

Brevard Public Schools

Edgewood Jr/Sr High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	0

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	17%
2019-20 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%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 7-12	No	15%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	32%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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
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	
Phillips, Diane	SAC Member	SAC Chairperson

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Jacqueline Ingratta M

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	17%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

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	182	186	154	150	134	131	937	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	2	0	6	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	0	

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		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/13/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

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		
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	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	

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

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

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	0
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%	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
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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%	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	90
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	87
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.

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. During the 2018, 2019, and pre-COVID 2020 school years we utilized a Power Hour (AKA Indian Time) where students could go to their teacher for assistance twice per week. There continues to be tutoring available in the media center and virtually twice a week, or as needed, by peer tutors from the National Honor Society. In addition, we added an ESE certified math teacher. Our curriculum is also more succinct. Previously department teams spent time 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. Data from the MAP assessments have added to progress monitoring and teacher driven instruction based on student progress.

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 was Hispanic students in science. This dropped by 9% from the previous year. We explored factors that contributed to this

decline. It is still unknown at this time. A curriculum change has been made for the 2020-2021 school year in which AP Biology and AP Chemistry are taught back to back with Biology 2 Honors and Chemistry 2 Honors to allow more in depth instructional exposure and time. This change may also provide students with greater learning opportunities due to the increased focus on AP standards. One factor for the decline may be the high stress levels in our students which the curriculum change with these two high level courses may help alleviate. Many students 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. In the 2019 school year we were 45% above the state in this category. One factor that contributed to this gap is the addition of a regular algebra and geometry 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 and Geometry 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 state's trend in the 50th percentile. The plan was to add a section of Algebra 2 so that these students may continue to be supported with a more appropriate pace and instruction. However due to COVID-19 and a change in scheduling which affected state requirements with seat counts in 2021 school year, we currently do not have courses in Math below honors or advanced. Our teachers of these students are scaffolding and differentiating instruction in order to meet the needs of these lower performing students. This will enable them to continue to learn at a more appropriate pace. For the 2022 school year, the plan is to revert to the sections of Algebra 1, Geometry, and Algebra 2.

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 taken was to develop a more consistent curriculum. Teams met to develop a vertical alignment. In addition, we had the benefit of adding an instructional assistant. Our instructional assistant (IA) 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. Due to the lack of state assessment data for the 2020 school year, we are following the district implementation of utilizing Reading Plus to collect baseline data for all ELA students. This data will be instrumental providing teachers with progress monitoring of students' achievement gaps and levels. SAT data showed learning gains across the board for all of the students who took the assessment. The mean of scores from 2019 to 2020 schoolwide increased 43 points, in ERW Edgewood increased 25 points, and in Math the increase was 17 points. Edgewood led the district in SAT ERW scores.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Students who were at risk due to attendance continued to be at risk during the spring of the 2020 school year. This was a time period when all students were engaged in virtual learning due to school closure. The COVID learning slide also affected readiness for the 2021 school year. We are continuing to monitor the effects of this learning slide. Quarantining students and ensuring that they are logging in as eLearners has presented an area of concern. Keeping students on track is critical in any given school year, but more so with regard to the 2020 COVID learning slide. Unfortunately, Edgewood has had a number of students quarantined more than once further increasing the challenge of student engagement and motivation through eLearning as well as regular attendance.

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

1. Students social/emotional growth
2. E-Learning and instructional models due to COVID
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 as well as all current ELA students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and 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.
Measurable Outcome:	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 rating to at least a 3.5 in May of 2021.
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. Teachers are faced with not only establishing relationships with their in person students but eLearning students as well. The eLearning environment brings about challenges that require thinking outside the box. Teachers are working with parents and students to conduct virtual meetings. Due to the COVID landscape, there is no precedent to create evidence based strategies. Simply put we are learning as we go. Struggling eLearning students are able to return to in person learning and teachers are improving in their use of virtual platforms.
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 succeed, they are more likely to be successful. This is especially relevant in the COVID landscape due to eLearning platforms and difficulties faced as a result of indirect in person access to teachers and peers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. One way our students will learn stress management is through our TRIBE curriculum once per week in addition to building powerful relationships with their students.
2. We are continuing Sources of Strength to strengthen its presence now that we have a better understanding of the program, We continue to implement school-wide initiatives ensuring students know that someone is always available to support them.
3. Guidance has increased communication through our school web page. Additionally, a bulletin board contains important dates and information. A Google Classroom for every cohort has all the information they needed. Seniors continue to have information related to senior year and beyond.
4. Piloting Social Emotional Health Curriculum: Lions Quest used by all grade levels in the fall of 2020-2021 and Edgenuity for all grade levels in the spring of 2020-2021 school year. This is done every Friday during 3rd Block for 30 minutes.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The COVID-19 pandemic brought about challenges with student engagement and learning gains when Edgewood moved to virtual learning in the spring of 2020. With the reopening of schools eLearning became an alternative for students/families concerned with returning to in person learning. The addition to eLearning required teachers to develop and learn virtual platforms in order to reach virtual student in synchrony with in person students. Training for teachers was provided during preplanning and continues through a Google Classroom forum for teachers to share and learn from each other regarding best practices and tools of the trade. Elearners have access to Google Classroom, virtual platforms, and teacher web pages through FOCUS.

Virtual opportunities have been and will continue to be provided for parents and students in the various presentations: Open House, PTO meetings, SAC meetings, Grade Level Informational Nights, to name a few. Edgewood is dedicated to providing the necessary flexibility and grace to all students and families and will continue to work toward streamlined processes and procedures.

Measurable Outcome:

Our objective outcome is to have increased engagement of all students. Assessment and progress monitoring data should be in alignment between in person and eLearning students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julia Diakakis (diakakis.julia@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Continuity of instruction is a large concern so strategies are in place to ensure regular attendance along with a google document for quarantined students. We are continuing to modify attendance processes. We are also looking at strategies involved with delivering instruction and assignment submissions. Documentation of accommodations with eLearning students and in person students is a priority as well. Teachers have made adaptations to accommodate students with IEPs or 504s who are also eLearners.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

There are challenges brought about when teachers have both eLearning and in person students to instruct during the same time/class block. Teachers continue to work toward fluidity of learning structure even with the challenges brought on by the COVID landscape. Some of the challenges are related to holding virtual IEP and 504 meetings. Difficulties can arise with poor connectivity issues or lack of knowledge in using the various virtual meeting platforms. Teachers are overcoming some of these issues through continued training and collaboration. Furthermore, school counselors and administrators are monitoring those students who are lacking in motivation and working with teachers and parents to increase productivity.

Action Steps to Implement

The establishment and provision of links to Google Classrooms, FOCUS, and other resources are provided to support students during teacher quarantine. This enables continuity of learning/instruction. Teachers who are quarantined but are not sick may work from home through virtual platforms and interact with all of their students. Substitute teachers are provided to maintain attendance taking, supervision, and support for learning. Teachers are accessing professional development on a continuing basis for strategies to motivate eLearners. Strategies are centered around regular attendance, engagement in chat/breakout rooms or with teacher/students in the classroom even if the teacher is teaching through a virtual platform on a given day. Teachers, counselors, students, parents, and school leadership will continue to monitor and assure that 504 and IEP accommodations are implemented for all students. Due to difficulties with

Block Scheduling and attendance, students worry about missing classes which prompts flexibility from administration and the attendance clerk.

Person Responsible Julia Diakakis (diakakis.julia@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to a decline in students with disabilities (SWD) in math during the 2018-2019 school year, we had chosen to focus on progress monitoring with our math teachers. The shift to at-home learning in the final months of the 2019-2020 school year and the resulting loss of assessment data mean that we must increase our monitoring of students' true current levels of mastery. 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. Upper-level National Honor Society student tutors will be utilized for additional peer support.
Measurable Outcome:	Our school will see an increase in mathematics scores, especially for students with disabilities.
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 individual data chats with both in-person and eLearners. Instruction can also be more individualized based on the results of the MAPs tool. Select teachers will hold Google Classroom academic support sessions for students not meeting the MAP benchmarks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this strategy is our drop in mathematics scores for students with disabilities during the 2018-2019 school year. 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 Steps to Implement

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 during class or during individual data chat conferences. Teachers can also combine groups to reach more students. For example, one of the Algebra teachers might teach a small group on solving equations. Students from the other Algebra classes offered during the same period could also attend this session, even though it is not with 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 the Algebra Nation and Geometry Nation programs.

Person Responsible Julia Diakakis (diakakis.julia@brevardschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

We had some students during the 2018-2019 school year 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---a problem compounded by the shift to at-home learning at the end of 2019-2020 and the assessment data gap due to COVID-19. As a result, we will be monitoring all ELA students during the 2020-2021 school year, broadening our focus from the ILA group. Upper-level National Honor Society student tutors will be utilized for additional peer writing support. 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) during the 2020-2021 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

Students who previously scored below a level 3 on their last ELA FSA assessment (spring 2019) will be successful on their next assessment in spring 2021 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 at three times during the year: as a diagnostic tool in September 2020, as a midyear checkpoint in January 2021, and as an end-of-year summative assessment in late spring 2021. This program targets fluency, comprehension and vocabulary, and at-home access to the program means seamless data collection for all our students, regarding of their learning platform. By practicing these skills, students will have the tools needed to be successful on the ELA FSA. Select teachers will hold Google Classroom academic support sessions for students not meeting the Reading Plus benchmarks.

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 perform on the FSA and which subskills still require additional instruction. Teachers can use the three testing data points for progress monitoring and for appropriate instructional adjustment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be given a Reading Plus account. Intensive Language Arts students are asked to work on this independently on their own time. All students will take a Reading Plus assessment in September 2020, January 2021, and late spring 2021 for progress monitoring.
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.
5. Teachers will use the information gleaned from Reading Plus to hold data chats with students in need of support, whether in-person or at-home learners.

Person Responsible

Abby Saul (saul.abby@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The school leadership team will continue to not only monitor their respective areas of focus but discussions on progress will occur throughout the school year in PLLT and PLT meetings as well as leadership team meetings. Threat assessment meetings will target students who are a concern in any of our areas of focus. Review of relative reports such as attendance, course failures, D & F reports, College and Career Readiness, graduation status and cohort, and behavioral reports will occur with all members of the leadership team on a regular basis during the above mentioned meetings.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

In January of 2020, students took the Youth Truth Survey (YTS). YTS provides feedback from student perspectives. In disaggregating the data, the areas of relationships and culture are Edgewood's greatest strengths. Edgewood scored a 4.43 (out of 5) on "How many of your teachers believe that you can get a good grade if you try?" Edgewood scored a 3.64 (2nd highest) on "Most adults in this school treat students with respect." Edgewood scored in the top 10% on most questions/statements in the areas of relationships and culture. An area in need of improvement is academic rigor which is surprising based on Edgewood's college preparatory curriculum. Students noted that teachers know the content they teach, but Edgewood scored a 3.9 (tied for 6th) on "My teachers give me assignments that help me to better understand the subject." Students noted a desire to connect learning to world experiences and future careers. An idea for further reflection for both teachers and administrators is the need to understand student life outside of school.

A yearly survey is administered to parents. Administration disaggregates all data. Data without comments is shared with staff. In 2019-2020, a pattern of comments pertained to communication along with suggestions for improvement. Due to work schedules, several parents noted that evening activities were not always accessible. Additionally, parents noted that some teachers were not communicating if a student was underperforming. Since the survey, administration created "communication officers" (Media Specialist and Teacher Leader) where information is disseminated via Facebook, school website, Blackboard Connect, and a weekly "Monday Report." During the COVID-19 quarantine, administration communicated daily via email and Blackboard Connect, and then transitioned to twice weekly in May. According to survey data, email is the best method of communication (93.41%) followed by Blackboard Connect Text Messaging (63.74%). Administration shared that teachers are expected to contact parents should a student's grade drop to a D/F or if change in behavior is noticed.

In January of 2020, BPS launched its annual Insight Survey where teachers provide feedback to administration regarding school operations, leadership, professional development as well as diversity,

equity and inclusion. Two emergent patterns were balance in class sizes and attendance email reminders seeming more of a reprimand than reminder. Administration explained that teacher preference of specific schedules and planning periods may effect class sizes, but we would work toward better balance. Additionally, attendance reminders would no longer include administration to alleviate the feeling of reprimand. Regarding trend data, Edgewood dropped in school operations from 7.3 to 6.7, but increased in professional development 5.3 to 5.6 and observation and feedback from 5.4 to 6.2. In 2019, subject specific professional development was a focus. Administrators observed and provided feedback to every teacher, not just those they evaluated. While instructional planning for student growth scored lowest, Edgewood increased in this domain from 4.4 to 4.5. An area of focus for 2021 is diversity, equity and inclusion. Administration continues to attend training to increase our score from 5.2. No prior trend data in this domain exists.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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