Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

Name of School:

Eau Gallie High School

Area:

South

Principal:

Dr. Mark Mullins

Area Superintendent:

Jeremy Salmon

SAC Chairperson:

Kristin King

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

To Serve Every Student with Excellence as the Standard

Vision Statement:

Eau Gallie High School will serve every student in an environment of college and career readiness through

a professional and collaborative community supported by all its stakeholders.

Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

Data Analysis from multiple data sources: *(Needs assessment that supports the need for improvement)*

One place to start – three year trend history (optional):

Data Analysis from multiple data sources: Through examination of FCAT reading data over the past five years, a pattern has emerged in the areas of students reading at level 3 and above and students making learning gains in reading. Eau Gallie's trend has amounted to taking steps forward in one year and steps backward the next. In those **reading at Level 3 and above**, 62% did so in 2008, but this measure dropped to 56% in 2009. This pattern has continued with 60% in 2010, dropping to 57% in 2011, and topping out at 64% in 2012. **Learning gains in reading for the bottom quartile** reflected similarly beginning with 65% in 2008 and 53%, 58%, 56% and 69% in the 2009 through 2012 years respectively. This trend also is reflected when examining **learning gains for the total population** over the same time frame. Beginning in 2008, the numbers are 65%, 53%, 58%, 56% and 71%.

This ebb and flow begs an examination of previous strategic undertakings with an eye toward the possibility that Eau Gallie is letting off the proverbial gas pedal. It speaks to the maintenance and monitoring portions of the Continuous Improvement Model (CIM) and suggests the need to look at what has worked and to build upon that to maintain momentum in successive years.

Absent among these numbers is the performance of students in the higher grade levels. With this in mind, conclusions regarding performance trends may be made through examination of **Cambridge Exam data** and that of student data on the ACT exams. The chart below reflects six years of Cambridge Exam performance in the areas of biology and mathematics.

Year/ Subject	2007 Tests/% Pass	2008 Tests/% Pass	2009 Tests/% Pass	2010 Tests/%Pass	2011 Tests/% Pass	2012 Tests/% Pass
Biology	3/0%	4/0%	11/45.5%	22/9.1%	0/0%	12/50%
Math	0/0%	6/66.7%	36/33%	37/35.1%	66/22.7%	44/4.7%
All Tests	23/82.6%	139/83.5%	267/76.8%	223/72.6%	365/63.0%	412/68.1%

As the Cambridge program has grown, so have the numbers of students taking exams in the varied subject areas. While overall passing rates do not reflect the up and down trend of the FCAT reading scores, biology and math results pale by comparison to the other tested areas. With respect to biology, numbers tested reflect reluctance on the part of students to take this exam, and while the passing rates vary, they are well below the overall rates. Much of the same can be said regarding math although reluctance probably isn't part of the equation there. The commonality between both is lower passing rates. This lends merit to any effort intended to increase reading comprehension skills in the core subject areas, particularly in math and science.

This also appears to be the case as it pertains to ACT data. The chart below provides information on math, science, and reading scores over a five-year period starting in 2008. These numbers reflect student college readiness percentages as determined by the ACT. (See next page.)

Year	# Tested	Math	Science	Reading
2008	264	39%	19%	50%
2009	207	42%	27%	52%
2010	342	39%	20%	51%
2011	299	36%	17%	45%
2012	331	43%	29%	49%

The greater number of students tested lends further validity to the previous interpretation of the Cambridge Exam results. Poorer performance on the college readiness scale for math and science, particularly science, makes plausible the idea of infusing content-area reading strategies as a possible remedy. Furthermore, the fact that college readiness numbers in reading are hovering around the 50% or less for the past five years doubles the argument for reading more across the curriculum.

This year AVID, with its inherent strategies, makes the shift from being the focus of the SIP to being one of the engines driving the effort to raise reading scores. Additionally, the expansion of professional learning communities and the shift toward the common core standards will fuel the need for collaborative efforts. Add in the second year of the new teacher evaluation system and the requisite professional growth planning, and the need to gather these initiatives under a central theme (improving reading scores) will provide focus and a common direction in which to concentrate efforts.

Best Practice: *(What does research tell us we should be doing as it relates to data analysis above?)*

The facts and figures outlined in this research portion have been gathered from the Carnegie Corporation of New York report Reading Next: A Vision for Action and Research in Middle and High School Literacy. The prevalent theme throughout this report decries the abandonment of reading comprehension instruction at the secondary level, a stance that is backed by some sobering statistics. It then outlines a comprehensive approach toward remediating this problem, a solution that is eclectic in nature thus allowing schools to address the unique needs of their clientele.

Students who are good readers in third grade aren't necessarily destined for the same as they enter their secondary school years. As text complexity rises, comprehension strategies need to be taught in conjunction with the more demanding content. Couple the absence of this type of instruction with the likelihood of teenage apathy, and the combination yields some alarming numbers. Seventy percent of older readers, those defined as being between fourth and twelfth grade, struggle with reading comprehension. Statistics sited from 2003, reveal eight million struggling readers in the aforementioned age grouping and in excess of three thousand students dropping out of high school on a daily basis.

An included report entitled "The Fifteen Elements of Effective Adolescent Literacy Programs," provides multiple strategies that may be mixed and matched dependent upon individual's and schools' specific needs. Six of these lend

justification to the strategies being employed in the Eau Gallie 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan. They are as follows: intensive writing, ongoing formative assessment of students, extended time for literacy, ongoing summative assessment of students, and teacher teams.

The research is clear that the teaching of reading is not solely the domain of the language arts classes. Reading instruction geared toward comprehending non-fiction material, for example, textbooks and subject-area articles, needs to be occurring across the curriculum. These experts argue that students need to be engaged in some form of reading instruction for four to six hours daily. The authors of Common Core State Standards believe that, "Just as students must learn to read, write, speak, listen, and use language effectively in a variety of content areas, so too must the standards specify the literacy skills and understandings required for college and career readiness in multiple disciplines."

Furthermore, writing is a vehicle that when used properly can serve to improve reading comprehension. As these efforts are made, frequent formative assessments should be administered to determine progress and shape instruction. AVID foundations, Professional Learning Communities (PLC), the Common Core Curriculum, and the notion of collaboration that is inherent to all of these movements are now the vehicles driving school improvement.

Analysis of Current Practice: *(How do we currently conduct business?)*

For the past two years, Eau Gallie's School Improvement Plan (SIP) has hinged on the AVID program becoming part of the school's culture. In 2010-2011, this involved professional growth training geared toward infusing AVID-based strategies across the curriculum. These efforts created a true AVID/ college readiness school culture and resulted in the school being chosen as a National Demonstration School site. With B.E.S.T. (Brevard Effective Strategies for Teaching) being the calling for 2011-2012, Eau Gallie was successful in demonstrating the interrelatedness of its AVID approach and conducted BEST professional growth sessions that maintained an AVID flavor. With BEST's calling for professional collaboration and the formation of Professional Learning Communities, (PLC's) along with a new teacher evaluation protocol that required Professional Growth Plans (PGP's), it seems fair to say that measures taken to address new expectations reflected a suddenness and lessened the likelihood of a truly linear relationship among the common core infusion, the CIM, the SIP, PLC's, PGP's, and professional development trainings.

Further introspection among the faculty and staff has focused on our previous insistence of college readiness for all, punctuated in our vision and mission statements. This altruistic mindset has left out a significant portion of our clientele for whom college would not be on the horizon. With 43% of our tested population reading below grade level, we maintained this stance until this school year in which college readiness and career preparedness will join hands to advocate for education and training beyond high school.

What the Eau Gallie SIP has lacked over the past five years has been a razor-sharp focus on a specific need. Instead, it has advocated for AVID and the Glasser Model before that. These approaches have had significant merit and impact school -culture wise, but they needed to be the vehicles through which specific goals were addressed. Their broadness has favored subjectivity over specificity. Succinctly, as the 2012-2013 SIP is drafted, the question needs to be asked as to how AVID, the common core curriculum, the CIM, PLC's, and PGP's might be geared toward a common cause, in this case improving versus backsliding on the aforementioned reading data.

CONTENT AREA:

Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Parental Involvement	Drop-out Programs
Language Arts	Social Studies	Arts/PE	Other:		

School Based Objective: *(Action statement: What will we do to improve programmatic and/or instructional effectiveness?)*

Teachers at Eau Gallie will implement reading comprehension strategies across the curriculum with an emphasis on informational text.

Strategies: *(Small number of action oriented staff performance objectives)*

Barrier	*Action Steps*	*Person Responsible*	*Timetable*	*Budget*	*In-Process Measure*
1. The need to find a forum to educate teachers on Common Core Standards	1. Establish a Collaborative Team that focuses on Common Core standards to serve in an advisory and professional development capacity.	Reading Coach	August, 2012-May, 2013		Minutes and materials from PLC meetings
2. Training on the Common Core Standards	2. Train all core teachers on unpacking the standards as a means of properly implementing the Common Core Standards curriculum.	Assistant Principal over curriculum	August, 2012-May, 2013		Agendas and materials used in trainings

3. The need to implement Common Core Standards	3. Infuse the Common Core reading standards across the curriculum via the collaborative efforts of departmental PLC's.	Department Chairs	August, 2012-May, 2013		Meeting minutes
4. Identify a process/ method to incorporate reading and writing strategies.	4. Employ AVID-based WICOR strategies to engage students in reading content and reflective writing.	AVID site team/ AVID coordinator	August, 2012-May, 2013		Sample lessons
5. Time factor needed to identify appropriate informational text material	5. Enlist the aid of the reading coach to create processes within departments to feature appropriate informational text readings including current events, biographical material, on-line articles, and magazines.	Reading Coach	August, 2012-May, 2013		Departmental meeting minutes/ Coach's activity log
6. Importance of daily incorporation of higher order thinking	6. Incorporate higher-order thinking questions in both formative and summative exams.	Department Chairs	August, 2012-May, 2013		Sample exams
7. Monitoring student progress	7. Utilize test-item analysis to inform instruction.	Department Chairs	August, 2012-May, 2013		Doc. cam bar graphs or other breakdowns

8. Motivational strategies to keep students engaged in reading	8. Re-institute the school-wide Classroom Challenge Measure of Reading, specifically non-fiction material.	English Department	August, 2012-May, 2013		Original materials created to promote and document effort
9. Restrictions presented by prescribed reading curriculum	9. Introduce literary analysis of poetry and prose in reading classes to foster higher-order thinking.	Reading teachers	August, 2012-May, 2013		Ancillary reading selections and corresponding lesson plans
10. Need to provide student incentives for academic performance	10. Provide professional development in district's Positive Behavior Support (PBS) initiative.	PBS committee members	August, 2012-May, 2013	Request for $500 in SAC funds Donations from Keiser Univeristy	P.D. agenda and materials, certificates, plaques, and tokens. Awards Assembly agenda

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

Qualitative and Quantitative Professional Practice Outcomes: *(Measures the level of implementation of the professional practices throughout the school)*

As a quantitative measure, a pre-test/post test assessing knowledge of the Common Core Curriculum will be given. It is expected that a 15% gain in this understanding will have been gained by year's end.

As a qualitative measure at the year's end, teachers will be asked to write a reflective piece on how the Common Core has impacted their instructional practices.

Qualitative and Quantitative Student Achievement Expectations: *(Measures of student achievement)*

The quantitative element will be derived from FCAT subtest data as well as Cambridge Exam and ACT Exam results. In the areas addressed by this plan, the Safe Harbor approach will be used to quantify improvements.

A reflective writing piece regarding the impact of the Common Core efforts will be solicited from students at year's end.

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

Reading Goal 1. **See over arching school-based objective outlined above**	**2012 Current Level of Performance** (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)	**2013 Expected Level of Performance** (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)
Anticipated Barrier(s): **1.**		
Strategy(s): **1.**		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	26%=191 students	30%=225 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	39%=7 students	55%=9 students
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	37%=266 students	45%=337 students

Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	28%=5 students	50%=8 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	44%=8 students	100%=16 students
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.** **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	67%=119 students	75%=141 students
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline data 2010-11:**		
Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading :	Enter numerical data for current level of performance	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance
White:	37%=157 students	19%
Black:	40%=19 students	20%
Hispanic:	33%=31 students	17%
Asian:	8%=1 student	4%
American Indian:		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	14%=2 students	7%
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	41%=34 students	20%

Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	39%=103 students	

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Unpacking the standards to deliver the common core curriculum	August, 2012-May, 2013	Departmental (PLC) meetings' minutes
AVID/B.E.S.T. trainings to focus on comprehension of informational text	August, 2012-May, 2013	Materials/Agendas from P.D.; sample lesson plans

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Listening/ Speaking:** 64%	Leave of absence taken by long-standing ESL teacher assistant	1.Provide a teaching assistant to deliver instruction in native language as necessary.	ESL teacher assistant/teacher referrals/log of assistance given
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Reading:** 18%	Identifying academic areas of need for ESL students	2. Appoint an ESL contact to ascertain proper documentation is in place.	ESL contact person/through registration of new students/ESL files maintained for auditing purposes
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Writing**: 27%	Need for greater hands-on instruction in this area	3. Acquaint ESL students with other students/staff members who speak the given native language. Use as ESL strategy.	Classroom teachers/ESL strategies/ documentation in lesson plans

Mathematics Goal(s):	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
1. **See over arching school-based objective outline above.**		

Anticipated Barrier(s): **1.**		
Strategy(s): **1.**		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	39%=7 students	60%=9 students
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	22%=4 students	30%=5 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	50%=9 students	100%=16 students
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline Data 2010-11:**		

Student subgroups by ethnicity : White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	31% 56% 55% 26%	15% 28% 28% 13%
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	83%	41%
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	60%	30%
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	46%	23%

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring

Writing	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**		

FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing		

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) **1.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science**:**		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading		

Science Goal(s) (High School) **1.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	9%=1 student	50%=5 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science	45%=5 students	100%=10 students

Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:** **Asian:** **American Indian**:		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

APPENDIX B

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS **ONLY**)

Algebra 1 EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**		

Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra**:**	40%=124 students	
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:	9%=27 students	
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:**	46%=37 students 63%=17 students 68%=43 students	
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	100%=13 students	
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	72%=43 students	
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	56%=85 students	

Geometry EOC Goal	**2012 Current Level of Performance(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry**:**		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry:		

Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:**		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		

Biology EOC Goal	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Biology**:**		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology:		

Civics EOC	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the**

	students that percentage reflects)	number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Civics**:**		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics:		

U.S. History EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in U. S. History**:**		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U. S. History:		

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: **Goal 1:** **Goal 2:**			

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: **Goal 1:** **Goal 2:**			

Additional Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: **Goal 1: Drop Out Prevention** **Goal 2**:	1. Counselors' work load 2. Need for time efficient credit retrieval 3. Lack of funds	1.Restructure guidance department in terms of graduation cohort groups to streamline services 2. Provide on-line credit retrieval opportunities in after-school setting, 3.Utilize Post Secondary Remediation Funds to secure hourly salary stipends for selected teachers.	Principal, Curriculum A.P./ After-school credit retrieval opportunities/Reports generated regarding credits retrieved. P.S.R.F. funds: Instructional Assistant in FLVS lab: $22, 919 Hourly stipends for credit recovery lab: $29,481

APPENDIX C

(TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

Highly Effective Teachers

Describe the school based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, highly effective teachers to the school.

Descriptions of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1.		

2.		
3.		

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are not highly effective. *When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field/and who are not highly effective	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective

For the following areas, please write a brief narrative that includes the data for the year 2011-12 and a description of changes you intend to incorporate to improve the data for the year 2012-13.

MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI (Identify the MTSS leadership team and it role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)
PARENT INVOLVEMENT:
ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies)
SUSPENSION:
DROP-OUT (High Schools only):
POSTSECONDARY READINESS: (How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful? Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.)