

Brevard Public Schools

Rockledge Senior 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	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Rockledge Senior High School

220 RAIDER RD, Rockledge, FL 32955

<http://www.rockledge.brevard.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Buster Clark B

Start Date for this Principal: 6/25/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	46%
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

The goal of Rockledge High School, through input of students, staff, parents, and community is to provide an environment that is safe, conducive to learning, hospitable and open to the free interchange of ideas.

Provide the school's vision statement

Contributing Educational Excellence to our Community

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Clark, Buster	Principal	
Kulaga, Terri	Assistant Principal	
Hamilton, Terri	Teacher, ESE	
Zeiler, Mark	Assistant Principal	
Papczynski, Peter	Assistant Principal	
Keehn, Aaron	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chairperson

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	393	418	383	317	1511
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	140	146	144	481
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	78	42	18	249
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	47	32	27	146
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	64	96	80	304

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	176	202	193	158	729

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	0	16	28	54	98
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	6

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

87

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/25/2019

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	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	58%	59%	56%	56%	58%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	52%	51%	54%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	40%	42%	43%	44%	44%
Math Achievement	41%	48%	51%	37%	50%	51%
Math Learning Gains	42%	49%	48%	31%	46%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	45%	45%	36%	43%	45%
Science Achievement	56%	66%	68%	64%	67%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	64%	70%	73%	61%	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	393 (0)	418 (0)	383 (0)	317 (0)	1511 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	51 ()	140 ()	146 ()	144 ()	481 (0)
One or more suspensions	111 (0)	78 (0)	42 (0)	18 (0)	249 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	40 (0)	47 (0)	32 (0)	27 (0)	146 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	64 (0)	64 (0)	96 (0)	80 (0)	304 (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	60%	62%	-2%	55%	5%
	2018	60%	60%	0%	53%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	56%	59%	-3%	53%	3%
	2018	50%	61%	-11%	53%	-3%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

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	54%	66%	-12%	67%	-13%
2018	62%	67%	-5%	65%	-3%
Compare		-8%			

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	61%	71%	-10%	70%	-9%
2018	58%	70%	-12%	68%	-10%
Compare		3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	32%	61%	-29%	61%	-29%
2018	22%	62%	-40%	62%	-40%
Compare		10%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	42%	60%	-18%	57%	-15%
2018	43%	60%	-17%	56%	-13%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		-1%			

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	24	31	24	14	48	44	32	33		75	31
ELL	36	50					40			80	
BLK	35	40	31	24	36	40	34	48		79	41
HSP	64	60	44	41	47	62	55	62		92	72
MUL	68	52	20	56	35		62	70		83	55
WHT	68	54	44	52	45	59	71	74		94	74
FRL	46	44	33	33	40	45	47	53		81	48

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	15	33	37	22	33	30	19	37		74	19
ELL	27	45		30	27						
ASN	87	86					80				
BLK	31	44	42	24	22	27	40	43		83	46
HSP	56	48	19	30	29	53	59	70		89	59
MUL	64	60	50	39	31		65	50		71	76
WHT	70	61	54	47	38	43	83	73		91	78
FRL	43	50	42	28	27	34	49	50		82	49

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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	87
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	635
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	59
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	41
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	62
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	64
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	50
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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile showed the lowest overall performance with only 36 percent of students scoring at level three or above.

FACTORS-Resources need to be allocated to reduce class sizes so that more targeted interventions may be implemented.

Trends- ELA Lowest 25th Percentile achievement reduced 7 percent from 2018 (43%) to 2019 (36%)

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

Science Achievement showed a decline from 64% proficiency to 56% proficiency (-8% proficiency year to year).

Factors- With the change of the science sequence, Rockledge High School placed all those students in Biology last year. A decline in science achievement was expected as a result of this change. Additionally, we had several inexperienced Biology teachers teaching the course.

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

Science Achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. In 2019, Rockledge High School's Science Achievement was 56% compared to the state average of 68%. In 2018, Rockledge High School's Science Achievement was 64%, compared to the state average of 67%. With the change of the science sequence, Rockledge High School placed all those students in Biology last year. A decline in science achievement was expected as a result of this change. Additionally, we had several inexperienced Biology teachers teaching the course.

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

Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest 25th Percentile showed the greatest improvement with an 11% increase respectively. A two-year comparison shows Rockledge High School's Learning Gains increase from 17% below state average in 2018 to just 6 points below the state average in 2019. Math Achievement increased from 37% proficiency in 2018 to 41% in 2019. Rockledge High School implemented a tutoring program which provided targeted interventions for math students and lowest 25th percentile math students. Additionally, Rockledge High School lowered class sizes of Algebra by hiring an additional teacher, furthermore, assignment of teachers was more targeted for increased math achievement.

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

Rockledge High School's greatest areas of concern are ELA Lowest 25th Percentile (36% proficiency) and Science Proficiency (56% proficiency).

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

1. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
2. Science Achievement
3. Math Achievement
4. Social Studies Achievement
5. Math Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Implementation of the 2019/2020 Rockledge High School Raider Focus 41% of our teachers agreed with the statement: "Students at my school write to explain their ideas across all subject areas."
Rationale	46% of our teachers agreed with the statement: "Students at my school support their answers and explain their thinking."

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	To cultivate an instructional culture that remains fiercely dedicated to the elements of excellent instruction through a literacy-rich curriculum.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Bradley Merrill (merrill.bradley@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Teachers will provide a literacy-rich curriculum by helping students build knowledge through content rich texts in appropriate courses, facilitate reading, writing, speaking and listening grounded in evidence from text. In addition, the following components should be observable during the cycle of instruction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Posting Clear Learning Objectives -Step by step teaching and a gradual release of responsibility to the students -Supporting students to take responsibility for their learning through guided practice -Teacher regularly checks for understanding -Adjustments are made to instruction based on formative assessment and teacher observation during guided practice -Writing to learn strategies have been taught to all appropriate content area teachers and teachers are given planning days throughout the year to develop lessons and to disaggregate student data on writing to learn assignments. -Hired an additional reading teacher to reduce Intensive Language Arts class sizes -Content area coaches in Science and English Language Arts have been allocated for 3 periods per day to assist teachers in tested subjects -Additional Instructional Assistant hours have been allocated for more targeted math interventions
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By providing a literacy-rich curriculum and implementing elements of excellent instruction, student achievement should increase across all content areas by providing student access to more complex texts, and offering a scaffolded approach for students to increase achievement via more rigorous content.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop RHS 2019-2020 Raider Focus 2. Create calendar for PD supporting only a Literacy-Rich Curriculum and Elements of Excellent Instruction 3. Introduce Raider Focus to faculty during pre-planning

4. Facilitate PD sessions supporting Raider Focus weekly on Tuesday mornings
5. Admin team observes Elements of Excellent instruction via walkthroughs and refers content coaches as needed

Person Responsible

Peter Papczynski (papczynski.peter@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)

Brad Merrill (Principal) has expanded the City of Rockledge Schools Community Leaders Council which is comprised of all the community schools' Principals and City Leaders twice per school year.

School safety drills are coordinated with Rockledge Police Department, Rockledge Fire Department, and Rockledge Regional Hospital twice throughout the year. Drills contain active assailant scenarios, and provide necessary law enforcement response training on campus. Paramedics and hospital personnel are trained in triage, and transport.