
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Edgewood Academy

3464 EDGEWOOD AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33916

<http://ewd.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Angela Nader

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Lee 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	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Edgewood Academy

3464 EDGEWOOD AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33916

<http://ewd.leeschools.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	91%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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.

Edgewood Academy exists to engage students through quality instruction in rigorous and meaningful work aligned with the Florida State Standards.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Edgewood inspires a love of learning to create future leaders.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Nader, Angela	Principal	Instructional Leader
Adams, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Angela Nader

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.*

0

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

450

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22**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	69	77	83	81	75	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	450
Attendance below 90 percent	14	23	22	22	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	16	19	30	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
Course failure in Math	0	13	16	17	21	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	27	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	16	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	15	17	22	25	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110

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	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

2020-21 - 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	79	86	76	84	74	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	469
Attendance below 90 percent	13	23	10	26	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	2	14	17	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	3	7	7	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	3	7	7	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

2020-21 - 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	79	86	76	84	74	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	469
Attendance below 90 percent	13	23	10	26	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	2	14	17	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	3	7	7	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	3	7	7	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				38%	57%	57%	32%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	56%	58%	47%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	50%	53%	57%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				39%	62%	63%	39%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				48%	65%	62%	45%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	54%	51%	34%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				32%	52%	53%	41%	54%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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
03	2021					
	2019	38%	58%	-20%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	32%	55%	-23%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2021					
	2019	34%	54%	-20%	56%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	54%	61%	-7%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	35%	62%	-27%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2021					
	2019	23%	58%	-35%	60%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	30%	50%	-20%	53%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady, and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

		Grade 1			
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		2/3.2	9/12.2	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		1/14.3	1/9.1	0/0
	English Language Learners		1/4.3	2/7.7	0/0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		1/1.6	5/6.8	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		1/14.3	1/9.1	0/0
	English Language Learners		1/4.3	2/7.7	0/0
		Grade 2			
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		2/2.7	7/9.2	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners		0/0	0/0	0/0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		0/0	2/2.6	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners		0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	7/10.8	11/16.4	12/17.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/12.5	1/12.5
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/3.6	2/7.1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	1/1.6	5/7.5	19/28.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	3/37.5
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/7.1	8/28.6
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9/16.7	19/33.9	18/32.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/33.3	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/9.1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	1/1.8	8/14.3	11/19.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/9.1	0/0

Grade 5					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		13/24.1	17/29.8	20/34.5
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		1/11.1	2/22.2	2/22.2
	English Language Learners		0/0	1/7.1	1/7.1
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		7/13	11/19.3	23/39
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		1/11.1	1/11.1	3/33.3
	English Language Learners		1/7.7	2/14.3	6/42.9
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		15/31.3	15/31.3	26/50
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities		2/28.6	3/50	5/62.5
	English Language Learners		2/15.4	3/23.1	5/38.5

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	19			42			46				
ELL	21	35		47	44		28				
BLK	33	31		40	33		24				
HSP	28	47	27	43	31	42	38				
WHT	33			71							
FRL	26	38	20	42	29	60	36				
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	17	33	36	22	48	64	19				
ELL	25	61	65	28	47	53	25				
BLK	30	38	36	31	44	64	24				
HSP	36	56	62	37	49	54	30				

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
WHT	58	75		65	56		50				
FRL	37	52	52	39	47	63	33				
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	20	42	56	23	35	29					
ELL	15	40	53	30	42	53	30				
BLK	28	52	62	28	38	31	20				
HSP	32	44	50	41	44	37	46				
WHT	38	56		50	56		43				
FRL	32	46	57	38	43	35	43				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	329
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	52
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ELA achievement performed low again this year. 20-21 31% of our students were proficient in ELA. 2016-17 we were 39% proficient, 2017-18 we were 32% proficient, 18-19 38% proficient.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA Learning Gains and L25% Learning Gains are the areas with the greatest need for improvement.
 ELA LG's 47%
 ELA L25 27%

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Teachers were not consistent with phonics materials or other instructional materials and techniques. Materials teachers were using were not researched based or standards driven. Programs that were used did not have a method for analyzing the data.

Steps for improvement include:

weekly data tracking in PLC's

DIBELS and i-Ready data is used to drive instruction and intervention

Teachers are all trained in Really Great Reading Phonics and is used daily

Intervention is based on data

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math L25 Learning Gains improved from 43% to 50%

Science Proficiency increased from 35% to 40%

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Math-Focused PLC's that modeled math instruction and the use of manipulatives and problem based learning

Science- District coaches supported teachers with instruction and data from exemplars

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Strategic placement of teachers based on student achievement data

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

ELA coaches in K-2 and 3-5 that are leading planning sessions with teachers

District support in PLC's for ELA and coaching

Really Great Reading PD

Marzano's Highly Engaged Classroom for all teachers

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

21st Century Grant for after school tutoring and SEL

Culturally Responsive Teaching

Begin the process of Level 1 certification for Marzano's High Reliability School

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our ESSA Black/African American sub group scored 38% on ELA proficiency based on the 2020-2021 FSA ELA Assessment.

Measurable Outcome: Our ESSA Black African American sub group will increase from 38% to 43% proficient on the 2021-2022 FSA ELA assessment.

Monitoring: Teachers will monitor weekly progress of pass rates and minutes on task in i-Ready. Based on this information teachers will create intervention lessons. Monthly PLC's focused on the Early Warning Systems data. Teachers lesson plans will list specific ESSA sub groups and specific strategies for teaching and learning. Admin checks for completion and implementation by walk throughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Angela Nader (angelamn@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will focus on ELA as our top priority to increase our number of proficient readers in the Black/African American ESSA sub group. To do this, we will focus on state standards, use data to drive instruction with embedded culturally responsive teaching strategies. DIBELS data will also be tracked for individual ESSA sub groups and used for intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students need a common approach to learning with sensitivity around cultural needs. Programs and strategies will be consistent among the school. We have narrowed our focus to allow for teacher and student continuity throughout the school.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Usage of ELA I-Ready. Use I-Ready diagnostic assessment tool to determine student needs.
2. Track DIBELS quarterly and monitor ESSA sub group progress.
3. Implement Attendance Enforcement Process.
4. We will monitor IReady data and hold data chats with our students. We will also hold Grade level data chats digging deep into the data and identifying strategies to support student needs.
5. Teachers will use Culturally Responsive Teaching strategies daily.
6. District support from the Diversity and Inclusion Coach to include follow up trainings.
7. Instructional strategic Plan aligned with District supports are in place.
8. Strategic implementation of ELA and Science coaches
9. Provide additional supports in the ELA and intervention block.

Person Responsible: Angela Nader (angelamn@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: ELA achievement performed low again this year. 38% of our students were proficient in ELA. 2016-17 we were 39% proficient, 2017-18 we were 32% proficient, and this year 2021 we were % proficient in ELA.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the number of proficient students from 38% to 48% as measured by the FY22 ELA FSA.

Monitoring: Weekly PLC's will focus on:
 Monitoring of i-Ready minutes and lessons passed
 Weekly lesson plan checks to ensure the use of high yield strategies, Kagan, Thinking Maps, Small group instruction
 Weekly review of student placement and performance within the intervention block
 School wide monitoring of goals outside of office and PLC room
 Coaches are completing data analysis using exemplar results

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Angela Nader (angelamn@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will focus on reading as our top priority to increase our number of proficient readers. To do this, we will focus on state standards, use data to drive instruction, and provide consistent implementation of rigorous instruction and activities to increase student achievement. We will use I-Ready. Which is evidence based program to improve academics and Really Great Reading as part of our ELA block. Implement High Yield Strategies to increase engagement through Kagan, and Thinking Maps. Monday-Thursdays we encourage our students to use Connect with Lee to read with a teacher.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students need a common approach to learning. Programs and strategies will be consistent among the school. We have narrowed our focus to allow for teacher and student continuity throughout the school. Because less programs are being used it allows for closer monitoring of ELA progress.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Usage of ELA I-Ready. Use I-Ready diagnostic assessment tool to determine student needs.
2. Use Really Great Reading program daily and for intervention when students need it.
3. Implement Attendance Enforcement Process.
4. We will monitor IReady data and hold data chats with our students. We will also hold Grade level data chats digging deep into the data and identifying strategies to support student needs.
5. Teachers will use strategies: High Yield Strategies: Distributive Summarizing, Collaborative Pairs, Thinking Maps
6. District ELA support person is leading and supporting planning with teachers during PLC's
7. Instructional strategic Plan aligned with District supports are in place.
8. Strategic implementation of ELA and Science coaches
9. Provide additional supports in the ELA and intervention block.
10. ELL additional reading supports during specials.
11. PCT support in grades 4 and 5, Resource teacher support in grades 2, 3, and 5. Reading intervention support in K-5.

Person Responsible Angela Nader (angelamn@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

n/a

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.

Parents, students, teachers, community members and stakeholders are invited to attend virtually or in person throughout the year. We work hard to engage all stakeholders in Edgewood events. Through these events we build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders. We have many strategies to help connect families with Edgewood. We send messages home through school messenger to connect with families. We have parents participate in surveys to help us better our efforts and give the parents and community what they want. All parents are asked to become volunteers when Covid restrictions are lifted to support our classrooms. Quarterly we seek the support from our parents, business partners, and community to create our school plans. We ask all stakeholders to be a part of our school advisory committee/PTO. The SAC/PTO creates parent involvement events for the upcoming school year and finds ways to support student needs. This is the group that helps create our Parent Family Engagement Plan, School Home Compact Agreement, and School Improvement Plans. We monitor the attendance from these planned activities at the end of each school year. We brainstorm strategies to increase parent involvement at Edgewood Academy. Our parent involvement activities build positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders and we continuously strive to engage students through quality instruction in rigorous and meaningful work aligned with the Florida State Standards.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Riverside Church- They support our school by providing rewards for PBIS, sponsor classrooms, supply drives, weekend food bags for students, and share our story with the community

Hoops on Mission- Mentorship program to students in need

Adult Education for GED and English class for our parents

Kiwanis- Donations of books to library and will read to students when allowed

FGCU- College interns support our school through student teaching and observation hours

American Legion- School supply donations

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00