Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

Name of School: **Area:**

North Area

Merritt Island High School

Principal: **Area Superintendent:**

Dr. Ronald Bobay

Gary A. Shiffrin

SAC Chairperson:

Michelle Hoolsema

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

The Merritt Island High School community, working cooperatively with their feeder schools, parent and business partners will strive to provide the best educational opportunities for students in a safe environment that allows them to be challenged to their full potential and encourages them to become citizens who are sensitive to their community and the environment.

Vision Statement:

In a tradition of excellence known as "Island Style" Merritt Island High School provides a safe and nurturing environment where individuals are empowered to think independently, communicate effectively and contribute to a global society.

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

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

For the 1st year in 3 years, MIHS was voted an "A" school for the 2010-2011 school year. For the previous two years, MIHS missed being voted an "A" school because of the inability for at least 50% of the lowest 25% to make learning gains. In 2010-2011, 51% of the lowest 25% make learning gains and last year, for 2011-2012, 64% of the lowest 25% made learning gains. Although we do not have our school grade yet, we are on track to compete for another "A" school grade.

Reading
Level 3 or Above 9th Grade
2012: 68%
2011: 69%
2010: 67%
2009: 63%
Level 3 or Above 10th Grade
2012: 69%
2011: 56%
2010: 51%
2009: 48%
Math
Algebra 1 EOC Level 3 or Above
2012: 67%
Level 3 or Above 10th Grade
2011: 87%
2010: 89%
2009: 89%
Writing
Percent Scoring 3 or Above
2012: 87%
2011: 98%
2010: 96%
2009: 88%
Percent Scoring 4 or Above
2012: 38%
2011: 83%
2010: 71%
2009: 67%

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

Last year, MIHS had two areas of focus: literacy standards-based PLC's and common assessments. In addition, we appointed PLC coordinators to lead discussions with their colleagues and work with administration in planning to empower other members of the faculty with shared leadership. Sitting on several bookcases were "MESH" handbooks developed by the district that outlined a repertoire of subject specific lessons addressing various learning styles, organized by the four reporting categories assessed by the

Reading FCAT. We secured a copy for each teacher in their discipline—Math, English, Science, History, Foreign Language, and Electives. Each department focused on a different reporting category each month and brought in copies of a student sample of the activity they used in their lessons to share what worked for their students, what didn't work, and what they would do differently next time. From Advanced Placement to Intensive Reading, to Chorus, and Physical Education, every teacher embraced this exchange of content work. Most importantly, teachers were differentiating their instruction daily, using lessons from their MESH book to reach a new student every day, in every discipline, in ways that they had never seen before.

Concurrently, teachers worked to create common assessments for their second semester exam. Every student is expected to master the same standards and have the same preparation to be afforded the same opportunities. We created a PowerPoint to outline the purpose, procedures, and expected outcomes. This was first shared with our department contacts followed by a Q and A to work out any misconceptions, answer any questions in doubt, and to promote buy-in from the leaders of the faculty. Next, we held a faculty meeting to review the same presentation, incorporating additional information or changes acquired from my department contact meeting. The faculty was well prepared for implementation and their concerns were addressed. During the common assessment collaboration, we observed a veteran teacher, who was formerly known as "least likely to collaborate," leading the discussion with examples of his students' assessments. Each final product included an exam review, ensuring consistent test preparation by all classes; an exam with outlined standards for each question, ensuring complete standards-based assessment; and an answer key. . PLC's are now a way of work at Merritt Island High School (MIHS).

Finally, we also assigned mentor teachers for each of our lowest 25% reading students. Teachers met freely with their students with no specific guidelines or focus.

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

Creating a Professional Learning Community is among the most effective practices within the educational process today. Richard DuFour defines a Professional Learning Community as an ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve. The idea of PLC's is based upon "learning by doing." In the teaching profession, it is essential for educators to continue improving their craft by taking an active approach to evolving their teaching styles around their students. These PLC's create a collaboration of ideas and intentions within a department and puts them in action. Without action, the continuous learning cycle cannot improve, therefore, hindering student achievement. Members of the PLC's concentrate their efforts in a focus on learning, collaborative teams, collective inquiry, action orientation, and continuous improvement. The goal of the PLC is to create conditions for perpetual learning.

"Data analysis can provide a snapshot of what students know, what they should know, and what can be done to meet their academic needs. With appropriate analysis and interpretation of data, educators can make informed decisions that positively affect student outcomes." (SEDL Letter, Fall/Winter 2010, Linking Research and Practice: "Using Data to Guide Instruction and Improve Student Learning") Students are constantly being assessed in various subject areas yet they focus on a single number as their outcome of that assessment. Too often, students are not involved in the analysis of what they got right, what they got wrong, and why. In addition, teachers work hard to ensure their students have mastered the material by creating standards based assessments, yet they often are remiss in analyzing the outcomes for improvement of teaching practices. According to DuFour, they need to ask themselves:

- What do we want each student to learn?
- How will we know when each student has learned it?
- How will we respond when a student experiences difficulty in learning?

There has been some compelling recent evidence that school-based mentoring (SBM) can promote a number of positive outcomes for youth participants. A new meta-analysis (Wheeler, Keller, & DuBois, 2010) of three major SBM studies found significant positive program effects in the areas of:

- Reduced truancy
- Increased youth perceptions of scholastic efficacy
- Decreased school-related misconduct
- Improved peer support
- Reduced absenteeism
- Youth self-reporting that they have a caring nonparent adult in their lives

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?)*

> Use established collaboration teams to focus on creating common assessments, data analysis of assessments, and incorporating Common Core State Standards into the social studies, science, and career and technical education curriculum.

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

Barrier	*Action Steps*	*Person Responsible*	*Timetable*	*Budget*	*In-Process Measure*
1. Time	1. Schedule time within the teacher school day for PLCs	PLC Coordinators	August 2012-May 2012	$4,794.00	PLC Schedule, Agenda, Minutes
2. Fidelity	2. Create Standards Based Common Assessment	Teacher Teams	August 2012-November 2012	N/A	Common Assessments outlined with state and core standards
3. Standards Based Instruction	3. Analyze student data of Common Assessments	Teacher Teams	December 2012-March 2012	N/A	Data Analysis results, PGP's
4. Resistance to change	4. Demonstrate how current practice can be easily modified to meet the expectations of Common Core Standards	Staff: CCSS Teacher Trainers/ Department Contacts	September 2012-March 2012	N/A	PLC Agendas, PLC Minutes, Faculty Meeting Minutes, Teacher Feedback

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

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

1. 100% of teachers in core subject areas, including foreign language, career research, and HOPE will submit to administration, administer to students, and analyze and document in PLC minutes 1st and 2nd semester common assessments.

2. 100% of teachers will analyze data with their students, to be used as a progress monitoring tool, based on 9 week grades, semester common assessment exams, and/or DA assessment scores. This will be apparent by the use of the Mustang Mentor/Mentee Monitor (M4) tool in administrative conferences.

3. Teachers will be provided with online surveys throughout the year on the effectiveness of the implementation of CCSS in their classroom, of those, 80% will show a favorable response.

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

1. 70% of students will pass the Algebra 1 EOC exam.

2. 60% of students will pass the Biology and Geometry EOC exam for its first year of baseline data.

3. 70% of 9th grade students will pass the FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment.

4. 72% of 10th grade students will pass the FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment.

5. 51% of 11th and 12th grade students will pass the FCAT 2.0 Reading Retake assessment.

6. 100% of students will be involved in data analysis at least 3 times per year, reviewing data, setting goals, and providing feedback of the effect of instruction on their performance.

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.		

Strategy(s): **1.**		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	69%=489	78%
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	43%=3	
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	41%=287	
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	29%=2	
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	0%=0	
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.** **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	67%=119	

Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline data 2010-11:	31%=152	
Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading :	Enter numerical data for current level of performance	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance
White:	27%=130	19%
Black:	77%=26	52%
Hispanic:	40%=56	31%
Asian:	25%=4	
American Indian:	50%=2	
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s): Only 1 or 2 ELL students in each English course.** **Strategy(s):** 1. Create a class for all levels of ELL students to receive individualized strategies to meet their levels of English ability.	63%=12	
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** 1.	61%=74	48%
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** 1.	44%=103	65%

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Vocabulary	Weekly	Word of the Week, Verbal Volley competition
Higher Order Questioning	October 2012	Common Assessment Development

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Listening/ Speaking:** 42%=8			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Reading:** 16%=3			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Writing**: 16%=3			

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.	N/A	
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** 1.	43%=3	

FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** 1.	**N/A**	
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** 1.	**29%=2**	
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** 1.	**29%=2**	
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** 1.	**N/A**	
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** 1.	N/A	
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline Data 2010-11:**	19%=32	42%
Student subgroups by ethnicity : White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	44%=49 50%=4 17%=2	42% 65% 42%
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	56%=20	66%
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	29%=12	42%

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Formative Assessments	Ongoing	DA Assessment/Monthly Lab Practice

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): Knowledge of rubrics and consistency across subject areas **Strategy(s):** 1. **Develop a rubric and steps to a quality essay within the English department to share at PLCs with our Social Studies and Science teachers.** 2. **Monthly "activity period" school wide writing project.**		
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	87%=290	
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing	60%=3	

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.		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science**:**		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science		
FCAT 2.0 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): **Strategy(s):** 1.		

Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	0%=0	
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science	0%=0	
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:** **Asian:** **American Indian**:	N/A	
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	N/A	
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	N/A	
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	N/A	

APPENDIX B

Algebra 1 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): Students must retake the test even though they are not enrolled in the Algebra curriculum. **Strategy(s):** 1. **Provide before school remediation for two to three weeks prior to the EOC Algebra administration.**		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra**:**	67%=106	
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:	9%=14	
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) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:**	32% = 36 63% = 5 29% = 4	
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	50% = 1	
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	62% = 18	
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	37% = 16	

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): **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry**:**	N/A	
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry:	N/A	
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) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:**	N/A	
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry	N/A	
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry	N/A	
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry	N/A	

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:	N/A	
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology:	N/A	

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	
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics:	N/A	

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	
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U. S. History:	N/A	

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 enrollment to full cohorts of 25 per class in each of our academies.** **Goal 2:**	Students are not aware of the advantages and curriculum of all of our academies.	Recruit students via signature academies events and open house forums.	-Charles Parker -Recruit at Middle School -Host Hospitality Baseball Event -Implement Clubs incorporating academies -Host Summer Enrichment promoting academies

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)

<u>Highly Effective Teachers</u>
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)

Principal (Instructional Leader):
Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making; ensures that the school implements a multi-tiered system of support; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation through the English, Math, and Exceptional Student Education (ESE) departments; ensures adequate staff professional development to support use of data analysis; and communicates with parents regarding school-based support systems.

Assistant Principal (Content Specialist): Ensures that when new curricular materials are obtained, implementers are adequately trained to use the materials; facilitates Professional Learning Communities, which are the clearinghouse for regularly-scheduled faculty data analysis.

Guidance Counselor (Facilitator):
Works as liaison between Guidance Department and faculty regarding the Student Review System for the school's multi-tiered system of support process. Provides input regarding specific information about individual students.

Literacy Coach and Data Coach:
Collects, organizes, displays, analyzes, and interprets data. While the AP is not the sole person who works with data, she will be responsible to assist the team in understanding and using data. Identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically-based curriculum-based assessments and evidence-based intervention approaches; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for students to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support

for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Faculty Representative(s) – MESH, ESE and Electives:
Provides information about instruction by participating in the process of student data collection, delivering Tier 1 instruction, and collaborating with other faculty to implement Tier 2/3 interventions.

Tasks: Provides vision for both academic and behavioral success. Plans, implements and monitors the progress of school improvement. Implements a school-wide focus of raising student achievement outcomes through data review and problem-solving. Systematically evaluates the school infrastructure, scheduling, personnel and curriculum resources, staff development, and procedures
Meeting Frequency 2011 - 2012: Meetings scheduled on an as-needed basis

The RtI Leadership Team designated a working group, including the Assistant Principal and the Chair of ESE, to represent the team in development and implementation of the school improvement plan as it pertains to multi-tiered system of support. This working group provided data on procedures and goals as well as input regarding academic and social/emotional areas that need to be addressed.

Implementation
The district-provided A3 software package (including Progress Monitoring Plan, Vision, and RtI sections) will be used to manage data collection and analysis, progress monitoring, and intervention/assessment management.
Baseline data: Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
Progress Monitoring: Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), FCAT Simulation
Midyear: FAIR, Intensive Reading and Math class scores, attendance and behavior data
End of year: FAIR, FCAT, Intensive Reading and Math class scores, attendance and behavior data
Frequency of Data Days: once monthly for data analysis
The Leadership Team received initial district training in Spring 2010.
Professional development on an overview of MTSS and the use of A3 will be provided during faculty meetings and PLC sessions throughout the year.
The Leadership Team will also evaluate additional staff PD needs during their meetings.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

Merritt Island High School has always been heavily supported by its parents, community members, and business partners. From our music programs, to academies and athletics, to volunteering with clerical support, Merritt Island High School involves its parents and community members in all aspects of its functions. Our goal is to clock at least 20,000 hours this school year (17,340 in 2011-2012), which is over 13 hours per student. We are a comprehensive high school and while volunteering is not mandatory, we encourage all parents to be involved in their student's academic and extracurricular high school experience. In addition, our business partners are a large part of our success throughout the years. This year, our goal is to increase our business partnerships from 16 to 20. In addition to getting parents and community more involved at the school, we want to increase our participation by 20% for the Parent Survey Participation, from 206 to 247.

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

In 2011 the school's attendance rate was 96.750%. MIHS ranks at the top for high schools across the county. Our goal is to maintain above 97% attendance rate for the 2012-2013 school year. The Deans are very active to monitor tardies, especially during 1st period, which cuts down on student tardies and absences. In addition, our teachers hold our students accountable for their assignments when school is missed. Students find it much easier and more productive to attend school daily, than have to make up their work when they are absent.

SUSPENSION:

In 2011-2012, there were 255 incidences of suspensions at Merritt Island High School. Our goal is to keep suspension rates at 200 or less incidences for 2012-2013. By instituting Saturday School, funded by the School Advisory Committee, students are afforded the opportunity to serve a consequence for their actions without being suspended and thus, missing a school day or receiving zeros for their missed assignments. In some situations, we also have an In-School-Suspension work option for students, but do not have a separate setting for daily use.

DROP-OUT (High Schools only):

In an attempt to increase graduation rate, Merritt Island High School will continue to offer credit retrieval options in the computer labs before, during and after school. In addition, we are now offering a full time competency based diploma program, PEGASUS, where students who are not successful in the traditional classroom have an option to graduate in an alternative setting. In doing so, we will also increase student GPA's to a minimum 2.0 and graduation rate. In 2011-2012, 96.6% of our students had a cumulative 2.0 GPA or above. Our goal for 2012-2013 is 97% of students have a 2.0 GPA or above.

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.)

Each year, students meet individually with their counselor to create and monitor Individual Plans of Student IPS. Regardless their chosen path, students work towards completing their individual portfolios and achieving their IPS goals. MIHS offers Gifted English Honors classes in grades 9-12. MIHS offers the Mustang Academic Scholars Program (MASP), an Advanced Placement (AP) Diploma, in addition to 21 AP courses, the Collegiate High School Program, dual enrollment courses, and early admissions. MIHS offers three career academies for students who desire career related focused enrichment. Students who excel in a career and technical field are able to earn nationally recognized industry credentials in their area of concentration which gives them the opportunity to be hired directly into a career field.