Edgewood Jr/Sr High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Edgewood Jr/Sr High School

180 E MERRITT AVE, Merritt Island, FL 32953

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

Demographics

Principal: Jacqueline Ingratta M

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	17%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (90%) 2017-18: A (89%) 2016-17: A (88%) 2015-16: A (89%) 2014-15: A (96%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* 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.

Table of Contents

Edgewood Jr/Sr High School

180 E MERRITT AVE, Merritt Island, FL 32953

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 7-12	No	14%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	27%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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 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, 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

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ingratta, Jacqueline	Principal	Principal
Diakakis, Julia	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, Curriculum and Instruction
Flora, Christy	SAC Member	SAC Chair
Stewart, Nicholas	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Cooper-Denton, Kristi	School Counselor	Guidance Department Chair
Roessler, Sarah	Administrative Support	School Secretary
Saxenmeyer, Jacqueline	Other	School Resource Officer
Worcester, Jeff	Teacher, K-12	Athletic Director and Teacher
Taylor, Danielle	School Counselor	ESE Contact
Saul, Abby	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	184	187	164	148	137	125	945
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3	4	3	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	2	1	4	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	2	5	23
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

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	1	2	2	1	0	6

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	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

57

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/17/2019

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	
One or more suspensions	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	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	

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	96%	59%	56%	96%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	75%	52%	51%	78%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	82%	40%	42%	79%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	96%	48%	51%	93%	48%	49%
Math Learning Gains	76%	49%	48%	71%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	83%	45%	45%	71%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	95%	66%	68%	97%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	99%	70%	73%	99%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	184 (0)	187 (0)	164 (0)	148 (0)	137 (0)	125 (0)	945 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	4 ()	1 ()	3 ()	3 ()	4 ()	3 ()	18 (0)
One or more suspensions	3 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	4 (0)	15 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	2 (0)	6 (0)	8 (0)	2 (0)	5 (0)	23 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (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
07	2019	95%	58%	37%	52%	43%
	2018	93%	56%	37%	51%	42%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	96%	63%	33%	56%	40%
	2018	97%	65%	32%	58%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
09	2019	98%	62%	36%	55%	43%
	2018	99%	60%	39%	53%	46%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
10	2019	99%	59%	40%	53%	46%
	2018	99%	61%	38%	53%	46%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	97%	62%	35%	54%	43%
	2018	99%	62%	37%	54%	45%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-99%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	90%	53%	37%	48%	42%
	2018	94%	55%	39%	50%	44%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	66%	33%	67%	32%
2018	99%	67%	32%	65%	34%
Compare	0%				

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	74%	24%	71%	27%
2018	97%	73%	24%	71%	26%
Compare		1%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	71%	29%	70%	30%
2018	100%	70%	30%	68%	32%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	61%	35%	61%	35%
2018	97%	62%	35%	62%	35%
Compare		-1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	60%	36%	57%	39%
2018	100%	60%	40%	56%	44%
Compare		-4%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	93	85		94	64						
ASN	100	79		93	78		96	100	89		
HSP	93	75	71	93	69	71	89	95	100		
MUL	98	91		100	81		100	100	100	100	100
WHT	97	73	83	97	77	85	95	99	97	100	92
FRL	96	76	77	93	75	73	93	98	90	100	83

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	92	36						100			
ASN	100	84		100	86		100	100	100		
HSP	97	73	79	100	73	83	98	97	100	100	95
MUL	98	73		97	73		96	100	94		
WHT	96	69	76	98	67	78	96	98	97	100	93
FRL	97	67	79	98	69	80	96	98	95		

2017 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
ASN	92	83		96	82		100	96	100		
HSP	96	79	77	94	69	64	97	100	96	100	100
MUL	100	79		92	75		100	96	100		
WHT	96	78	80	93	70	73	97	99	95	100	92
FRL	94	77	82	90	67	62	96	98	88		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	90
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	992
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	84
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	91
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	84
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	97
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	90
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	87
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance is math learning gains for students with disabilities. In order to assist our students with disabilities we needed to increase their opportunities for assistance. We have since added a Power Hour (AKA Indian Time) where students can go to their teacher for assistance twice per week. There is also tutoring available in the media center twice a week by peer tutors from the National Honor Society. In addition, we have added an ESE certified math teacher. Our curriculum is also more succinct. We had a team spend time over the summer aligning our curriculum across all subjects and grade levels. Therefore, 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.

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

The component that had the greatest decline from the previous year is Hispanic students in science. This dropped by 9% from the previous year. We are exploring the factors that have contributed to this decline. It is unknown at this time. One factor may be the high stress levels in our students. Many of them are stressed from their rigorous classes and numerous standardized tests most likely contribute to their stress as well. Our students care deeply about their grades and test scores so they feel the pressure very easily. Also, the population of this subgroup is very small so this decline could represent one or two students.

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 component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was math achievement. We are 45% above the state in this category. One factor that contributed to this gap is the addition of a regular algebra class. While all of our students work above grade level, some of our 8th graders were not ready for the honors version of their mathematics course. The addition of one section of Algebra 1 allowed the teacher to move at a pace that was better matched to these students, thus allowing them to be more successful. We typically trend in the 90th percentile for math compared to the states trend in the 50th percentile.

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

The area that improved the most was students with disabilities in ELA learning gains. They went from 36% in 2018 to 85% in 2019. One of the new actions we took was to develop a more consistent curriculum. We had teams meet in the summer to develop a vertical alignment. In addition, we had the benefit of adding an instructional assistant. Our instructional assistant pushed into ELA classrooms and primarily assisted our students with disabilities. The IA also checked in with them frequently and reminded them to complete assignments and answered questions in areas in which they were struggling.

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

Our main area of concern in relation to EWS is attendance. Part of the issue is ensuring that teachers are marking attendance correctly. Another part of our attendance problem is that we have a few

students who are consistently absent. We need to have better communication with parents and documentation to notify parents so students are present more often. There is a direct correlation to students' absentee rate and their academic performance.

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

1. Students social/emotional growth
2. Attendance: better checks and balances across all school systems
3. Progress monitoring for math with all students, including a focus on SWD
4. Progress monitor students who scored below a level 3 and opted out of ILA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Social Emotional Growth
Rationale	Based on student survey data, students are lacking the ability to cope with stress and stressful situations. Our seniors have stated year after year that they do not feel they are taught the necessary skills to cope with stress. This causes students to stress out and shut down, thus putting them further behind. Students have also been visiting the guidance office more frequently to discuss their academics, their stress and how to manage their busy lives.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome that we plan to achieve is improved data on our student survey, particularly our senior student survey. Our class of 2019 ranked stress management education at a 2.67 on a one to five scale. We would like to improve this to at least a 3.5.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jacqueline Ingratta (ingratta.jackie@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Building relationships with students is extremely important. Through our TRIBE classes, teachers are provided the opportunity to follow a class of students from 7th-12th grade, thus providing ample time for the teachers to get to know the students. Our teachers will be provided a google doc in which every student in the school will be listed by grade level. The teachers will have the ability to place their name next to students who they feel they have a meaningful positive relationship with. We will then look for students who do not have a teacher's name next to theirs and work to build relationships with those students by getting them involved in school activities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting this strategy is the evidence behind the power of building relationships with students. In 'The 5 Powers of an Educator', Mawi Asgedom shares that power 2 is to relate with heart. He describes how poverty is the absence of positive relationships. Students need these meaningful relationships to feel valued and to succeed in school. When students feel that teachers are genuine, deeply care about them and desire for them to succed, they are more likely to be successful.

Action Step	
Description	1. One way our students will learn stress management is through our TRIBE curriculum. Over the summer a group of teachers planned activities to help students learn coping skills. Teachers use this curriculum during their TRIBE class once per week in addition to building powerful relationships with their students. We will also implement the state mandated 5 hours of mental health instruction during our TRIBE classes.
	2. Sources of Strength is a new program we began last year. This year we hope to continue to strengthen it's presence now that we have a better understanding of the program, how it works and the needs of our school. We will implement school-wide initiatives to help students realize their unique differences and to ensure they know that someone is always available to listen and support them.
	3. Another way we can help with students' social emotional growth is by providing increased communication from guidance. We continue to provide a guidance section on our school webpage. In addition, we manage a bulletin board with important dates and information. This year we have added a google classroom for seniors so they have all the information they need for a very important year.

Person Responsible	Kristi Cooper-Denton (cooper.kristi@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	Inaccurate reporting, in addition to multiple students missing a large number of days, has led to a decrease in attendance rates. When students are not in school, they are not as successful in the classroom.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Attendance will be reported more accurately by teachers. This will partially contribute to the attendance rates increasing. We will also be more diligent with our communication to parents about their students' absences and put a plan in place for students to be present more often.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Julia Diakakis (diakakis.julia@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will tighten our attendance reporting procedures and ensure teachers are taking attendance accurately. We will also increase communication with all stakeholders, especially parents.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to Hanover Research's report from August 2016, there are a few key findings about student attendance rates. First, chronic absenteeism is shown to reduce educational outcomes. Therefore, addressing this issue is extremely important for our students academic success. Next, the most successful policies should involve families and the broader school community. We will increase our communication with parents so they are aware of their child's absences which will allow us to work on a plan together to help their child succeed. In addition, attendance policy success is often contingent on collecting and correctly interpreting well-targeted school attendance data. Our initiative to tighten up our attendance procedures will help us ensure accurate reporting.

Action Step	
Description	1. We will follow up with teachers daily to ensure their attendance is being reported accurately. 2. Our attendance clerk will send letters home to families at 3, 5, 7 & 9 days absent. 3. We will hold meetings with parents, students and administration at 7 days absent. 4. During our meetings, we will create a plan for students with 7 or more absences. This plan will detail how we can assist students and families with their attendance issues. 4. We will create a contract for students at 9 days absent reminding them that the district policy is that students cannot have more than 9 unexcused days per semester before they are considered for failing due to absences.
Person Responsible	Julia Diakakis (diakakis.julia@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Progress monitoring for math
Rationale	Due to a decline in students with disabilities (SWD) in math, we are choosing to focus on progress monitoring with our math teachers. With the new implementation of the NWEA MAPs progress monitoring tool, we will be able to guide our math teachers through the process of progress monitoring their students and adjusting their curriculum accordingly.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our school will see an increase in mathematics scores, especially for students with diabilities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Julia Diakakis (diakakis.julia@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will utilize the MAPs progress monitoring tool. Teachers will then analyze this data so they can adjust their curriculum as needed. They will also be able to provide assistance to struggling students through tutoring during Indian Time. This instruction can be more individualized based on the results of the MAPs tool.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting this strategy is our drop in mathematics scores for students with disabilities. While our ELA learning gains increased dramatically, our math scores for our SWD students dropped. By using a progress monitoring tool, teachers will be able to formatively assess these students throughout the year and have easily accessible data to analyze.

Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will utilize MAPs for progress monitoring three times per year. They will analyze their data and look for trends and students who are struggling. 2. Teachers will meet in their PLTs and have data discussions in addition to planning strategies to assist their struggling students. Teachers will discuss ways to service these students either in small groups in their classrooms or during Indian time. Teachers can also combine groups to reach more students. For example, one of the Algebra teachers might teach a small group during Indian time on solving equations. Students from the other Algebra classes would also attend this sessions, even though it is not their teacher. 3. Competency based instruction will be the focus of the math teachers. Teachers of Mathematics have expressed their desire to continue to use Algebra Nation, and in 2019-2020, Geometry teachers will use Geometry Nation.
Person Responsible	Christy Flora (flora.christy@brevardschools.org)

#4	
Title	Progress monitoring for ILA students
Rationale	We have some students who scored below a level 3 opt out of intensive language arts (ILA) instruction. Left unmonitored, these students may not score proficient again the following year causing great concern, especially in the 10th grade. Our goal is that all of our students are successful and earn a passing score on their English Language Arts (ELA) Florida Standards Assessment (FSA). .

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students who previously scored below a level 3 will be successful on their next ELA FSA and score a level 3 or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Julia Diakakis (diakakis.julia@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will be using progress monitoring to assist us in helping these students achieve success. We will do this through the use of Reading Plus. This program targets fluency, comprehension and vocabulary. By practicing these skills, students will have the tools needed to be successful on the ELA FSA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Utilizing this program allows us to see comparison between previous assessments. This allows us to target specific areas of concern and provide interventions as needed. Reading Plus is also a great predictor of how successful a student will be on the FSA.

Action Step	
Description	1. Students will be given a Reading Plus account. Students are asked to work on this independently on their own time. 2. Ms. Saul will provide Dr. Diakakis weekly Reading Plus reports. Dr. Diakakis will meet with these students to discuss their progress. 3. Ms. Saul will pull students three times per year to administer a progress monitoring assessment within the Reading Plus program. 4. Ms. Saul will check in with these students' teachers and monitor their grades. She will check-in with students as needed.
Person Responsible	Abby Saul (saul.abby@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).

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Social Emotional Growth**				**$2,500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	4021 - Edgewood Jr/Sr High School	School Improvement Funds		$2,500.00
			Notes: Payment of teachers to be trained in the summer on develop of TRIBE (social/ emotional) curriculum.			
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Attendance**				**$300.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	7300	370-Communications	4021 - Edgewood Jr/Sr High School	General Fund		$300.00
			Notes: Stamps and printing costs to mail home various communications.			
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Progress monitoring for math**				**$1,500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	520-Textbooks	4021 - Edgewood Jr/Sr High School	General Fund		$1,500.00
			Notes: Purchase of supplemental resources for mathematics (Algebra, Geometry)			
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Progress monitoring for ILA students**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$4,300.00**