

The School District of Lee County

# Edison Park Creative And Expressive Arts School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Edison Park Creative And Expressive Arts School

2401 EUCLID AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33901

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Sherri Wipf**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: C (53%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Edison Park Creative And Expressive Arts School

2401 EUCLID AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33901

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">77%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">52%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
<b>Grade</b>		A	A	A

## 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.**

To prepare every student for success.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

The mission of Edison Park Creative & Expressive Arts School is to celebrate diversity, encourage creativity, and nurture a love of learning in pursuit of excellence.

### 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
Wipf, Sherri	Principal	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Monday 9/20/2021, Sherri Wipf

**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.*

2

**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.*

2

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

406

**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	60	65	61	70	75	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	406
Attendance below 90 percent	3	9	8	10	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	2	2	3	4	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	2	0	0	3	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	15	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	24	20	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	2	2	3	4	22	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

**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	3	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**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	62	58	56	64	66	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	375
Attendance below 90 percent	7	1	2	8	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	1	2	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

**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	1	2	0	0	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

**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	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	62	58	56	64	66	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	375
Attendance below 90 percent	7	1	2	8	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	1	2	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

**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	1	2	0	0	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

**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	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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				74%	57%	57%	74%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	56%	58%	61%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	50%	53%	44%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				75%	62%	63%	77%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				77%	65%	62%	77%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	54%	51%	59%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				80%	52%	53%	78%	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	77%	58%	19%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	68%	55%	13%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2021					
	2019	72%	54%	18%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	69%	61%	8%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	65%	62%	3%	64%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	81%	58%	23%	60%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	77%	50%	27%	53%	24%
Cohort Comparison						

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

iReady Reading and Math Diagnostics three times a year. 5th grade Science will be using the District Science Progress Monitoring test in Unify/Performance Matters three times a year.

<b>Grade 1</b>				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16% (10/61)	51% (31/61)	62% (38/61)
	Economically Disadvantaged	12% (3/25)	36% (9/25)	36% (9/25)
	Students With Disabilities	17% (1/6)	33% (2/6)	17% (1/6)
	English Language Learners	0% (0/2)	0% (0/2)	0% (0/2)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7% (4/61)	23% (14/61)	48% (29/61)
	Economically Disadvantaged	4% (1/25)	4% (1/25)	28% (7/25)
	Students With Disabilities	0% (0/6)	17% (1/6)	50% (3/6)
	English Language Learners	0% (0/2)	0% (0/2)	0% (0/2)

  

<b>Grade 2</b>				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19% (12/62)	48% (30/62)	60% (37/62)
	Economically Disadvantaged	12% (4/33)	33% (11/33)	45% (15/33)
	Students With Disabilities	0% (0/4)	0% (0/4)	0% (0/4)
	English Language Learners	0% (0/0)	0% (0/0)	0% (0/0)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8% (5/62)	24% (15/62)	55% (34/62)
	Economically Disadvantaged	3% (1/33)	12% (4/33)	33% (11/33)
	Students With Disabilities	0% (0/5)	0% (0/5)	0% (0/5)
	English Language Learners	0% (0/2)	0% (0/2)	0% (0/2)

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29% (19/65)	57% (37/65)	58% (38/65)
	Economically Disadvantaged	13% (4/32)	0% (0/0)	0% (0/0)
	Students With Disabilities	0% (0/0)	0% (0/0)	0% (0/0)
	English Language Learners	50% (1/2)	50% (1/2)	50% (1/2)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7% (5/67)	39% (26/67)	49% (33/67)
	Economically Disadvantaged	0% (0/32)	16% (5/32)	25% (8/32)
	Students With Disabilities	0% (0/0)	0% (0/0)	0% (0/0)
	English Language Learners	0% (0/4)	0% (0/4)	0% (0/4)
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52% (34/66)	55% (36/66)	52% (34/66)
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%(12/38)	42% (16/38)	32% (12/38)
	Students With Disabilities	13% (1/8)	13% (1/8)	13% (1/8)
	English Language Learners	0% (1/1)	50% (1/2)	50% (1/2)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9% (6/66)	29% (19/66)	39% (26/66)
	Economically Disadvantaged	5% (2/38)	16% (6/38)	21% (8/38)
	Students With Disabilities	13% (1/8)	13% (1/8)	13% (1/8)
	English Language Learners	0% (0/2)	50% (1/2)	50% (1/2)

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46% (65)	58% (73)	62% (71)
	Economically Disadvantaged	41% (37)	45% (40)	49% (39)
	Students With Disabilities	0% (0/10)	0% (0)	10% (1/10)
	English Language Learners	33% (3)	33% (3)	67% (3)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19% (67)	43% (72)	47% (71)
	Economically Disadvantaged	14% (37)	28% (39)	32% (38)
	Students With Disabilities	0% (0/10)	0% (0/10)	11% (1/9)
	English Language Learners	33% (3)	33% (3)	33% (3)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	46% (70)	60% (72)	72% (67)
	Economically Disadvantaged	32% (38)	46% (39)	58% (36)
	Students With Disabilities	0% (0/10)	20% (2/10)	38% (3/8)
	English Language Learners	33% (3)	33% (3)	67% (3)

**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	13	30		20	20						
BLK	39	52		38	48	40	38				
HSP	44	18		44	55		40				
MUL	64			50							
WHT	85	86		81	73		93				
FRL	41	46	33	38	49	40	49				
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	18	30		33							
BLK	51	48	30	59	74	63	56				
HSP	68	54		64	77						
WHT	90	78		93	85		100				

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
FRL	62	56	32	60	73	48	65				
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	25			33							
BLK	50	44	39	59	65	47	45				
HSP	78	76		70	82		82				
WHT	86	68		89	82		100				
FRL	65	56	45	71	73	56	68				

**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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	380
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

Native American Students	
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	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	40
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	57
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	84
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	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Our ELA scores showed stronger gains compared to our Math scores and gains. In all content areas our economically disadvantaged did not reach 50% proficiency by the end of the year, and continuously showed lower gains compared to our non economically disadvantaged students. Our Science proficiency was very close to our ELA proficiency scores.

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

The greatest need for improvement is across grade levels we had 28 students that fell in the ESE category from our 28 students only 4 students were proficient. In addition, our economically disadvantaged students are another area of focus to improve their gains and proficiency scores. Our progress monitoring also showed that our 3rd graders were not as proficient as expected. Our L25 students are not making high learning gains compared to the rest of our student population.

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

Based off of progress monitoring the contributing factors were due partly to the pandemic; support personnel was not consistently on campus throughout the year to support students' intervention needs, student's attendance that were in need of interventions were high in addition to behavior incidents with same subgroup. New actions that need to be taken to address the need for improvement would be to

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

The progress monitoring data showed our overall ELA 3-5 proficiency achievement was 61% and learning gains were 59%. The Math 3-5 proficiency data achievement was 58% proficient and 61% of our students showed learning gains. Our students demonstrated high proficiency and learning gains in all content areas when they took the 2019 state assessment (ELA 74% and 64%, Math 75% and 77%, and Science 80%).

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

Contributing factors for the improvement of our progress monitoring included; coaching and modeling close reading strategies using rigorous reading passages that our students had to grapple and dig deep into the comprehension complexity of higher level questioning and tasks. Having an experienced educator work, plan and model with teachers with only a few years experienced also helped in this area.

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

Fidelity with reading intervention programs and students being pulled consistently. PLC trainings and working collaboratively to support each other and all of our students. After looking



over the data, staff will work to differentiate small group instruction. Incorporating high yield strategies when instructing.

**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.**

District training on Questioning and Higher Level Thinking, PD with our progress monitoring program three times a year after each diagnostic, ongoing district level offerings for programs that are implemented, PD on our reading intervention programs and AR, providing Thinking Map PD in house, on-site visits with our District ELA and Math coordinators to provide feedback to improve instructional strategies.

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

We will continue to provide PLC trainings. Running our reading intervention programs with fidelity while providing staff with the opportunities for additional trainings provided by the district. Identifying, monitoring, and tracking our L25s in both reading and math using our A.B.C. form (attendance, behavior, curriculum) once a month during our PLC time. Each teacher will create their own SMART goals that aligns to our SIP plan.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** Edison Park's SWD subgroup has been below the 41% for past school year. It as been below 32% for two consecutive years. Data from schoolwide progress monitoring also shows a deficiency of this sub group for both ELA and Math.

**Measurable Outcome:** Baseline iReady ELA data for K-5th: 2/21 (10%)students were proficient on the baseline. Students 3rd-5th 1/13= 8% were proficient on the base line iReady ELA. In the spring, 6/13 will be proficient on the iReady ELA progress monitoring assessment.

**Monitoring:** Weekly data analysis from the ESE teacher with the support staff will check assessments given. Students will meet with staff weekly to talk about their progress. Students who are not proficient at the baseline will receive small group ELA instruction to improve reading proficiency.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Barbara Harrington (barbaralh@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Really Great Reading will be used to help support reading deficiencies in ELA. Students will work with our reading resource teacher once a day for 30 minutes to help increase their reading proficiency. All 13 students including the 3 students in 2nd grade will be invited to our annual afterschool tutoring program to help assist and improve students in ELA.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Really Great Reading is a researched based reading program to help students to improve their reading skills. Students who are 1- 2 years below reading level will be utilizing the BLAST or HD RGR program for 30 minutes a day by a highly effective teacher.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Students will be monitored by the RGR program and compare their progress with grade level assessments and tri yearly progress monitoring iReady assessments.

**Person Responsible** Deanna Sell (deannams@leeschools.net)

Students will be monitored by the RGR program and compare their progress with grade level assessments and tri yearly progress monitoring iReady assessments.

**Person Responsible** Deanna Sell (deannams@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.

**The school culture and environment will be monitored using a Behavior Intervention Form (BIF) and Spreadsheet accessible to all staff prior to staff writing referrals. Our discipline data will be monitored by our PBIS(Positive Behavior Intervention Support School) members to report data out to our staff during our staff meetings. Weekly a service dog will be on campus to help support students with behavior needs to help them remain in the classroom or remain in school for the day.**

#### **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.**

In order to promote positive behavior, Edison Park uses PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention Support) to set clear expectations for student behavior school-wide. The Core 4 expectations are consistently taught and modeled all year. The Core 4 expectations (Be Respectful, Be Responsible, Be Safe, and Be a Good Citizen) are created in poster form, framed, and placed in all classrooms and displayed throughout the school's campus. All students receive a Core 4 card and lanyard. The cards have individual blocks that can be filled with a stamp in response to a display of positive behavior. All teachers, staff, and guests are empowered to reward children in the classroom and around campus. As students fill cards, they receive different levels of rewards and recognitions. Filled Core 4 cards students receive an in-class reward chosen by their teacher, they sign the principal's book, and the student will then be entered in the weekly Core 4 drawing where students are given the opportunity to spin the principal's wheel of prizes at the end of each week. After each day, the principal or staff member will recognize those that have signed the principal's book under each recognition (I Filled my Card, I Met my Goal, and I am an Amazing Citizen) on the school's morning news. Students also have the opportunity to participate in an additional 15 minutes of fun games and activities on Fridays or last day of the week for students that have met a series of goals. The goals that students strive to meet each week include; achieving their reading percentage and point goals, computer reading and math minutes, attending each day here and on time, and no behavior infractions. Students also have the opportunity to be recognized as our student of the week to celebrate and learn more about students at school who display being a leader and adhering to our expectations. A service dog will be on campus each week to help with behavioral needs for students and staff needs.

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

The P.B.I.S team consisting of teachers, support staff, and administration meet regularly to promote a positive culture and environment at the school. At the beginning of the year we have an informational half day meeting informing all staff of our behavioral process. From the information given, teachers are to start the first week creating rules as a class using our school's Core 4 expectations (Be Respectful, Be Responsible, Be Safe, and Be a Good Citizen). Students are then responsible for signing their class rules. Students are also given a student statement of understanding letter that they are to take home and read with their parents. In the letter it informs parents and students that they are aware of the school's policies, procedures and behavioral expectations. The letter also states that there are positive consequences for adherence to, and negative consequences for violations of the Lee County Code of Student Conduct and our school's conduct plan and dress code. The parent's statement reads that they have read the Lee County School District Code of Student Conduct with their child and they the parent will have the responsibility to verify communication between school and home. Our Core 4 was designed to foster a climate of cooperation, respect, and safety. It makes use of clear and consistent positive reinforcement to teach students the skills and behaviors necessary to succeed now and in the future. We also have a series of committees that consist of teachers, staff members, and administration. The committees include; ways to celebrate students' reading successes, achieving their intervention goals, beautifying the campus, celebrating diversity, monthly staff "sunshine" notes, and ideas on how to involve the community and parents into the school.

**Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>