Lena Vista Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lena Vista Elementary School

925 BERKLEY RD, Auburndale, FL 33823

http://schools.polk-fl.net/lenavista

Demographics

Principal: Diameshia Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 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* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (45%) 2014-15: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Polk 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

Lena Vista Elementary School

925 BERKLEY RD, Auburndale, FL 33823

http://schools.polk-fl.net/lenavista

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 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	50%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

We, at Lena Vista Elementary, strive to empower students in an engaging environment with rigorous instruction that promotes academic excellence in all subgroups.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lena Vista creates a learning environment that will provide 100% Student Success

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sharp, Deneece	Principal	Members of the School Based Leadership Team assist with the development of the SIP. The team provides strategies, academic data, social/emotional data, and data for Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets. They help set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, and Relationship). Information is used to understand barriers, determine the effectiveness of the strategies and determine the next steps needed to move the school forward. Dru Gainey - Assistant Principal Erin Larson-Pease - Reading Coach Jane Jergensen - Media Specialist/AR Coordinator Windy Snyder - Math Coach Hunter Williams - Dean/PBIS Coach Teresa Hallam - Guidance Counselor Sara Lemire - School Social Worker Vivian Rivera - LEA
Larson-Pease, Erin	Instructional Coach	
Jergensen, Jane	Instructional Media	
Snyder, Windy	Instructional Coach	
Williams, Hunter	Dean	
Lemire, Sara	Attendance/ Social Work	Work with student and teachers on social and emotional issues.
Rivera, Vivian	Teacher, ESE	Oversees all ESE issues with students and teachers
Gainey, Dru	Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	126	133	159	144	131	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	827
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	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	3	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

41

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 6/9/2019

Prior Year - 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	89	87	72	78	73	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	482
One or more suspensions	2	1	3	11	19	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	0	10	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	33	50	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	2	1	7	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

Prior Year - 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	89	87	72	78	73	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	482
One or more suspensions	2	1	3	11	19	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	0	10	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	33	50	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	2	1	7	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	45%	51%	57%	40%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	51%	58%	44%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	49%	53%	38%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	43%	57%	63%	45%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	41%	56%	62%	39%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	47%	51%	35%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	47%	53%	51%	46%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	126 (0)	133 (0)	159 (0)	144 (0)	131 (0)	134 (0)	827 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (89)	0 (87)	0 (72)	0 (78)	0 (73)	0 (83)	0 (482)
One or more suspensions	0 (2)	0 (1)	0 (3)	0 (11)	0 (19)	0 (5)	0 (41)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (0)	0 (10)	0 (6)	0 (3)	0 (21)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (33)	0 (50)	0 (39)	0 (122)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	48%	52%	-4%	58%	-10%
	2018	38%	51%	-13%	57%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	48%	-13%	58%	-23%
	2018	29%	48%	-19%	56%	-27%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	40%	47%	-7%	56%	-16%
	2018	42%	50%	-8%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	56%	-4%	62%	-10%
	2018	36%	56%	-20%	62%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	56%	-17%	64%	-25%
	2018	34%	57%	-23%	62%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	25%	51%	-26%	60%	-35%
	2018	52%	56%	-4%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-27%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	38%	45%	-7%	53%	-15%
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	31	44	45	31	47	40	32				
ELL	25	43	58	30	40	33	25				
BLK	29	37	31	28	25						
HSP	36	39	50	36	43	33	45				
MUL	50			60							
WHT	53	56	56	49	43	48	43				
FRL	43	48	52	41	38	34	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	16	23	33	17	28	26	15				
ELL	31	38		31	37	23	20				
BLK	18	40	56	31	40	31	33				
HSP	43	52	40	39	38	14	43				
WHT	44	41	48	49	54	39	51				
FRL	39	43	48	41	46	30	46				
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	10	20	27	14	42	57	19				
ELL	30	47	45	37	41		47				
BLK	24	44	38	25	27	31	38				
HSP	40	47	57	43	45	54	52				
MUL	47			73							
WHT	45	41	29	50	38	29	55				
FRL	35	39	36	40	38	35	42				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	358
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39

English Language Learners	
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	25
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	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Data:
5th grade learning gains (including lowest 25%) was the lowest performing data component. This is a trend from previous years with this cohort.

Contributing Factors:
One 5th grade teacher was out on Pregnancy Leave and one 5th grade teacher resigned. Also the behavior/attendance rate of students within this cohort.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Data:
5th grade math proficiency showed the greatest decline from prior year.
4th grade math showed a 17% decline and 3rd grade math showed a 13% decline.

Contributing Factors:
One 5th grade teacher was out on Pregnancy Leave and one 5th grade teacher resigned. Also the behavior/attendance rate of students within this cohort.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Data:
5th grade math and language arts had the biggest gap when compared to the state average.
5th grade math had a 28% gap and 4th grade ELA had a 27% gap.

Contributing Factors:
One 5th grade teacher was out on Pregnancy Leave and one 5th grade teacher resigned. Also the behavior/attendance rate of students within this cohort.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Data:
3rd Grade had improvement in ELA and Math proficiency gains. This is not a trend from previous years.

Actions:

Professional Learning Communities that enabled teachers to instruct on the intent of the standard with a focus on cognitive complexity and student autonomy. Staff also worked on creating engaging classrooms with focus on student engagement activities in the classroom. Behavior and Attendance also was monitored and supported through Positive behavior classrooms.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance of All Students to maximize the learning potential

Engaging African American students through understanding of culture differences and use of strategies that impact the learning of these culture differences.

Setting high expectations of English Language Learners through the use of Success Criteria and Standards tracking.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Engaging African American Students
2. Attendance of Students
3. Engaging English Language Learners

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase students cognitive engagement in core instruction through rigorous and standards driven instruction
	School Grade of Core Instruction with 43% proficient
Rationale	Year 2 of working with Learning Science International on the Ignite Program in regards to the Data trends that show over the past 2 years that Lena Vista has not increased or established proficient growth in the core instruction specifically for Academic Proficiency and Growth in ELA and Math.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase growth by 10% Proficiency in core instruction School leader side-by-side coaching with an LSI consultant to build the vision, inspection, and feedback skills necessary to increase all students learning gains • Teamwork training, coaching, and a suite of classroom and leadership tools to produce sustainable transformations (with visible next-day results) in core instruction • Practical, hands-on training where teachers leave with skills to use in their next-day lessons • Coaching for Implementation that connects the professional learning to immediate classroom actions to ensure next-day implementation results and builds the capacity of school-based coaches to help lead this work
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Deneece Sharp (deneece.sharp@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Cognitive engagement in rigorous tasks aligned to the academic standards by: • School leader side-by-side coaching with an LSI consultant to build the vision, inspection, and feedback skills necessary to increase proficiency and learning gains Teamwork training, coaching, and a suite of classroom and leadership tools to produce sustainable transformations (with visible next-day results) in core instruction • Practical, hands-on training where teachers leave with skills to use in their next-day lessons which contain Learning Targets/Success Criteria, Target-Task Alignment, Team Talk, Purposeful Task, Mini Lessons and Team Ownership • Coaching for Implementation that connects the professional learning to immediate classroom actions to ensure next-day implementation results and builds the capacity of school-based coaches to help lead this work Tracking Student Growth and Progress through: • Using LSI Standards Tracker™, with IPads to focus on evidence of standards and monitor student progress examining student evidences to increase Core • Using LSI Growth Tracker™, to empower teachers, coaches, and PLC's with the tools and metrics to see video examples, facilitate peer support, and awards of professional growth in teaming, cognitive engagement, and verifying of learning to address Core Instruction. • Using LSI Standards Tracker™, for teachers to clarify standards-based learning targets

	and success criteria and ensure students are at the correct level of rigor. Teachers will use standards-based lesson planning/implementation with monitoring for real-time learning by examining student evidences from group or individual tasks and tracking the progress of student teams/individual students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Data as supported from Michael Toth and Robert Marzano: Learning Sciences International (LSI) has created Ignite Core Instruction™, a groundbreaking professional development (PD) series that focuses on igniting student ownership and engagement as the gateway for rigorous student-centered learning. Developed by LSI's Center for Applied Research, the Ignite Core Instruction PD series is comprised of in-person sessions with integrated technology-based supports and metrics designed to help teachers and school leaders strengthen core instruction to results-driven outcomes, including igniting students to increase:

Action Step

Description	Professional Learning throughout the year based of Learning Science International Ignite Program: 4 Professional Learning Communities (PLC) with training on Cognitive Engagement for instructional leaders to develop Core Instruction. Practical, hands-on training where teachers leave with skills to use in their next-day lessons. 3 School leadership side-by-side coaching to build the vision, inspection and feedback skills necessary for the principal to support the focus on rigorous, student-centered core instruction. 4 Virtual sessions are to provide implementation support to leaders. Coaches and school leaders look at the tool taught in the training, review building data collected by the principal prior to the session, and determine action steps for the leadership team to increase implementation across classrooms. *All of the above will include but not limited to: LSI Training and Conference in Summer w/ travel expenses for teachers and administration, LSI supplies, books, and materials , Print Shop for Printing, and IPads for Standards Tracker which includes cart, tv, pads. Administration will support and follow-up LSI sessions in all PLC trainings and Grade Level Planning sessions. The Leadership Team will review data on a regular basis to pinpoint areas of need and address those needs through the coaching cycle, interventions with students, and after-school learning opportunities.
Person Responsible	Deneece Sharp (deneece.sharp@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Rigor Based Standard Instruction on ESSA Subgroups of African American and ELL students. 39% African American and 25% ELL proficiency on FSA ELA
Rationale	Data trends that show over the past 2 years that Lena Vista has not increased or established proficient growth in the ESSA groups of African American and ELL students to meet the rigor of the standards through alignment of targets and success criteria.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase growth by 10% Proficiency in all deficient sub groups African American and ELL students. School leader side-by-side coaching to build culture awareness, learning strategies, and engagement feedback skills necessary to increase African American and ELL students. • Book study on creating teaming through rigorous task for all students with a focus on how to engage cultural differences, boys of color, and english language learners • Cultural training and coaching to produce sustainable transformations (with visible next-day results) in core instruction • Practical, hands-on training specifically designed to support learning of African American and English Language learners where teachers leave with skills to use in their next-day lessons • Coaching for Implementation that connects the professional learning to immediate classroom actions to ensure next-day implementation results and builds the capacity of school-based coaches to help lead this work
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Deneece Sharp (deneece.sharp@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using Ignite Core Instruction for Setting Goals, Objectives,Targets and Success Criteria for success of all students through teaming. Using inserts and book studies on: Understanding Poverty - Ruby Payne and Engaging Students with Poverty in Mind/Poorer Students, Rich Teaching - Erik Jensen
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Data as supported from Michael Toth and Robert Marzano: Learning Sciences International (LSI) has created Ignite Core Instruction™, a groundbreaking professional development (PD) series that focuses on igniting student ownership and engagement as the gateway for rigorous student-centered learning in all students Culture Understanding through Ruby Rayned and data collected through her research Brain Engagement through the works and study of Erik Jensen.
Action Step	
Description	Professional Learning throughout the year: Ongoing all year Professional Learning Communities (PLC) with training on Cognitive Engagement for African American and ELL students.

3 School leadership side-by-side coaching to build the vision, inspection and feedback skills necessary for the principal to support the focus on rigorous, student-centered core instruction with a focus of learning gains on African American and ELL students.

Meet with district and school Coaches and ESOL instructor monthly to monitor progress and student proficiency on state and district assessments such as STAR, IStation, Freckle, Use of Florida Studies Weekly and Florida Ready

Students, along with their teachers, will regularly analyze evidence of African American and ELL individual student progress. Teachers and students will track their progress on math and reading assessments and assignments, analyze their errors for patterns, and describe what they see in the data about their current level of performance through student success criteria. Students set personal goals informed by data they understand, and they own those goals.

Person Responsible   Deneece Sharp (deneece.sharp@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Fidelity of the Multi-Tiered system of Attendance through PBIS
The PBIS Team, Attendance Manager, Counselor, and District Social Worker will use bi-monthly attendance reports to monitor grade level attendance and identify students and families to support to improve attendance.
The Counselor will coordinate the Morning Club attendance intervention program for students with less than 90% attendance rate, including the 2018-19 Tier 3 students.
The Assistant Principal will recognize classes with attendance improvement and classes maintaining attendance rates at or above 90% each month. We will implement an attendance awareness program so that we increase the number of students arriving on time to school. We moved classroom intake to 10 minutes earlier so instruction could begin at exactly 8am.
The PBIS team, Attendance Manager, Counselor, and School Social Worker will monitor attendance of African American and ELL students along with behavior/social/emotional needs to make sure all supports are given to support the learning process.

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 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.

Lena Vista will host grade level family nights in order to provide parents the needed tools to help their children at home, to the extent feasible and appropriate, in order to move students forward in the areas of Language Arts, math, science and technology.

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.

Students identified as having social-emotional needs are given the opportunity to meet with the guidance counselor individually or in small groups or if applicable can be met through the classroom staff on a one-to-one basis. Severe cases may be handled with a contracted mental health counselor. The IEP also identifies and addresses social emotional goals for all of our students. Our school also utilizes the following resources (not all will apply and please elaborate on applicable resources):
• CHAMPS
• PBIS
• Mindful Schools
• Mentoring Programs
• Action Based Learning
• DrumBeats

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

Lena Vista Elementary assists Pre-K students in their transition to elementary school. Our school provides two Exceptional Student Education classes and Early Intervention Pre-K. Throughout the course of the year, Pre-Kindergarten students participate in school-wide programs that provide them with literature and information to make the transition into kindergarten a smooth process. In the spring, families are invited to participate in Kindergarten Round-Up. During round-up families are taken on a campus tour then presented with school information, which is delivered by administration, the reading coach, and kindergarten teachers. Materials from Title I and Success by Six are distributed to provide parents with information and practical strategies for children from birth to six years of age. Families are invited to the event through the use of local and social media, Title 1 newsletters, and SchoolMessenger.

Pre-K teachers use various techniques (observation, assessment, parent feedback), to monitoring the students' readiness. FLKRS is administered at the onset of the kindergarten school year. The data is disaggregated and the results aid in creating a target list of students who are labeled as high risk. Students who are found to have low readiness rates, are monitored and provided additional support. Reading and Math/Science Coaches work with teachers in planning lessons that accommodate the learning modalities of the high risk students, as well as assisting in the constant monitoring of students' progress. Parent feedback is another tool used to evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions in place. Kindergarten and Pre-Kindergarten teachers will collaborate with one another to monitor student progress in achieving readiness skills.

Other transitions are:
5th grade night at the middle school for incoming 6th graders

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 project funds school-wide services at our eligible and participating Title I schools. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions so that all students achieve

academic success.
• Title I, Part C project funds assist students that are prioritized by the MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status, as defined by federal and state regulations.
• Title I, Part D project funds provide Transition Facilitators at select Neglected and Delinquent school sites to assist students who transition from Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facilities back into their zoned school.
• Title II funds provide professional development resources to build the capacity of teachers by funding consultants, district professional development personnel, including district/regional coaches, and curriculum specialists. The Title II project contributes to the recruitment/retention of teachers in the district by funding district recruitment personnel, recruitment initiatives both within and outside the school district. Also, may reimburse certification exam fees for teachers placed in an area in which they do not yet have certification in upon successful passing of exam.
• Title III provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their teachers in Title I schools, professional learning opportunities for school staff, as well as parent family engagement opportunities.
• Title IX – Homeless OR HEARTH Program funded through Title IX and Title I, provides support for students identified as being in a homeless situation. Title I provides support for this program, through funding of HEARTH staff, professional development, and contracted extended learning services for students.

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

Lena Vista uses partnerships with local businesses to promote career awareness. Our SAC committee includes community members. Our Great American Teach-In encourages community members to visit our school to share their career information with students on an annual basis. We work with our local high schools to provide a Graduation Walk so students have role models. We also have college days where we have colleges come in and present music (band) and athletics. The staff joins in by wearing our college tshirts.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase students cognitive engagement in core instruction through rigorous and standards driven instruction				$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0841 - Lena Vista Elementary School			$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Rigor Based Standard Instruction on ESSA Subgroups of African American and ELL students.				$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0841 - Lena Vista Elementary School			$0.00
					Total:	$0.00