Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

Name of School:

Edgewood Jr/Sr High School

Area:

Central Area

Principal:

Mrs. Sandra Demmon

Area Superintendent:

Dr. Kenneth J. Winn

SAC Chairperson:

Erik Linde

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

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

Vision Statement:

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

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):

READING: Based on the years of 2008-2012, 97% of the students in grade 7 achieved a level 3 or above on the FCAT Reading Test. In 2012, 97% of grade 7 students achieved a level 3 or above on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test which included the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. In the years of 2008-2012, 94% of the students in grade 8 achieved a level 3 or above on the FCAT Reading Test. In 2012, 96% of the 8th grade students who tested on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test achieved at a level 3 or higher. In 2008 and 2009, 92% of 9th grade students achieved a level 3 or above on the FCAT Reading Test with an increase to 98% in 2010. In 2012, 94% of 9th grade students achieved a level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test. During the years of 2008-2011, there has been a steady increase from 84%-87% in 10th grade students achieving a level 3 or higher on the FCAT Reading Test. In 2012, 99% of the 10th grade student achieved a level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test. In addition to FCAT testing, formative assessment is conducted through FAIR Testing as well as teacher made tests that assist teachers in diagnosing deficiencies and design instruction based on such assessments.

The percentage of students achieving a level 3 or above increased overall for grades 8 thru 10. It is important to note the grade 10 students had the greatest increase with the new FCAT 2.0 Test. The 2012 10th grade FCAT 2.0 Reading scores leaped to 99% at level III and above.

MATH: Based on the years of 2008-2010, 99% of the students in grades 7, 8, and 10 achieved a level 3 or above on the FCAT Math Test. In 2012, 96% of the students in the 7th and 8th grade achieved a level 3 or higher. 97% of the students taking the 2012 EOC Algebra test met or exceeded the cut score. Five students received perfect 475 scores. In 2011, only one student received a perfect EOC Algebra Score. In comparison to the state by thirds, 83% of the students taking the Geometry EOC scored at or above the cut score.

WRITING: When analyzing the writing scores between the years of 2008-2010 it is recognized that the scoring has changed and the requirement for proficiency changed from 3.5 in 2009 to 4.0 in 2010 and thereafter. Scoring was also based on different types of writing prompts in 2008-2009 (expository and narrative) whereas in 2010 it was strictly on expository writing. In 2008-2009, two scorers were used to score student writing unlike 2010 where one scorer was utilized to score student writing. In 2008, 99% of 8th grade students achieved a 3.5 or higher and 90% of 10th grade students achieved a 3.5 or higher. In 2009, there was a drop in 8th grade students scoring

3.5 or higher to 96% but an increase for the 10th grade students to 93% achieving a 3.5 or higher. With the new requirements of 2012 along with scoring differences, 94% of 8th grade students received a 3.0 or higher and 99% of 10th grade students achieved a 3.0 or higher. The grading scale was modified this year after state results drastically dropped.

SCIENCE: Based on a three year analysis of FCAT testing (2009-2011) in grades 8 and 11, scores have remained steady at 93% of students performing at a level 3 or higher with the exception of 11th grade in 2009 where 89% performed at a level 3 or higher. Although scores in the level 3 and higher have been steady, the percentage of students who received level 4 or 5 has increased by 1% in the 8th grade level. However, 11th grade students scoring a level 4 or 5 decreased by 8%. A further analysis of the strands relating to the science test shows a decrease by 5% in the 8th grade scientific thinking and by 9% in the 11th grade scientific thinking from 2010 to 2011. In comparison to the state scores by thirds, 79% of the 2012 students who took the Biology EOC scored at or above the cut score.

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

Professional Learning Communities is a research based practice in which members of the school have a common vision of teaching and learning for which teachers are mutually accountable. Collaboration amongst members increases cohesiveness in strategy implementation, assessment, and continuous improvement. Common assessments and teacher collaboration will provide students with a more consistent educational experience, and provide an environment where students are more likely to succeed and show mastery of state mandated standards (Dufour, 2010). During this practice, teachers become aware of inconsistencies in pace, practice and assessment. Teachers share BEST teaching strategies with each other and catalogue successful lessons for reference. By using Rick Dufour's guiding questions; "What do we expect students to learn? 2. How will we know when they have learned these skills? 3. What will we do if they do not learn these skills? 4. What will we do when students do learn these skills?" (Dufour 2010) teachers have a foundation in their PLC.

Integrating summative and formative assessments so that data from external assessments used for system monitoring may be used to shape teaching and learning in the classrooms. Formative assessment methods and techniques produce significant learning gains (Looney, 2011).

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

Currently, teachers work independently and collaboratively in PLC's to work on common assessments that are both formative and summative. Teachers in PLC's are working together to prepare

students for FCAT and EOC exams along with any other high stakes testing taking place within the school environment by creating curriculum pacing guides that are aligned and incorporate the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and Common Core State Standards. Incorporating the practice of PLCs will ensure that teachers will share and develop the best practices for student achievement with continuous monitoring and improvement. All teachers are continuing to dedicate time and effort to "horizontally" and "vertically" align the curriculum so students receive the same information across the curriculum and students receive the necessary information they would need to be successful in the next course in the district progression plan.

Teachers at Edgewood are making stride in conducting classroom activities and lessons around student leadership. Not only are teaching having data chats with students, but the teachers are also helping students establish academic goals for themselves. The progress is monitored through various formative assessments throughout the school year. Included in this student centered concept is the incorporation of technology in the classroom. More teachers are using interactive methods of instruction such as interactive notepads, interactive white boards and electronic notebooks (NOOKS). Students are given more opportunities to get of their seats and participate in learning process.

Edgewood's Postsecondary Remediation Plan allocates addition supply funding for electronic "nooks" for students enrolled in the intensive reading program. The use of the electronic notebooks will be utilized to enrich instruction and provide remedial work in the area of reading. The goal is to increase FCAT reading scores to Level III and above for all students.

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 will continue to participate in Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) to address instructional strategies to improve student academic performance. Through a collaborative effort, teachers will meet in their PLCs on a regularly scheduled basis to develop teaching strategies that will blend Common Core State Standards into the curriculum throughout the 2012-2013 school year. Teachers will utilize formative assessments periodically to check for student understanding and measure academic performance. They will also utilize common summative assessments to gather data and establish benchmarks based on the Common Core and Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. Data will then be disaggregated from the common summative assessments and other standardized tests (FAIR, FCAT, ACT, SAT, AP, EOC) to determine student mastery of the standards and curriculum. In turn, teachers will share teaching strategies with each other and implement them in their classrooms to address academic areas of concern.

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

Barrier	*Action Steps*	*Person Responsible*	*Timetable*	*Budget*	*In-Process Measure*
1.Professional Development	1. PLC meetings 2.Faculty meetings 3.MESH meetings 4. PD Days (2)	Hall / Winn	Aug-May	0	PLC minutes MESH Catalogue In-service attendance sheets

2. Time	1. Schedule PLC meetings 2. Schedule collaboration time (KUD) 3. Schedule LTM meetings 4. Offer classroom coverage time 5. Create Resource manual	Winn/ Hall	Monthly	Sub dollars	Agenda calendars
3. Resources	1. Provide Complex Reading materials 2. Provide electronic books to low readers 3. provide supplemental readings for AP	Tridnivka	August 2012	$5000 from school sources $1000 from AP Supply Money	Book inventory Technology inventory

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

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

By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, teachers will be collaborating with each other and utilizing resources to increase academic performance. The outcome will be a decrease in level 3 students in FCAT Reading and an increase in the number of Level 4 and level 5 readers. The school will see an increase in the overall academic performance of students taking the EOC Science Exam. Teachers will provide opportunities for student to analyze test data and establish individual learning goals. Teachers will share effective teaching strategies with each other and evaluate their effectiveness. Students scoring in the lowest 25% of FCAT reading will be identified and "mentored" throughout the school year. FCAT reading data will be analyzed in the spring to determine learning gains. Teachers will meet in a collaborative setting to address teaching strategies to improve academic performance. This will be measured by reviewing PLC minutes, MESH meeting minutes, classroom walk-through data and teacher feedback.

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

The students at Edgewood Jr/Sr High School will increase academic performance in Reading , Math, Science and Writing based on FCAT Reading Math and Writing exams as well as EOC Science exams. The expectation in reading is to increase the level 4 and 5 students from 75% to 80%. In math the goal is to increase levels 4 and 5 from 72 to 77%. The expectation for science is to increase the level 4 and 5 students from 32% to 60%.

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

Reading Goal **1.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance** **(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance** **(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie.**

	students)	31%=1134 students)
Anticipated Barrier(s): **1.**		
Strategy(s): **1.**		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	21%=141	16%=105
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	75%=495	80%=529
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A

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.**	55%=67	65%=79
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 : White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	Enter numerical data for current level of performance	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A

Reading Professional Development

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

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Listening/ Speaking:**			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Reading:**			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Writing**:			

Mathematics Goal(s): **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)**
Anticipated Barrier(s): **1.**		
Strategy(s): **1.**		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	23%=79	18%=60

Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	72%=244	77%=260
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	63%=53	75%=63
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:		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	N/A	N/A

Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	N/A	N/A

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	97%=315	100%=324
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing	N/A	N/A

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle)	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. All students who are at level two should move to level three. Reduce the number of students at level 3 from 96 to 70, and increase level 4's and 5's from 54 students to 100.		

Barrier(s): Data Sources **Strategy(s):** 1. **Benchmark test** 2. **Gather data** 3. **Share data** 4. **Formulate teaching strategies to address low scoring strands**		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science**:**	56%=96	40%=70
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	N/A	N/A
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	32%=54	60%=102
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading	N/A	N/A

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		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science		
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%=70	35%=62
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:	58%=102	63%=111
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:**		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	N/A	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	N/A	N/A

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 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 Civics**:**		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics:		

U.S. History EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter	2013 Expected Level of Performance

	percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	(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:** **Goal 2**:			

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: Currently, parents are given access to Edline during registration. Increasing the number of active parent Edline accounts will improve communication. Parents are encouraged to use their Edline account, and are required to volunteer at least 20 hours per school year. Emails and Monday Reports are sent to all parents reminding them to activate Edline, to view Interim Reports, and the school newsletter, as well as updating them on what is going on at school that week.
ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies) Edgewood attendance rate consistently ranges from 95%-98%
SUSPENSION: Edgewood suspension rate is almost non-existent. Less than 2%

DROP-OUT (High Schools only):

100% graduation rate. 0% Drop out rate

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.)

100% of the graduates from Edgewood are postsecondary ready