

Polk County Public Schools

# Laurel Elementary School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>12</b>

# Laurel Elementary School

1851 LAUREL AVE, Poinciana, FL 34759

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/laurellions>

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2017-18 Title I School</b>	<b>2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

## School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	C	D	D*

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Polk County School Board on 8/1/2018.

## 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.

The mission of Laurel Elementary is to provide our students with rigorous and relevant educational experiences that will ensure that all students receive a high quality education.

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

The vision of Laurel Elementary School is to create a school in which a progressive leadership team and involved parents support high performing teachers who utilize a variety of high-yield instructional strategies, teach a rigorous and relevant curriculum, build relationships with students and families, and establish and maintain a safe and orderly environment to maximize student achievement, while nurturing students to become responsible citizens who contribute to the success of their community.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

Name	Title
Allen, Julia	Principal
Blackburn, Jennifer	Assistant Principal
Larrousse, Peter	Instructional Coach
Haber, Sandra	School Counselor
Kiddle, Melinda	Dean
Hernaiz, Amaris	Teacher, K-12

#### Duties

#### Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Julia Allen - Principal: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning.

Jennifer Blackburn – Assistant Principal Facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

Sandra Haber – Guidance Counselor Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk;” assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Sandra Haber - Guidance Counselor: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and

documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Peter Larrousse - Instructional Coach: Facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

Melinda Kiddle - Behavior Interventionist: Identifies systematic patterns of student behavioral needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" provides teachers with strategies for management of student conduct; participates in the design and delivery of professional development.

## Early Warning Systems

### Year 2017-18

#### 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	65	51	60	64	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	296
One or more suspensions	4	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	21	41	24	47	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
Level 1 on statewide assessment	35	69	109	126	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	456

#### The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	10	13	24	24	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

#### 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	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

#### Date this data was collected

Wednesday 6/27/2018

### Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	45	42	45	59	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222
One or more suspensions	7	20	7	28	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	3	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	54	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
Overage students	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

**Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	45	42	45	59	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222
One or more suspensions	7	20	7	28	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	3	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	54	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
Overage students	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**Assessment & Analysis**

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

**Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?**

Student with disabilities performed the lowest (ELA 15%, Math 17%). Yes, this is a trend.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

4th grade ELA and Math, both, had a decline of 8%.

**Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?**

3rd grade ELA had a gap of -25%.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?**

4th grade math had an increase 4 points. No, this is not a trend.

**Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.**

Strengthening/reassigning the core teachers in 4th grade.

**School Data**

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	36%	50%	56%	38%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	36%	51%	55%	36%	49%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	45%	48%	39%	42%	46%
Math Achievement	43%	58%	62%	44%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	43%	56%	59%	23%	52%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	44%	47%	11%	41%	46%
Science Achievement	0%	53%	55%	0%	46%	51%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	65 (45)	51 (42)	60 (45)	64 (59)	56 (31)	0 (0)	296 (222)
One or more suspensions	4 (7)	1 (20)	4 (7)	0 (28)	1 (17)	0 (0)	10 (79)
Course failure in ELA or Math	21 (1)	41 (3)	24 (10)	47 (14)	20 (0)	0 (0)	153 (28)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	35 (0)	69 (0)	109 (0)	126 (54)	117 (49)	0 (0)	456 (103)

**Grade Level Data**

**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	2018	32%	51%	-19%	57%	-25%
	2017	40%	53%	-13%	58%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	32%	48%	-16%	56%	-24%
	2017	29%	51%	-22%	56%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	39%	56%	-17%	62%	-23%
	2017	47%	58%	-11%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	39%	57%	-18%	62%	-23%
	2017	35%	60%	-25%	64%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data**

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	15	23	31	17	31	40					
ELL	19	22	25	27	32						
BLK	33	44		44	44						
HSP	35	36	38	39	39	47					
WHT	38	22		54	48						
FRL	35	37	38	42	44	52					
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	20	35	38	17	41	45					



2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
ELL	22	35	45	40	30	25					
BLK	38	47	70	44	44						
HSP	38	42	50	50	37	21					
WHT	44	50		53	36						
FRL	39	48	63	48	44	39					

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

#### Areas of Focus:

##### Activity #1

**Title** Safe and Engaging Learning Environment

**Rationale** If students feel safe and are engaged, they will want to attend school and student achievement will increase.

**Intended Outcome** Improved student attendance and student achievement.

**Point Person** Jennifer Blackburn (jennifer.blackburn@polk-fl.net)

##### Action Step

**Description**

1. Continue use of PBIS strategies, PAWS store, and monthly events.
2. Dean will monitor student referrals and create FBAs/BIPs when needed.
3. Teachers will participate in a book study on Eric Jensen's book, "Poor Students, Rich Teaching" and "Poor Students, Richer Teaching"
4. Attendance manager will print weekly attendance reports and look for trends with students.
5. Parent conferences with administration, teacher, and parent for students with documented attendance concerns.
6. Weekly and monthly attendance recognition.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Blackburn (jennifer.blackburn@polk-fl.net)

##### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

**Description**

1. Decrease in student referrals.
2. Observed implementation of strategies from the Eric Jensen's
2. Documentation of parent conferences regarding attendance.
3. Monitor attendance for a decrease in absences.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Blackburn (jennifer.blackburn@polk-fl.net)

## Activity #2

**Title** Moving students to grade level mastery and beyond

**Rationale** If we are able to move students from below-level to on-level or beyond, then students will be better prepared to be successful in college and career.

**Intended Outcome** Student achievement will increase.

**Point Person** Julia Allen (julia.allen@polk-fl.net)

### Action Step

**Description**

1. Increase and monitor use of Accelerated Reader
2. Increase and monitor use of IStation
3. PD from LSI consultant on the Ignite Series: Forging a Vision
4. Teachers will utilize tasks for instruction, as well as for centers, that are aligned to the depth of the standard.
5. Guided Reading instruction will be utilized during the reading block and power hour.
6. Math fact fluency will be monitored through the use of SMADs.
7. Before-school tutoring will be offered to struggling students for reading and math.
8. Instructional coaches will utilize the coaching cycle with struggling teachers.
9. Interventionists will be used to work with struggling students in their areas of need.

**Person Responsible** Julia Allen (julia.allen@polk-fl.net)

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

**Description**

1. AR reports will be monitored for percent correct, number of books read, and points earned.
2. IStation reports will be monitored for usage, interventions implanted, and student growth.
3. Lesson plans and walkthroughs will be monitored for effective implementation of LSI strategies.
4. Tasks will be reviewed prior to use during common planning and then the data will be reviewed after the use of the common task.
5. Walkthroughs and student scores on assessments will be utilized to monitor the effectiveness of guided reading.
6. Classroom charts will be utilized to track mastery of math facts.
7. Pretests and posttests will be utilized to monitor effectiveness.
8. Walkthroughs will be used to monitor the effectiveness of the coaching cycle.
9. Assessments and grades will be used to monitor the effectiveness of the interventionists.

**Person Responsible** Julia Allen (julia.allen@polk-fl.net)

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

See Parental Involvement Plan

#### **PFEP Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

When staff members identify students with social-emotional needs, they are referred to the school counselor. The school counselor will meet with the student (and parent if necessary) to determine what services are needed. Students may be assigned a buddy, check-in check-out system, group counseling, referral to the MTSS team, and/or referred to the mental health counselor.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

Laurel Elementary has Voluntary PreK, ESE PreK, and Head Start Pre-K classes. In the spring of each year, Laurel does early registration and parents are provided with backpacks filled with manipulatives, books, and other items to prepare students for kindergarten. In order to determine readiness rates of transitioning PreK students to kindergarten, Laurel uses a variety of readiness tools within the first thirty days of school. These include: STAR ELA, FLKRS, iStation, teacher made assessments, and teacher observation. The kindergarten teachers administer these assessments. As a result of these screening, the kindergarten teachers and administration are able to target specific needs for intervention. The Assistant Principal is available as a resource to provide feedback on reading test results and to recommend instructional strategies. In addition, during May of each year, PreK students visit the KG classrooms to become familiar with the KG classroom.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

Title I, Part A funds school-wide services to Laurel Elementary. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions for students with academic achievement needs. This program supports after-school and summer instructional programs, supplemental instructional materials, resource teachers, technology for students, professional development for the staff, and resources for parents. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III to ensure that staff development needs are addressed accordingly.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Migrant students enrolled in Laurel Elementary will be assisted by the school and by the District Migrant Education Program (MEP). Student will be prioritized by the MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status. MEP Teacher Advocates, assigned to schools with high percentages of migrant students, monitor the progress of the high need students and provide or coordinate supplemental academic support. Migrant Home-School Liaisons identify and recruit migrant students and their families for the MEP. They provide support to both students and parents in locating services necessary to ensure the academic success of these students whose education has been interrupted by numerous moves.

Title I, Part D, provides Transition Facilitators to assist students with transition from Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facilities back into their zoned school. The Transition Facilitators communicate

with the Guidance Counselors at schools to facilitate the transfer of records and appropriate placement. Professional development resources are available to all schools through Title II funds. In addition, School Technology Services provide technical support, technology training, and licenses for software programs and web-based access via Title II-D funds as made available. Funds available to Laurel Elementary are used to pay teacher salaries for collaborative planning after school. Title III provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners and their teachers in Title I schools, as well as professional learning opportunities for school staff.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

NA

Part V: Budget	
Total:	\$0.00