Edison Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Edison Elementary School

1607 E CURTIS ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Heinze   Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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

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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 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	93%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dodd, Candice	Principal	
Fernandez, JudithAnne	Instructional Media	SAC Chair
Barber, Nancy	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Reading Resource Teacher
Cooley, Joshua	Instructional Coach	Math Coach
Stewart, Sharon	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach
Wilson, Lisa	Other	
Heinze, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/2/2022, Jennifer Heinze

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

305

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

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	39	58	42	46	32	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	249
Attendance below 90 percent	0	27	18	10	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	22	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	19	19	21	28	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	7	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/30/2022

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	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

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	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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	21%	53%	56%				44%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						44%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	75%						48%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	32%	50%	50%				44%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	62%						59%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	87%						77%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	28%	59%	59%				39%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	23%	55%	-32%	58%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	33%	54%	-21%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	62%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	33%	57%	-24%	64%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	25%	51%	-26%	53%	-28%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	20	60		37	52		25				
ELL	11	50		24	91						
BLK	20	55	73	29	51	82	29				
HSP	13	50		27	85						
FRL	22	58	75	33	60	86	29				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	421
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Based upon 2021-2022 FSA data, students are making gains in ELA and Math. 67% of bottom quartile students demonstrate growth in ELA and 87% in math. However, twenty-one percent were proficient in ELA, thirty-two percent in Math and twenty-eight percent in Science.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on 2021-2022 FSA data, the greatest need amongst our student population is meeting grade level proficiency in both Math and Reading.

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 on data from 2021-2022 school year: I-Ready Diagnostic, monthly assessments and on-going monitoring, there are significant gaps in student readiness at all grade levels across our school. This is especially present as a result of COVID closures and remote learning. As a result, an increased focus is occurring across all grade levels and aggressive monitoring techniques are being used in Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 5 to monitor student progress to proficiency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA and Math Learning Gains
ELA and Math Bottom Quartile Gains

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

We implemented intentional small group instruction with coaching cycles
As a staff, we added DDI culture and Aggressive monitoring techniques.

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

Instruction practice around Vocabulary instruction, Writer's Workshop and BEST Standards.
Student engagement techniques - Kagan Structures, Hot Talk Cool Moves will need to be implemented
to strengthen student ownership of learning.

**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.**

P/D will be provided to support Vocabulary best practices across content areas, Writer's Workshop
support and coaching, Breakdown and analysis of the BEST Standards through professional
communities. Student engagement opportunities through positive culture building, conversation starter
trainings and student engagement trainings.

**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 math coach, reading coach and reading resource teacher to support coaching teachers and
pulling small groups of students. This also is assisting us in building capacity and gaining teacher
leaders across our campus.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data
sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	FSA data indicates a trend of students not demonstrating proficiency. Twenty-one percent of students on FSA ELA and thirty-two percent of students on FSA math were proficient. As a result, we must strengthen our core instruction and instructional knowledge of new BEST Standards. In addition, implement checks for student understanding through "Aggressive Monitoring" techniques and know how to "in the moment" respond based upon student needs.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective 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: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	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: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Through collaborative planning and coaching sessions, teachers will build and implement instruction and tasks aligned to the BEST standards. Teachers will use "Aggressive Monitoring" techniques during students' independent practice within whole group lessons and incorporate "in the moment" reteach strategies for small group instruction around acceleration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Administrators and instructional coaches (Reading Coach, Reading Resource, Math Coach) will learn NEW Best Standards.

2. Provide Professional development on: Best Standards and task alignment, Vocabulary strategies,

Writer's Workshop and how to use data to plan for and implement "in the moment" reteach strategies during core and small group instruction.

3. Create Look Fors Around Best Standards and task alignment and "in the moment" reteach strategies and communicate with staff.

4. Revise Planning Protocols to continue DDI and add Best Standards-based instruction and task aligned practices. Protocols used during daytime Grade Level Collaborative Planning PLCs with instructional coaches.

5. Staff will be provided with safe practice opportunities and baseline data will be collected, reviewed and shared for teacher feedback.

6. Implement targeted small groups and interventions to support SWD students within ESSA Group.

7. ILT will review and share walkthrough trend data with the staff and make adjustments. .

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

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	FSA data indicates a trend of students not demonstrating proficiency. Twenty-one percent of students on FSA ELA and thirty-two percent of students on FSA math were proficient. As a result, we must strengthen our core instruction and instructional knowledge of new BEST Standards. In addition, implement checks for student understanding through "Aggressive Monitoring" techniques and know how to "in the moment" respond based upon student needs.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective 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: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	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: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Through collaborative planning and coaching sessions, teachers will build and implement instruction and tasks aligned to the BEST standards. Teachers will use "Aggressive Monitoring" techniques during students' independent practice within whole group lessons and incorporate "in the moment" reteach strategies for small group instruction around acceleration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

-Administrators and instructional coaches will learn the NEW Best Standards.
- Staff professional development will take place on: Best Standards and task alignment, Vocabulary strategies across content areas, Writer's Workshop and how to use data to plan for and implement "in the moment" reteach strategies during core and small group instruction. Monitoring: Leadership Team

- Create Look-For's Around Best Standards and task alignment and "in the moment" reteach strategies, communicate with staff. Monitoring: Leadership Team
- Revise Planning Protocols to continue to embed DDI and add Best Standards-based instruction and task aligned practices. Protocols are used during daytime Grade Level Collaborative Planning PLCs with instructional coaches and support staff. Monitoring: Leadership Team.
- Staff will have safe practice opportunities and baseline data will be collected, reviewed and shared for teacher feedback.
- 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)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

I-Ready and Wonders K-2 Screener data indicates a trend of students not demonstrating proficiency. 38% of K-2 students were considered below level on i-Ready and K-2 Wonders Screener assessments (62% on or above level). As a result, we must strengthen our core instruction and instructional knowledge of new BEST Standards. In addition, implement checks for student understanding through "Aggressive Monitoring" techniques and know how to "in the moment" respond based upon student needs.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

FSA data indicates a trend of students not demonstrating proficiency. Twenty-one percent of students on FSA ELA were proficient. As a result, we must strengthen our core instruction and instructional knowledge of new BEST Standards. In addition, implement checks for student understanding through "Aggressive Monitoring" techniques and know how to "in the moment" respond based upon student needs.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

A minimum of 70% of all K-2 students will reach proficiency on the STAR assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

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:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dodd, Candice, candice.dodd@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Through collaborative planning and coaching sessions, teachers will build and implement instruction and tasks aligned to the BEST standards. Teachers will use "Aggressive Monitoring" techniques during

students' independent practice within whole group lessons and incorporate "in the moment" reteach strategies for small group instruction around acceleration.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

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:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-Administrators and instructional coaches will learn the NEW Best Standards. - Staff professional development will take place on: Best Standards and task alignment, Vocabulary strategies across content areas, Writer's Workshop and how to use data to plan for and implement "in the moment" reteach strategies during core and small group instruction. Monitoring: Leadership Team - Create Look-For's Around Best Standards and task alignment and "in the moment" reteach strategies, communicate with staff. Monitoring: Leadership Team - Revise Planning Protocols to continue to embed DDI and add Best Standards-based instruction and task aligned practices. Protocols are used during daytime Grade Level Collaborative Planning PLCs with instructional coaches and support staff. Monitoring: Leadership Team. - Staff will have safe practice opportunities and baseline data will be collected, reviewed and shared for teacher feedback. - ILT will review and share walkthrough trend data with the staff and make adjustments based on data.	Dodd, Candice, candice.dodd@hcps.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

We build a positive school culture and promote stakeholders involvement in connection with our community school status. This embodies the belief and desire to be a pillar within our community and meet the needs of our Edison family and the families that create the community we serve.

Students:

- Enhanced Positive Behavior Practices connected to Student Incentive Room

- School based "Ambassador" roles to increase Inclusive Leadership

- Opportunity for student voice to impact school-based programs and decision making

Staff:

- Enhanced teacher collaborative and wellness spaces

- Offer and support staff-based events focused on deepening "school family" connection.

Families:

-Building community partnerships to support needs, provide services and enhance school environment.

-Parent focused workshops to strengthen parent engagement and community success

- School based resource center to include food pantry, school supplies, hygiene resources etc.

We also participate 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:

- On going data collection from all stakeholders through the listening project to identify needs and assets

- Monthly School Advisory Council Meetings with in-person and virtual access to ensure availability for all stakeholders.

- Community School Team collaboration sessions monthly (Including all Stakeholders)

- Quarterly Parent Teacher Conferences to ensure full support for all family needs and supports for all students to learn (Student Led Conferences)

- Monthly Family Nights centered around community awareness, academic and art based curricular focus, and school celebrations.

- Quarterly Student Culture Assemblies with monthly House meetings

- 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 from Community members.

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

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.

Urban League – this is a community partner that participates as a member of our community resource team and sponsors various school needs.

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.