

Brevard Public Schools

Edgewood Jr/Sr High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Edgewood Jr/Sr High School

180 E MERRITT AVE, Merritt Island, FL 32953

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide a positive and safe environment for all students with a challenging curriculum, with high expectations for student achievement, and with emphasis on critical thinking skills, problem solving, a sound knowledge base, and lifelong learning skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To seek excellence in who we are, what we know, and what we do.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ingratta, Jacqueline	Principal	Principal
Stewart, Nicholas	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Instruction Contact
Flora, Christy	Assistant Principal	Operations, Facilities and Student Services
Cooper-Denton, Kristi	School Counselor	Guidance Department Chair
Taylor, Danielle	School Counselor	ESE Contact
Saul, Abby	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach
Kaltenbach, Andy	Administrative Support	Athletic Director / Activities Coordinator
Phillips, Diane	SAC Member	SAC Chair and Instructional Staff
Cofer, Brandy	Graduation Coach	College and Careers Specialist / Coach

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The individuals noted above are all members of the leadership team. We meet weekly to discuss calendar updates, recognitions, concerns and school improvement data. Ms. Phillips serves as the SAC chair and Ms. Saul serves as Edgewood's literacy coach. Each member has a unique role as it relates to the school improvement process. There are weekly and monthly meetings scheduled for school improvement purposes. The SAC reviews the school improvement plan and input is offered from parents, students, staff and community members. The SAC will vote on whether it agrees with the goals outlined in the school improvement plan. The school improvement plan is shared with the Professional Learning Leadership Team (PLLT also known as Department Chairs) so input may be collectively gathered and discussed for school improvement purposes. There are monthly meetings with the Literacy Leadership Team to determine areas of growth for students who may not meet benchmark standards, and a meeting takes place in May to determine benchmark standards for students who have been conditionally accepted to Edgewood Junior/Senior High School.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The school improvement process is ongoing. Regular weekly and monthly meetings occur in order for educators to determine the best course of action for students. No meeting is held in isolation. Minutes are collected for each meeting, and those minutes are shared with stakeholders. The school improvement plan is discussed as SAC (School Advisory Council) meetings as well as PTO (Parent Teacher Organization) meetings.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	32%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	17%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)

	White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	94	53	52	96	59	56
ELA Learning Gains	74	52	52	75	52	51
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	79	40	41	82	40	42
Math Achievement*	96	37	41	96	48	51
Math Learning Gains	80	44	48	76	49	48
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	85	46	49	83	45	45
Science Achievement*	94	63	61	95	66	68
Social Studies Achievement*	96	67	68	99	70	73
Middle School Acceleration	95			97		
Graduation Rate	100			100		
College and Career Acceleration	98			93		
ELP Progress						

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.](#)

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	90
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	991
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	100

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	48			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	82			
HSP	88			
MUL	91			
PAC				
WHT	90			
FRL	88			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
 Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	94	74	79	96	80	85	94	96	95	100	98	
SWD	62	33										
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	95	82	88	97	69		96	100	96			
BLK	93	71										
HSP	92	81	76	90	87	71	92	95	92	100	93	
MUL	94	76	100	97	76		89	94	91	100	92	
PAC												
WHT	94	72	76	96	80	86	95	95	96	100	100	
FRL	93	70	80	93	76	81	91	93	91	100	100	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	91	68	68	95	58	64	92	97	93	100	95	
SWD	76	41		70	40			92				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	96	73	70	97	73		95	100	97			
BLK	100	79		94	50				90			
HSP	87	59	57	90	50	71	93	94	91	100	94	
MUL	96	72		100	48		95	93	95			
PAC												
WHT	90	68	69	95	60	62	91	98	93	100	95	
FRL	91	71	74	92	59	67	92	98	82	100	94	

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	96	75	82	96	76	83	95	99	97	100	93	
SWD	93	85		94	64							
ELL												

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	100	79		93	78		96	100	89			
BLK												
HSP	93	75	71	93	69	71	89	95	100			
MUL	98	91		100	81		100	100	100	100	100	
PAC												
WHT	97	73	83	97	77	85	95	99	97	100	92	
FRL	96	76	77	93	75	73	93	98	90	100	83	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	98%	54%	44%	50%	48%
07	2023 - Spring	90%	53%	37%	47%	43%
08	2023 - Spring	84%	52%	32%	47%	37%
09	2023 - Spring	96%	56%	40%	48%	48%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	100%	58%	42%	48%	52%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	77%	48%	29%	44%	33%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	51%	43%	50%	44%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	50%	43%	48%	45%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	61%	37%	63%	35%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	69%	27%	66%	30%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	62%	34%	63%	33%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

According to the data from the Florida Department of Education (***) Note the data on edudata.fldoe.org lags by one year (***) the component that had the greatest decline from the previous year was our subgroup of students with disabilities [SWD]. In reviewing the data from the Florida Department of Education, our SWD dropped from 64% to 48%. In 2021, our SWD had an achievement level of 3+ in English Language Arts [ELA] with 41% of our SWD making learning gains. In 2022, these data declined. 62% of our SWD earned a proficiency rating of 3+ on FAST while only 33% of our SWD made learning gains. We cannot compare any other achievement level (ie: Mathematics, Social Studies or Science) as there is not enough data available, which means we had fewer than 10 students in this particular subgroup. While our SWD subgroup is quite small (22 students in 2022 and 20 students in 2021) these

numbers can fluctuate drastically if one or two students do not meet proficiency. Still, these numbers remain a concern in ELA. We will explore factors that contributed to these decreases in proficiency on state assessments. Factors are unknown at this time. According to edudata.fldoe.org, Edgewood increased in every other area.

From school year 2022 to 2023, Edgewood's overall performance did not change drastically. The three areas where proficiency levels decreased are: Geometry (96% to 93%); ELA 8th grade (93% to 84%); and 8th grade Science (91% to 77%). In 2022, Edgewood increased in all areas across every grade level. With regard to 8th grade Science, the NGSSS assessment tested students on their knowledge from 6th, 7th and 8th grades. Students are assessed in Science in 5th grade, but the Class of 2027, who took the 8th grade Science assessment, did not take an assessment in 5th grade due to COVID. Consequently, these students never took a standardized Science assessment at all. The state percentage of students scoring 3+ is 44%, with the district average being slightly higher at 48%.

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

As in past years, the data component that showed the lowest performance is ELA and ELA learning gains for students with disabilities. In order to assist our students with disabilities (SWD), we have increased opportunities for assistance. We hired an instructional assistant to work with our SWD students during power hour (lunch), before school and after school. We increased our academic support by providing extra help/tutoring in both ELA and Mathematics by certified teachers outside of school hours. Additionally, we have an ESE-certified math teacher who provides added support for our SWD population. Previously and continuing for 2023, department teams spend time aligning curriculum across all subjects and grade levels. Teachers are aware of what students learned the previous year, what they are expected to learn this year and what they will be learning in their next course. Teachers use pacing charts for students to ensure that students are ready for the next level in the curriculum. Data from the MAP and FAST assessments add to progress monitoring and teacher-driven instruction based on student achievement.

Factors that contributed to this decline are unknown. Teachers document the accommodations used by SWD, but perhaps more training is needed to ensure that students are receiving the individualized support that is needed. During preplanning 2023, our ESE Contact/Guidance Counselor and our Assistant Principal for Curriculum (both of whom are ESE certified) led a training for all high school teachers to assist in support facilitation.

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 gap between Edgewood's levels of proficiency to the state's levels of proficiency is significant in all areas. Edgewood outperformed the district and the state in all areas. Edgewood's proficiency levels are above 90% in every area except ELA 8th grade and 8th grade Science (as noted in question 1).

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

The area that improved in ELA learning gains was that 94.2% of students scored levels 3+ in school year 2022. This is an increase from 91.2% in SY21. One of the new actions taken was to develop a more consistent curriculum. Teams met to develop a vertical alignment. We have an instructional assistant (IA) for students with disabilities. Our IA pushed into ELA classrooms and primarily assisted our students with disabilities. The IA also checked in with these students frequently and reminded them to complete assignments and answered questions in areas in which they were struggling. Read 180 data will be instrumental in providing teachers with progress monitoring of students' achievement gaps and levels.

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

In reflecting on our Early Warning Systems data, our primary area of concern is attendance. We had students take advantage of senior skip days, extended college visits as well as families planning various vacations and celebrations. In order to address our concerns, Administration implemented new procedures regarding student attendance and we outlined this information in our student handbook. Parents received detailed communication regarding excused and unexcused absences, and students are being held accountable for their attendance through proper documentation, parent letters and assigned detentions for tardiness.

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

There are three academic areas of concerns:

1. In reviewing our student survey data, particularly YouthTruth, there are two areas of focus. The first area of focus is the students who reported that "my work makes me think." The second area of focus is "my teachers make an effort to understand what my life is like outside of school." For the first area of focus, the students ranked the question 3.56 out of 5 that their work makes them think. For the second area of focus, the student ranked the question a 2.59 out of 5 on teachers making an effort to understand what their life is like outside of school.
2. ELA 8th grade - the level of proficiency for 2023 is 84%. This is a 9% decrease from 2022.
3. Attendance - 55 students (5% of our student body) had an attendance rate below 90% in 2023.
4. Science 8th grade (NGSSS) - the level of proficiency for 2023 is 77%. This is a 14% decrease from 2022, and one of the lowest scores Edgewood has received in several years.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We have several years of data available from the YouthTruth survey. Although we have seen an increase in the overall categorical rankings of Relationships and Academic Rigor, we looked deeply at the statements asked of our students and focused on two statements that were ranking low. Since relationships and academic challenge are important to the culture of Edgewood, the faculty collectively agreed to focus on:

1. My work makes me think.
2. My teachers make an effort to understand what my life is like outside of school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

1. In 2023, the students ranked "my work makes me think" a 3.56 out of 5. In 2024, we would like to increase this data to 4.0 out of 5.
2. In 2023, the students ranked "my teacher makes an effort to understand what my life is like outside of school" a 2.59 out of 5. In 2024, we would like to increase this data to 3.5 out of 5.

Monitoring:

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

Each faculty meeting, we will remind the staff of our goals. Additionally, we will monitor this data through classroom observations and conversations with students. The Student Government Association is also looking at this data, and the executive officers will work closely with Administration on ideas they have that could help us address these two areas of focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christy Flora (flora.christy@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers discussed strategies that they could implement to focus on ensuring that their assign work makes students think. The teachers meet monthly in their departments, and these areas of focus are on the meeting agendas. During faculty meetings, teachers will share strategies with their colleagues to help provide further ideas and support. Student Government will work with their peers to share the data and offer suggestions that would benefit teachers in helping them ensure that students think during their lessons and activities.

Guidance will also share individual stories with the students' direct teachers on their personal lives that may hinder their ability to perform as well as they would like. Teachers will then know and understand some of the struggles so they can scaffold the work accordingly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The student data from the YouthTruth survey is the rationale for these strategies. The data needs to be student and teacher driven. If we work collectively as a community, we will be able to address our students' areas of concern. The teachers collectively agreed to work on these particular areas.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Review and disseminate the data.

Person Responsible: Christy Flora (flora.christy@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 2023.

Discuss bimonthly (at both faculty and department meetings).

Person Responsible: Christy Flora (flora.christy@brevardschools.org)

By When: March 2024 - when we receive the results from the YouthTruth survey (or district-administered survey).

Classroom observations

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Ingratta (ingratta.jackie@brevardschools.org)

By When: April 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

While the ELA proficiency data for Edgewood is well above the state and district in every grade level, there are areas where improvement is needed. In grades 7 and 9, Edgewood showed a slight decrease in overall scores. For 7th grade, the overall proficiency level of students in 2022 was 92%, and 90% in 2023. For 9th grade, the overall proficiency level of students in 2022 was 98%, and 96% in 2023. There was a significant decline for students in 8th grade - from 93% in 2022 to 84% in 2023. Overall, Edgewood will monitor as well as work to improve the overall proficiency rates across all grade levels.

In reviewing the data from 2022, the proficiency levels of our students with disabilities [SWD] was 63% whereas in 2023 it increased to 69%.

In 10th grade, there was an increase from 95% in 2022 to 98% in 2023. Edgewood ranked 1st in the state for students meeting proficiency in 10th grade ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA proficiency will improve by grade level as noted below:

7th Grade - proficiency rates will increase from 90% to 93%.

8th Grade - proficiency rates will increase from 84% to 93%.

9th Grade - proficiency rates will increase from 96% to 98%.

10th Grade - proficiency rates will either remain at 98% or increase to 99/100%.

For SWD - proficiency rates will increase from 69% to 75%.

Monitoring:

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

FAST Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 data will continue to be used and disaggregated, which will allow teachers to target areas of deficiency. All departments are involved in using the data to drive instruction. Regular monitoring of interim reports, Read 180 data, and FAST progress monitoring allows Administration and the Guidance Counselors to inform all departments of struggling students and areas in need of targeted support. Additionally, students who had parents who opted them out of intensive reading are routinely progress monitored through Ms. Saul, Mr. Stewart, and their ELA teacher. Data chats will occur monthly in the Literacy Leadership Team meetings in order to target very specific benchmarks for students not meeting proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicholas Stewart (stewart.nicholas@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We continue to use progress monitoring to assist us in helping these students achieve success. We will do this through the use of Read 180 and FAST three times during the year: as a diagnostic tool in September 2023, as a midyear checkpoint in January 2024, and as an end-of-year summative assessment in late spring 2024. The Read 180 program targets fluency, comprehension and vocabulary, and at-home access to the program means seamless data collection for all our students in intensive reading. All ELA teachers hold office hours, and some of those sessions are targeted for fluency, comprehension, vocabulary and writing.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Utilizing the FAST PM 1, FAST PM 2 and Read 180 (inventory benchmark) data, teachers will be able to compare data with previous assessments. This allows us to target specific areas of concern and provide interventions as needed. These assessments are strong predictors of how successfully a student will perform on the FAST and which subskills still require additional instruction. Teachers can use the three testing data points for progress monitoring and for appropriate instructional adjustment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Students taking the Intensive Reading course take a reading inventory assessment.

Person Responsible: Abby Saul (saul.abby@brevardschools.org)

By When: All students will take a Read 180 inventory assessment in August 2023, January 2024 and late spring 2024 for progress monitoring.

Ms. Saul, along with the Literacy Leadership Team, will provide Mr. Stewart and Guidance with Read 180 reports. Mr. Stewart, Ms. Marquez (the intensive reading instructor) and Ms. Saul will meet with the students in intensive reading to discuss their progress.

Person Responsible: Abby Saul (saul.abby@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023, January 2024 and late spring 2024 for progress monitoring.

All ELA teachers in grades 7-10 will print and share their FAST PM 1 and FAST PM 2 data with the Literacy Leadership Team to target specific areas of growth.

Person Responsible: Nicholas Stewart (stewart.nicholas@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 2023, January 2024 and late spring of 2024.

The Literacy Leadership Team meeting is composed of ELA teachers, Guidance, Administration and the literacy coach. Decisions are made in this meeting based on concrete data to determine the level of support for each student who is performing below proficiency (and for those students who may be proficient but dropped a level or two from one progress monitoring assessment to another).

Person Responsible: Nicholas Stewart (stewart.nicholas@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In reviewing our Early Warning Systems, 5% (55 students) had less than a 90% attendance rate.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We would like to decrease the number of students with less than a 90% attendance rate from 5% to 4.5% (42 students).

Monitoring:

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

We will follow all district procedures as well as run regular attendance reports. Parents will be notified after their student is absent 3 days, 5 days, 8 days and continuously thereafter. Administration will include attendance in their probationary meetings with families.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christy Flora (flora.christy@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Regular notification to families - to include phone calls, emails, letters and meetings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We want to increase student attendance to benefit student performance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Educate students and families on the importance of attendance (through parent meetings and grade level meetings).

Person Responsible: Christy Flora (flora.christy@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Run regular reports

Person Responsible: Christy Flora (flora.christy@brevardschools.org)

By When: Weekly

Students who miss more than 5 days (without proper notification or documentation) will meet directly with Guidance and Administration.

Person Responsible: Christy Flora (flora.christy@brevardschools.org)

By When: A review of the reports will take place weekly.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The level of proficiency for 2023 for 8th grade Science (NGSSS) is 77%. This is a 14% decrease from 2022, and one of the lowest scores Edgewood has received in several years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We want to increase our overall 8th grade Science scores from 77% proficiency to 90%.

Monitoring:

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

The two 8th grade Science teachers will collaborate and use their unit tests to determine the areas of deficiency. The 8th grade Science teachers will give a common end-of-semester assessment/exam.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicholas Stewart (stewart.nicholas@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will ask the district resource teacher to meet with the department and discuss strategies for best practices, and the teachers will work together to develop standardized assessment questions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The decrease in score was the largest decrease across all grade levels and assessments.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Invite the district resource teacher to join the Science Department meeting.

Person Responsible: Nicholas Stewart (stewart.nicholas@brevardschools.org)

By When: October 2023

Allow release time for teachers to collaborate on best practices, complete a data review and develop common assessments.

Person Responsible: Nicholas Stewart (stewart.nicholas@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly meetings