research tell us we should be doing as it relates to data analysis above?)*

In the 2007 book *Learning by Doing,* by DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, and Many, this research statement is made: "The best team structure is simple: a team of teachers who teach the same course or grade level…The fundamental question in organizing teams is this: 'Do the people on this team have a shared responsibility for responding to the critical questions in ways that enhance the learning of their students?'" This is also from the same book, "A group of people working *interdependently* to achieve a *common goal* for which members are held *mutually accountable*. Collaborative teams are the fundamental building blocks of PLCs."

In an article titled, "Work Together: But Only If You Want To," published in the February (2011) issue of *Phi Delta Kappan*, Rick DuFour argues that collaboration among educators cannot be a voluntary process and presents evidence that teacher isolation is not as successful as a collaborative culture.

Mike Schmoker in his book *Results Now* states, "The lack of clear goals may provide the most credible explanation for why we are still only inching along in our effort to improve schooling for U.S. children." He goes on to state, "Professional learning communities have emerged as arguably the best, most agreed-upon means by which to continuously improve instruction and student performance. For reasons that will become clear, they succeed where typical staff development and workshops fail."

Comments from fellow teachers regarding collaboration include such things as: "Collaboration not only provides for an exchange of ideas (both in instruction and in student management techniques), but also provides some

much-needed encouragement from those who are working to meet the same challenges as I am." "After our recent early release day, I now see the importance of the 70 minutes to be able to come together as a team or staff and collaborate." "We can now work together as a team to improve instruction across the curriculum. This teamwork and collaboration should enable me be a more effective teacher."

Analysis of Current Practice: *(How do we currently conduct business?)*

As soon as the 2012-13 school years began, we formed our PLC's and Collaborative teams. The groups are either focused on the lowest 25% or the ACT. Some changes that have occurred from last year's PLC groups include: more frequent meetings (at least once per month) and they are now subject-specific groups vs. multi-subjects. The PLC's met early this school year and decided to break down into smaller teams that will meet to work collaboratively on Common Core Standards, common assessments/ lab manuals/etc. This will assist us in making the collaborative teams efforts more meaningful within the individual classrooms. By focusing on single subjects, it will allow the collaborative team to hone in on a specific area that needs improvement within our school – such as the Algebra EOC.

CONTENT AREA:

☒Reading	☒Math	☒Writing	☒Science	☐Parental Involvement	☐Drop-out Programs
☒Language Arts	☒Social Studies	☒Arts/PE	☐Other:		

School Based Objective: *(Action statement: What will we do to improve programmatic and/or instructional effectiveness?)*

Melbourne High School will continue to implement Professional Learning Communities (PLC) across the entire curriculum in every discipline.

PLCs will be expanded to include Interest-Based PLCs (collaborative groups) which will target the lowest 25% population and under-achieving sub-groups, as well as student performance on the ACT. In addition, teachers will discuss strategies for incorporating Higher Order Thinking into their courses when they meet with their PLCs.

Strategies: *(Small number of action oriented staff performance objectives)*

Barrier	***Action Steps***	***Person Responsible***	***Timetable***	***Budget***	***In-Process Measure***
1. Teachers are confused on what to do in a PLC	1. Designate a clear set of expectations from the leadership	School Admin	Yearlong	0	Emails/ dept meeting notes/ exit cards from meetings
2. Internal competition among teachers	2. We will build a "sharing culture" with SMART goals that require interdependent collaboration	School admin Team leader	Yearlong	0	Collaborative meetings/ PLC groups by topic/ agendas & feedback provided
3. Teachers are not comfortable and trusting enough to engage in shared personal practice	3. To build and strengthen the capacity of the school staff so that they all share the common goal of ensuring student success and	School admin Team leader	Yearlong	0	Pro/con list from each monthly collaborative meeting shared with admin

	can make continual progress toward that goal.				

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

Qualitative and Quantitative Professional Practice Outcomes: *(Measures the level of implementation of the professional practices throughout the school)*

We will measure the implementation of the School Improvement Plan's (SIP) goal while grading each teacher's Professional Growth Plan. They must address how they will incorporate it within their teaching throughout the school year. When we meet to review their plan in mid year, and follow up the next school year, we will be able to see how well they did. During each faculty meeting, there is a portion set aside to address the SIP goal, in addition to sharing information with regard to EOC and Common Core Standards. Our teachers will be given a pre and post survey through Survey Monkey to assess their knowledge of what Professional Learning Communities are, how often they actively participate, and other pertinent questions. We will continue to analyze our school data, such as EOC, SAT/ACT, and FCAT results. Currently, only about 70% of teachers are effectively working within a PLC. In addition,

Qualitative and Quantitative Student Achievement Expectations: *(Measures of student achievement)*

To measure students' achievement throughout the school year, the administration will perform classroom walkthroughs and share the data with each other, as well as the individual teacher. The number of students that are engaged will be a critical component. In most courses, teachers have performed a pre-test and will be assessing a post-test. There are several teachers that are assigning student surveys within their course, in addition to the student survey assigned by the school district. Results will be looked at and discussions will ensue with regard to any necessary changes that may be needed. The school faculty and administration will continue to analyze and compare data from EOC/SAT/ACT exams, as well as FCAT Reading &

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

Reading Goal **1.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance** **(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance** **(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)**
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1. Content Area teachers do not think they have the time to include more reading and writing in their curriculums. 2. The entire 9th and 10th grade FCAT testing is computerized this year.		
Strategy(s): 1. Professional Learning Communities will focus on common planning to include Higher Order Thinking Skills in curriculum. 2. Literacy Coach will work with content area teachers to incorporate more complex texts and real-world reading and writing experiences, without distracting from current curriculum. 3. Emphasize the importance of taking the FAIR test as a simulated testing opportunity to practice taking a test on the computer. 4. All reading classes will work on computerized reading remediation programs prior to the FCAT (Read 180, Reading Plus, and FCAT Explorer).		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** 1. To move students from Level 2 into Level 3 (and to keep Level 3 students from slipping into Level 2) requires increased reading instruction across the curriculum. 2. These students typically lacking reading stamina. **Strategy(s):** 1. All teachers will participate in school-based professional development and PLCs, focusing on reading strategies, higher order thinking skills, and text complexity. 2. Literacy coach will lead a professional reading discussion group composed of teachers from all curriculum areas. 3. English teachers will incorporate more silent,	<u>9th grade</u> 28% (137/490 stdts.) <u>10th grade</u> 32% (151/471 stdts.) <u>TOTAL</u> 30% (288/961 stdts)	<u>9th Grade</u> 30% <u>10th grade</u> 35% <u>School Goal</u> 32%

sustained reading (independent reading) into their instruction.		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading **Barrier(s):** 1. These students have a wide range of abilities and meeting all of their needs in the classroom is challenging. 2. Limited vocabulary hinders student comprehension. **Strategy(s):** 1. Teachers will assess abilities and use small-group instruction to differentiate instruction. 2. Introduction of the Lexia computer-based reading program will assist in meeting the needs of a diverse population of readers. 3. Incorporating more explicit vocabulary instruction into daily lesson plans across the curriculum and encouraging independent reading will improve vocabulary knowledge.	43% (3/7 stdts.)	45%
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading **Barrier(s):** 1. Limited planning time for teachers to collaborate on higher-order lessons to challenge these students. **Strategy(s):** 1. PLCs will utilize early release days to focus on collaborative planning. 2. Literacy coach will work with content area teachers to plan lessons together using more complex texts and higher order thinking skills.	9th grade 39% (191/490 stdts.) 10th grade 44% (207/471 stdts.) TOTAL 41% (398/961 stdts)	9th grade 41% 10th grade 46% School Goal 43%
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading **Barrier(s):** 1. Limited planning time for ESE teachers to meet with their peers in the content areas. **Strategy(s):** **1.** ESE teachers will collaborate with content area teachers through the PLC process to improve instruction.	29% (2/7stdts.)	33%

Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** 1. Limited planning time for ESE teachers to meet with their peers in the content areas. 2. Limited vocabulary hinders student comprehension. **Strategy(s):** **1.** Through PLCs, ESE teachers will collaborate with content area teachers. **2.** Explicit vocabulary instruction will improve vocabulary skills.	50% (2/4 stdts.)	55%
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** • Computerized testing puts additional stress on students because of the unfamiliar testing environment. **Strategy(s):** **1.** All reading classes will spend at least one class period per week working on computerized reading instruction. **2.** Literacy coach and teachers will conference regularly regarding student performance on computerized remediation software. **3.** Teachers and literacy coach will conduct data chats with students. **4.** Reading teachers are implementing increased independent reading requirements in their classrooms. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	66% (150/226 stdts.)	70%
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:		

Baseline data 2010-11:		
Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading : White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: →	**2012 Current % Scoring SATISFACTORY** W: 76% B: 48% H: 63% A: 79% AI: n/a	**2013 EXPECTED % Scoring SATISFACTORY** W: 80% B: 52% H: 67% A: 80% AI: n/a
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** 1. Limited ELL support staff for an increasing number of students. 2. Limited ELL materials in many languages. **Strategy(s):** 1. Depending on needs, ELL students will work with Lexia computerized reading remediation to give them a stronger foundation in English basics. 2. Materials acquisition is ongoing.		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** 1. Wide range of abilities within reading classes. **Strategy(s):** **1.** Students were identified and scheduled into reading classes based on FCAT data and teacher input to allow for more homogeneous groupings of students. **2.** Instructional assistants will work with small groups. **3.** Computerized instruction allows for individuals to work at their own level; close teacher monitoring assures students are working in the right program and making progress.	40/84 = 47.6%	49%

Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** 1. Stress from outside of school impacts performance. **Strategy(s):** **1.** Mentoring program has been established to provide students with extra support at school.		

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Higher Order Thinking Skills	October, November, January, and February	PLCs will share experiences and issues within their departments and with the Literacy Coach.
Incorporating Reading and Writing across the Curriculum	October and February	Literacy Coach will continue to plan with teachers and co-teach as needed in classrooms to ensure adequate reading and writing is included in the content areas.

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Listening/ Speaking:** 50	Lack of listening materials such as audio books. Kindles have the ability to program books for listening	Use kindle audio books with audio capabilities to allow students to listen stories while reading.	Classroom teacher Jose Soto – ESOL Contact
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Reading:** 38	Lack of reading materials that are age appropriate for ESOL students	Use kindle audio books with audio capabilities to allow students to listen stories while reading.	Classroom teacher Jose Soto – ESOL Contact

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Writing**: 50	Not enough use of writing material from the media center	Utilize our ESOL material from the library and keep track through the media center.	Classroom teacher Jose Soto – ESOL Contact Media Center

Mathematics Goal(s): **1.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Anticipated Barrier(s): **1.**		
Strategy(s): **1.**		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):**		

Strategy(s): **1.**		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline Data 2010-11:**		
Student subgroups by ethnicity : White: → Black: → Hispanic: → Asian: → American Indian: →	**2012 Current % Scoring SATISFACTORY** W: 70% B: 55% H: 55% A: 92% AI: n/a	**2013 EXPECTED % Scoring SATISFACTORY** W: 55% B: 48% H: 38% A: n/a AI: n/a
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics		

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Common Core Standards	Sept 10, 2012 (PDD)	1) During the early release day PLC meetings, teachers will share ideas from the Professional Development Math mini-conference regarding Common Core Standards. 2) PLC leaders will email five key ideas/strategies to the Collaboration Team Leader. 3) Collaboration leader will compile list of strategies and email back to team members
ACT & Lowest 25% Problem Solving Strategies	Sept 26, 2012 (early release day)	1) During the early release day PLC meetings, teachers will share strategies they have implemented in the classroom to improve ACT and Lowest 25% scores. 2) PLC leaders will email five strategies to the Collaboration Team Leader. 3) Collaboration leader will compile list of strategies and email back to team members.

Writing	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): DOE recently changed the grading rubric resulting in lower writing scores. Teachers have not received training on the new Florida Writes grading rubric.		

Strategy(s): MHS's Writing Contact will attend district training for the new Florida Writes grading rubric. MHS Writing Contact will provide Florida Writes Grading Rubric training to all MHS English teachers. MHS English teachers will attend a September 10th, 2012, Language Arts in-service—which will include writing workshops. MHS English teachers will review and utilize writing information available on the Department of Education website.		
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	91% (reflects 441 students out of a total of 485 students)	92% (reflects 519 students out of a total of 564 students)
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing		

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) **1.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science**:**		

Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading		

Science Goal(s) (High School) **1.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Barrier(s): Student apathy. Help students find relevance of the topic in real world. IS 3 has had biology over a 3 year		

period. Expect and demand mastery. Avoid and control cultural bias in the classroom. **<u>Strategy(s):</u>** Review. Review. Review. The student will isolate important scientific information in word problems and be able to defend/explain their answer. The student will recognize measurements, metric units of measurement and compare and contrast metric units with English units. The student will be proficient in dimensional analysis, converting between units. The student will organize, analyze and interpret data. Students will be involved in formative assessments to determine the prior knowledge that will be assumed during instruction. Students will prepare formal lab reports. Mnemonics and CRISS strategies. BEST practices Inquiry labs. Guided practice followed by individual practice. The new biology text offers suggestions for differentiated		

instruction in each section, as well as remediation strategies. Show online animations, videos and extra worksheets prepared by the publisher. Give log in code to each student.		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:** **Asian:** **American Indian**:		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

APPENDIX B

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS **ONLY**)

Algebra 1 EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students

	that percentage reflects)	that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Interpreting Word Problems **Strategy(s):** Reading Comprehension strategies (focus on understanding math vocabulary and establishing problem solving procedures)		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra**:**	51% = 126 out of 248 students	53%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:	5% = 12 out of 248 students	8%
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce [redacted] Achievement Gap 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:**		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory		

progress in Algebra		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

Geometry EOC Goal	**2012 Current Level of Performance(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Barrier(s): Interpreting Word Problems **Strategy(s):** Reading Comprehension strategies (focus on understanding math vocabulary and establishing problem solving procedures)		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry**:**	58% = 258 out of 444 students	61%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry:	8% = 36 out of 444 students	10%
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-		

Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. **White:** → **Black:** → **Hispanic:** →		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		

Biology EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Biology:	Spring 2012 test was not scored by Achievement levels 44% of students scored in the top 1/3 (194/441 stdts.)	How??? Unable to predict using prior statistics
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology:	Spring 2012 test was not scored by Achievement levels UNABLE TO DETERMINE	How??? Unable to predict using prior statistics

Civics EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Civics:	n/a	How??? Unable to predict using prior statistics
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics:	n/a	How??? Unable to predict using prior statistics

U.S. History EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in U. S. History:	n/a	How??? Unable to predict using prior statistics
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U. S. History:	n/a	How??? Unable to predict using prior statistics

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: **Goal 1:** **Goal 2:**			

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: **Goal 1:** Increase the overall pass rate on the Industry Certification tests in all CTE program areas **Goal 2:** Increase enrollment in CTE programs	• Inadequate materials to teach the test topics • Student apathy and a lack of motivation on the part of the student to recognize the value of the tests • Student refusal to study or do homework to adequately prepare for the tests	• Secure appropriate resources and teaching materials to assist students to pass the assessments • Create incentives to motivate them to want to be successful on the tests • Recognize those students in the Graduation Program who have received industry certification • Keep records of areas of weakness and provide remediation in those areas • Certification Pins to all seniors who pass their appropriate CTE test • Utilize word walls to illustrate technical vocabulary • Invite speakers from industry to visit classrooms to reinforce the value of the tests	

Additional Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: **Goal 1:** **Goal 2**:			

APPENDIX C

(TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

Highly Effective Teachers

Describe the school based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, highly effective teachers to the school.

Descriptions of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1.		
2.		
3.		

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are not highly effective. *When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field/and who are not highly effective	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective

For the following areas, please write a brief narrative that includes the data for the year 2011-12 and a description of changes you intend to incorporate to improve the data for the year 2012-13.

MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI (Identify the MTSS leadership team and it role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)

Identify the MTSS leadership team: MTSS is a problem solving model of service delivery for General Education students. It is headed up by the school based leadership team facilitated by an administrator and consisting of a guidance counselor, MESH teacher representatives, the reading coach and a staff member with intervention knowledge (ESOL or ESE).

Its role in development and implementation of the SIP: Data shows that early intervention with struggling students helps them improve grades, behaviors and in the end improves the school graduation rates. Melbourne High School has set in place school wide teams to study and work with students scoring at the lowest 25% on the reading FCAT and the Algebra 1 EOC. The role of the Leadership Team is to monitor the school/teacher implementation of interventions and strategies to be used across the curriculum with these students.

Data sources, data management: The A3 system is the county-wide system developed to manage data as it relates to MTSS. Faculty and staff will utilize A3 or AS400 to record information and monitor student progress. The MTSS team implements response to instruction/intervention as a school wide method of raising student achievement. Based on data collected they evaluate the school infrastructure, scheduling, personnel and curriculum resources, staff development and procedures.

How the staff is trained in MTSS: The MTSS Leadership Team received initial district training in Spring 2010. Staff will continue to be trained on MTSS through professional development opportunities. Professional development on an overview of MTSS, MTSS forms 1 – 8, the use of A3, AS400, and problem–solving will be provided throughout the year. The MTSS Leadership Team will also

evaluate additional staff PD needs during their meetings.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

In 2011-12, Melbourne HS created a school newsletter and made it available on the school website, as well as in the front office. Due to expenses, we do not mail it home. The School Advisory Council, which is comprised of students, teachers, parents and the principal, met monthly. The school website was regularly updated and the look of it has been modified several times with the goal being of being user-friendly. We had many teachers utilizing Edline to post assignments and notes, as well as grades. The administration checked Edline status reports and let teachers know if content had not been updated. It seems that many parents are accessing Edline through the child's account because of the ease of use – they did not have to come in person to obtain the password. During Open House, we publicized that Edline passwords are available to parents in the guidance office. We utilized Synervoice to notify parents of upcoming events such as Open House and Parent-Teacher conferences, in addition to the BPS Parent Survey. Once the final tabulations arrived, it was shown that Melbourne HS led the entire school district in terms of parent responses. While most schools had approx. 10-15% of parents respond, we had over 30% of our parents respond (608 parents). We achieved this through concerted efforts: teachers made phone calls to parents, reminders were sent home to parents through Edline, guidance staff placed the survey link on Edline, and several Synervoice messages were sent home by the school secretary. In addition, I continually updated faculty/staff on our current response status.

In 2012-13, we have ramped up the expectations for both the school website, as well as the athletic website. We have dedicated students whose responsibility is to work with our Web Design teacher, as well as district personnel, in designing and updating all information in a timely manner. We continued to sign parents up for Edline at registration and Open House, and will publicize it at the upcoming Parent-Teacher conferences in November. The school administration is checking for teacher updates to Edline on a bi-weekly basis, and sending notices to the teacher if this requirement is not met. Our current plan is to "market" the parent survey in the same manner as last year, as well as try to encourage more teachers to assist in this endeavor. Our goal is to increase the response to the Parent Survey to over 40%.

ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies)

MHS maintained an average daily attendance of 95.64% for the 2011-2012 school year. This followed Assistant Principal, Ed Everette, meeting with students in danger of failing due to absences at several critical points through the year. We are in hopes of achieving a 96% attendance rate for the 2012-2013 school year. In addition to meeting at critical times with students in danger of failing due to absences, Mr. Everette will include involving parents in the conversation with the students, in order to enlist their aid in encouraging a higher attendance rate. The administration regularly runs an excessive tardy list and calls in those students who have exceeded the set number for that time period. The students and parents are made aware of the need to be on time for classes, as well as the discipline action assigned.

SUSPENSION: During 2010-11, there were 390 out-of-school suspensions, which accounted for 18.4% of the actions taken by the administration. In 2011-12, there were 379 out-of-school suspensions, which accounted for 20.3% of the actions taken by the administration. Our goal for 2102-13 is to limit the percentage of out-of-school suspensions to less than 17%. The administration will attempt to utilize suspensions pending parent conference more frequently in a attempt to curb the more serious behavior. In the past, the suspension pending parent conference accounted for less than 2% of the actions taken. Granted, there are may circumstances that may prohibit the use of the suspension pending parent conference, but the attempt will be made nonetheless.

DROP-OUT (High Schools only): Melbourne High School identifies students who are at a high risk of dropping out due to GPA or credit issues and offers those students and their parents an opportunity to participate in the Quest Lab/ After school credit retrieval & grade forgiveness programs. During 2011-12, we had 335 students participate during school hours. They retrieved a total of 621 classes. During our afterschool program, we had 77 students enroll and complete a total of 68 courses. The afterschool program has several students who have transportation issues, as well as work issues, so it does not always show the same level of success as our main credit retrieval lab. During the 2012-13 school year, we will continue to identify students that are at high risk for dropping out and place them into the Quest lab.

POSTSECONDARY READINESS: (How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful? Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.)

Every school year school counselors meet with each student and their parents for an “Individualized Program of Study” conference. Each grade level has specific times of the year when these conferences are conducted. During these meetings the counselor discusses the course selections that correlate to the student’s college and career goals. This directive counseling is meaningful for the students because a thorough review is done in reference to the student’s academic history, interests and standardized test scores in order to create personally meaningful program of study that will give the student the greatest opportunity to improve on college or career readiness.

Strategies for improving student readiness IPS meetings, review of the PLAN results for the sophomore class to help provide advice to students in future course selections, and a review of the ACT results for the junior class to help advise students in future course selections to improve the level of college readiness.