

Brevard Public Schools

Merritt Island High School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Merritt Island High School

100 MUSTANG WAY, Merritt Island, FL 32953

<http://www.merritt.hs.brevard.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: James Rehmer

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	34%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: B
School Grades History	2017-18: B 2016-17: B 2015-16: B 2014-15: A 2013-14: B
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

To serve every student at MIHS with excellence as the standard, Island Style.

Provide the school's vision statement

Empowering students to be positive and productive contributors to society through rigor, relevance, and relationships.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Rehmer, James Principal	Principal
Lubbers, Debbie Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Farrell, Robert Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Hoppenbrouwer, Andrew Dean	Dean
VeVea, Finerson Dean	Dean
Saul, Abby Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total		
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	389	389	400	329	1507
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	42	45	26	238
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	39	40	23	158
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	54	65	34	189
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	71	93	24	255
ELA Course Failure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	38	31	8	100
Math Course Failure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	34	54	29	141
US History EOC failure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	58	5	76

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total		
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	58	67	25	217

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total		
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	14	2	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	11	1	25

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

81

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/17/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	62%	59%	56%	63%	58%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	52%	51%	53%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	40%	42%	44%	44%	44%
Math Achievement	54%	48%	51%	47%	50%	51%
Math Learning Gains	48%	49%	48%	44%	46%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	45%	45%	41%	43%	45%
Science Achievement	73%	66%	68%	68%	67%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	70%	73%	75%	70%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	389 (0)	389 (0)	400 (0)	329 (0)	1507 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	125 (0)	42 (0)	45 (0)	26 (0)	238 (0)
One or more suspensions	56 (0)	39 (0)	40 (0)	23 (0)	158 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	36 (0)	54 (0)	65 (0)	34 (0)	189 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	67 (0)	71 (0)	93 (0)	24 (0)	255 (0)
ELA Course Failure	23 (0)	38 (0)	31 (0)	8 (0)	100 (0)
Math Course Failure	24 (0)	34 (0)	54 (0)	29 (0)	141 (0)
US History EOC failure	0 (0)	13 (0)	58 (0)	5 (0)	76 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
09	2019	64%	62%	2%	55%	9%
	2018	59%	60%	-1%	53%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	57%	59%	-2%	53%	4%
	2018	64%	61%	3%	53%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	66%	6%	67%	5%
2018	63%	67%	-4%	65%	-2%
Compare		9%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	66%	71%	-5%	70%	-4%
2018	72%	70%	2%	68%	4%
Compare		-6%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	30%	61%	-31%	61%	-31%
2018	36%	62%	-26%	62%	-26%
Compare		-6%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	60%	2%	57%	5%
2018	48%	60%	-12%	56%	-8%
Compare		14%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	28	34	22	29	35	32	28	23		93	40
ELL	44	42	20	50						43	
BLK	44	48	54	21	42			42		82	43
HSP	53	41	21	49	62		54	60		85	64
MUL	59	50	25	47	44		59	75		97	46
WHT	66	55	43	59	45	46	78	71		94	64
FRL	45	40	35	36	47	44	57	48		82	49

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	33	48	38	19	48	52	51	54		84	55
ELL	50	62									
ASN	85	64									
BLK	41	46	44	21	32		52	59		100	33
HSP	56	56	40	25	42	50	54	55		85	59
MUL	63	49	57	40	47		64	89		80	75
WHT	65	54	45	53	44	38	73	80		89	71
FRL	49	50	40	32	43	44	55	69		80	54

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	667
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Our component with the lowest performance were the learning gains of the ELA Lowest 25th percentile. Only 38% of our lowest 25% ELA students made learning gains. A contributing factor was inconsistent progress monitoring through ELA and ILA courses. In addition, lack of scaffolding to grade level appropriate text and standards for our level one and two students.

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

Our categories with the largest decrease from the previous year were ELA lowest 25% (-6% change) and our US History EOC pass rate (-8% change). There is a direct correlation between the two categories. ELA success and its reading comprehension/analysis are skills needed to be successful on the other state assessments. In addition, among our ESE students within the ELA lowest 25%, only 22% achieved learning gains, this is a 16% decline from last year. This closely correlates with the US History EOC,

whereas only 23% of our ESE students achieved a 3 or higher, which is a 31% decline from last year.

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

The data components with the greatest gaps when compared to the state average were ELA lowest 25% students, who had a -6% difference, and social studies achievement, with a -8% difference. Again, the factors that contributed to the gap would be not teaching to depth of the standard, not using resources that the district has provided for the teachers to ensure assessments and tasks are reflecting the standards.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Math Lowest 25% LG with a 9% gain. The past two years the math department focused on common quality assessments, a strong focus on teaching to the depth of the standard, as well as small group collaboration to discuss successes and struggles with instructional strategies related to the standards..

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Two areas of concern from EWS data, would be attendance < 90% and the number of students receiving a Level 1 on Statewide assessments. Attendance shows that 16% or 238 students of 1507 total students have attendance below 90%. In addition, 255 students of 1507 students, which is 17% of students, received a level 1 on a statewide assessment.

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

1. Learning gains among lowest 25% in ELA.
2. Reading comprehension with analysis and synthesis across all content areas.
3. Learning gains in both ELA and Math for our ESE students.
4. Fewer students with less than 90% attendance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	<p>ELA lowest 25% learning gains</p> <p>The learning gains of the lowest 25% of students in ELA decreased by 6% from 2018 to 2019. This is 2% below the District average and 4% below the state average. There was also a 1% decline in both ELA 3+ achievement and ELA learning gains. In addition, we also believe this correlates to our decline of 8% in our Social Studies achievement scores.</p>
Rationale	
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>ELA L25% learning gains will increase from 38% to 45%. ELA 3+ proficiency will increase from 62% to 65% and ELA learning gains will increase from a 52% to a 55%. In addition, as a result of the correlation of ELA achievement and Social Studies achievement, we will see an increase from 67% to 75%.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	<p>Abby Saul (saul.abby@brevardschools.org)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>School wide implementation of standard-based instruction, tasks, and assessments that align with the standard and the grade level complexity of the standard, which includes requiring students to utilize the text to support their ideas and responses with evidence from the text.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>We believe the decline in our achievement in ELA and SS is the result of misalignment of the level of the standard, task complexity, and quality standard based assessments. If standard, task and assessment alignment would occur, we believe student achievement in ELA and Social studies would increase.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide teachers with the opportunities to collaborate and build common lessons, tasks and assessments that reflect the standards and the grade level complexity. 2. Provide PDD days for MESH subject areas to meet with District Resource Teachers in order to demonstrate access to resources to aide building instructional strategies, tasks, and assessments reflective of the standards. 3. Begin the implementation of data discussions based on results from common lessons, tasks and assessments. 4. Implement self-reflection on instructional strategies and use these reflections as talking points in feedback discussions between evaluator and teacher. 5. Provide opportunities for students to receive tutoring and individual help through "bootcamps" for ELA FSA. 6. Continuous monitoring to identify current at risk students through early warning indicators.
Person Responsible	<p>Debbie Lubbers (lubbers.debbie@brevardschools.org)</p>

#2	
Title	Math and ELA learning gains for our students with disabilities
Rationale	Our Students with Disabilities subgroup, with a focus on the Lowest 25%, achieved a 22% in ELA achievement and a 32% in math achievement. This was a decline of 16% in ELA from 2018 and 20% decline in Math in 2018.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will increase our ELA proficiency and our Math proficiency of our Students with Disabilities by increasing our ELA L25% achievement from 22% to 40% proficiency and our Mat L25% achievement from 32% to 55% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Debbie Lubbers (lubbers.debbie@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Progress monitoring and utilization of results to modify instruction, including differentiation, high yield instructional strategies, and data discussions at small group collaborations. In addition, adding push-in support facilitation to MESH classes where there is a high number of ESE students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We believe that we did not adequately support our ESE students within their ELA and math classes. In addition, there needs to be differentiation within the classes and utilization of progress monitoring data to guide instruction in order for students to be able to master the standards.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase the number of push-in support facilitation within our schedule. 2. Have each teacher identify their lowest 25% ESE students to ensure awareness of students' specific academic needs. 3. Provide teachers with the opportunities to collaborate and discuss progress monitoring data and produce a product of common assessments, tasks, and/or lessons. 4. Schedule regular progress monitoring throughout the year for the math department (algebra-geometry). 5. Provide PDD day for MESH teachers with district Resource teachers to demonstrate lessons, tasks and quality assessments that are standard-based. 6. Provide opportunities for students to receive tutoring and individual help through "bootcamps" for Algebra 1 and Geometry.
Person Responsible	Debbie Lubbers (lubbers.debbie@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Students below 90% attendance
Rationale	Attendance below 90% is an indicator of at-risk students in the Early Warning System. In 2018-2019, 238 of students at MIHS had an attendance rate below 90%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 2019-2020 school year, no more than 5% of our student population will have below a 90% attendance rate.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Andrew Hoppenbrouwer (hoppenbrouwer.andrew@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Consistent monitoring and excessive absence reports will be run to identify the students-at-risk of excessive absences. In addition, face to face communication with at risk students, parent meetings, and intervention meetings will be held to address the individual student absences and interventions that should be implemented..
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Student face to face meetings and communication to parents provides many students as well as parents with the accountability needed to improve attendance. In addition, having a procedure in place to monitor attendance and a process to implement interventions will aide in better attendance.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Twice monthly excessive attendance reports are run to identify at risk students. 2. Dean's will meet with students at risk of attendance below 90%. 3. Deans will send home letters to parents detailing district attendance policy. 4. Intervention meetings will take place for students that have a high absence rate.
Person Responsible	Andrew Hoppenbrouwer (hoppenbrouwer.andrew@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

We will also be implementing training for our teachers on the Trauma Centered Classroom and implementing Sources of Strength in order to address the social/emotional needs of our students.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: ELA lowest 25% learning gains				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			4011 - Merritt Island High School	Other		\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Math and ELA learning gains for our students with disabilities				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			4011 - Merritt Island High School	Other		\$0.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Students below 90% attendance				\$0.00
					Total:	\$0.00