

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Edison Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Edison Elementary School

1607 E CURTIS ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Heinze

Start Date for this Principal: 5/16/2019

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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Edison Elementary School

1607 E CURTIS ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

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	97%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	96%

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 Hillsborough 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.

Educate. Encourage. Empower.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. Our District's graduation rate goal is 90% by 2020. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

Empowering all Edison Eagles to soar to success in the classroom and beyond.

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
Dodd, Candice	Principal	Develops and monitors all SIP areas to improve student outcomes. Consults with various stakeholders to share progress towards SIP goals and modify the plan as needed throughout the year. Responsible for full operations and achievement.
Fernandez, JudithAnne	Instructional Media	Sac Chair
Cooley, Joshua	Math Coach	Monitor, analyze and report on data and instructional trends in reading. provide instruction support and coaching for increased instructional success and to build capacity within Reading.
Demers, Erin	Reading Coach	Monitor, analyze and report on data and instructional trends in reading. provide instruction support and coaching for increased instructional success and to build capacity within Reading.
Barber, Nancy	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Monitor, analyze and report on data and instructional trends in reading. provide instruction support and coaching for increased instructional success and to build capacity within Reading.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 5/16/2019, Jennifer Heinze

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

22

Total number of students enrolled at the school

325

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

6

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

6

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	40	41	43	50	47	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	264
Attendance below 90 percent	13	12	17	19	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	21	19	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	14	14	23	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	3	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/16/2021

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	40	41	43	50	47	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	264
Attendance below 90 percent	13	12	17	19	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	40	41	43	50	47	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	264
Attendance below 90 percent	13	12	17	19	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	19	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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				44%	52%	57%	34%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				44%	55%	58%	53%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	50%	53%	64%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				44%	54%	63%	39%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				59%	57%	62%	64%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				77%	46%	51%	59%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				39%	50%	53%	29%	51%	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	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	23%	55%	-32%	58%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	33%	54%	-21%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	62%	-31%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	33%	57%	-24%	64%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	25%	51%	-26%	53%	-28%
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 Diagnostic Assessment

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10/24%	8/17%	7/17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/24%	7/17%	6/14%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	1/25%	0	1/20%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10/24%	8/17%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/24%	7/15%	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	1/25%	1/20%	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	4/11%	3/9%	6/19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/11%	3/9%	6/19%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	1/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	3/7%	3/8%	4/10%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/7%	3/8%	4/10%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	1/8%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9/25%	2/6%	2/6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/23%	1/3%	2/6%
	Students With Disabilities	1/9%	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	2/7%	2/7%	1/3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/4%	1/4%	1/3%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	1/4%	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/4%	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	27			30	31		18				
ELL	12										
BLK	29	17		29	40		22				
HSP	15			14							
FRL	26	14		27	36	40	18				
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	37	56	45	33	65	83	67				
ELL	47	38		53	38						
BLK	40	46	50	42	63	75	33				
HSP	50	29		50	40		42				
FRL	43	43	48	43	59	77	38				

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	42	54		50	77						
ELL	43	55		57	92						
BLK	29	51	71	36	65	62	18				
HSP	57	62		54	70		55				
FRL	34	53	64	39	64	59	29				

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	30
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	212
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	88%
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	20
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	27
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	25
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	29
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?

Very few students across grade levels and subject areas are reaching proficiency. When looking at our ELL and ESE students, little to no proficiency is being reached.

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

All data components need improvement

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

Multiple teacher vacancies, students on eLearning that did not log in, low attendance rates, limited teacher experience.

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

Math gains

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

Several people available to pull math groups; our reading people were covering vacancies.

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

More exposure to grade level texts, more hands-on math and science, more intentional progress monitoring. Teacher coaching cycles implemented to increase effectiveness of core instruction.

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.

Professional development and priority focused around data-driven instruction, with an emphasis on aggressive monitoring.

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

We hired a reading coach and reading resource teacher to help coach teachers and pull small groups of students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement**Areas of Focus:**

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	FSA data indicates a trend of students not meeting learning gains. Thirteen percent of students on FSA ELA and thirty-six percent of students on FSA math made adequate learning gains. Furthermore, only twenty-six percent of students were proficient in ELA while twenty-eight percent of students demonstrated proficiency in math. As a result, we must strengthen core instruction, check for student understanding through "Aggressive Monitoring" techniques and know how to "in the moment" respond based upon student needs.
Measurable Outcome:	The following are measurable outcomes: A minimum of 40% of all students will reach proficiency. A minimum of 60% of all grades 3-5 will make learning gains in ELA and math. A minimum of 35% of all 5th graders will reach proficiency in science.
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored through monthly common assessments, exit tickets and classroom walkthrough visits.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Candice Dodd (candice.dodd@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use data to incorporate "Aggressive Monitoring" techniques during students' independent practice within whole group lessons and plan for "in the moment" reteach strategies for small group instruction around acceleration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The data suggests there is tremendous need for intentional checks for understanding using "Aggressive Monitoring" techniques, frequent monitoring of students' abilities through interim assessments, and make action plans to reteach and plan for acceleration. Aggressive Monitoring and Four Principles of DDI based upon Paul Bambrick-Santoyo research, have a high correlation to positive student achievement and improving instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Train instructional coaches (Reading Coach, Reading Resource, Math Coach & Teacher Leader) and leadership team to support Paul Bambrick-Santoyo's Four Principles of Data Driven Instruction Model. Monitoring: Administration
2. Staff professional development will take place on: Paul Bambrick Santoyo's Aggressive Monitoring Techniques, how to plan for these opportunities during planning, and how to use data to plan for core and small group instruction. Monitoring: Leadership Team
3. Create Look Fors Around Aggressive Monitoring and Coding System and communicate with staff. Monitoring: Leadership Team
4. Create Planning Protocols to embed DDI, Aggressive Monitoring, and standards-based instruction practices. Protocols are used during Grade Level Collaborative Planning PLCs. Monitoring: Leadership Team
5. Staff will be provided with safe practice opportunities and baseline data will be collected
6. ILT will review and share walkthrough trend data with the staff and make adjustments based on data

Person Responsible Candice Dodd (candice.dodd@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: FSA data indicates a trend of students not meeting learning gains. Thirteen percent of students on FSA ELA made adequate learning gains. Furthermore, only twenty-six percent of students were proficient in ELA. As a result, we must strengthen core instruction, check for student understanding through "Aggressive Monitoring" techniques and know how to "in the moment" respond based upon student needs.

Measurable Outcome: The following are measurable outcomes:
A minimum of 40% of all students will reach proficiency.
A minimum of 60% of all grades 3-5 will make learning gains in ELA.

Monitoring: The area of focus will be monitored through monthly common assessments, exit tickets and classroom walkthrough visits.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Candice Dodd (candice.dodd@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use data to incorporate "Aggressive Monitoring" techniques during students' independent practice within whole group lessons and plan for "in the moment" reteach strategies for small group instruction around acceleration.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The data suggests there is tremendous need for intentional checks for understanding using "Aggressive Monitoring" techniques, frequent monitoring of students' abilities through interim assessments, and make action plans to reteach and plan for acceleration. Aggressive Monitoring and Four Principles of DDI based upon Paul Bambrick-Santoyo research, have a high correlation to positive student achievement and improving instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Train instructional coaches (Reading Coach, Reading Resource, Math Coach & Teacher Leader) and leadership team to support Paul Bambrick-Santoyo's Four Principles of Data Driven Instruction Model. Monitoring: Administration
2. Staff professional development will take place on: Paul Bambrick Santoyo's Aggressive Monitoring Techniques, how to plan for these opportunities during planning, and how to use data to plan for core and small group instruction. Monitoring: Leadership Team
3. Create Look Fors Around Aggressive Monitoring and Coding System and communicate with staff. Monitoring: Leadership Team
4. Create Planning Protocols to embed DDI, Aggressive Monitoring, and standards-based instruction practices. Protocols are used during Grade Level Collaborative Planning PLCs. Monitoring: Leadership Team
5. Staff will be provided with safe practice opportunities and baseline data will be collected
6. ILT will review and share walkthrough trend data with the staff and make adjustments based on data

Person Responsible: Candice Dodd (candice.dodd@hcps.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.

Upon review of SafeSchoolsAlex.org, it was determined that in 2019-2020, Edison had a school incident rating of High. Edison was reporting 2.3 incidents per 100 students on average. Despite this rating of high, it is clear that the school culture is improving and incidents are significantly decreasing across time. In 2018-19, Edison had 8.3 incidents per 100 students. As a result, Edison has chosen to continue with the development and use of Positive Behavior Systems through our House System. Our biggest areas of concern are:

1 - Physical Attack

2 - Bullying

We are actively working to monitor these events via our House system, monthly SEL Team meetings and review of incident data as well as through the implementation of community based events with each house to increase student buy-in and involvement across the school campus. Edison also provides the Second Step Curriculum to teachers for support in meeting diverse student Social and Emotional needs. Students have access to speak with a team of trained professionals about social and emotional needs and receive coaching on strategies for reaching solutions. Each month we celebrate students of increased success in each specials class, house and in each homeroom to continue to develop high expectations and a mindset of growth and development for all students.

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.

We build a positive school culture and promote stakeholders involvement through the following Edison participates in Positive environment strategies with the implementation of school houses, supported by a point system in which all teachers submit points, using LiveSchool, to reward students and staff meeting SOAR expectations across the campus. This extends into community service through house sponsored family nights and community building through school care responsibilities. In addition, we hold the following community events:

- Monthly School Advisory Council Meetings with in-person and virtual access to ensure access for all stakeholders.
- Quarterly Community Involvement Committee (Including parents and partners)
- Quarterly Parent Teacher Conferences to ensure full support for all family needs and supports for all

students to learn

- Monthly Family Nights centered around community awareness, academic and art based curricular focus, and school celebrations.
- Quarterly Student Culture Assemblies
- After-School Student Clubs hosted by community partners and school faculty
- Partnerships with Local businesses and District Community Partners to provide access to Books, Food and other items of need.
- Participation in District Sponsored learning Activities with Support form Community members.

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

School Advisory Council - this group consists of faculty, families and school business partners to ensure a wide array of perspectives as we present, analyze and problem solve school based successes and needs.
PTA - this association meets frequently to identify school based needs and provide additional support to teachers, students, staff and school families.

Seed Folks - this community partner sponsors after school clubs in Chess, coding and agriculture as well as many other extra curricular programs to support student culture and meet school based needs.

Seminole Heights Public Library - this community partner helps support and promote literacy access for students and families. Through needs based information sessions we are able to increase access to resources needed by students and families.

Junior League of Tampa Bay - this community partnership provides access for students to books

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00