

Polk County Public Schools

Highlands Grove Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Highlands Grove Elementary School

4510 LAKELAND HIGHLANDS RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

www.polk-fl.net/highlandsgrove

Demographics

Principal: Lyndsy Kulcher

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2019

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)	77%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (69%) 2014-15: A (65%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Highlands Grove Elementary School

4510 LAKELAND HIGHLANDS RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

www.polk-fl.net/highlandsgrove

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	66%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	A	A	A

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.

At Highlands Grove Elementary our goal is to provide engaging instruction to our students and ensure that every student will achieve measurable learning gains. I make a difference!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Highlands Grove Elementary believes that all children can learn and that all teachers can find ways for the students to learn. The mission of Highlands Grove Elementary is to enhance the development of the total child with a life-long love of learning. That they may become a contributing member of society and display an eagerness to learn by participating in an academically challenging environment for students, staff, parents and community.

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
Henry, Ben	Principal	
Brackman, Gina	Teacher, K-12	ELA Coach
Franklin, Meagan	Teacher, K-12	Gifted Teacher K-5
Fish, Heather	School Counselor	Oversee MTSS
milcich, megan	Teacher, K-12	4th ELA teacher
Sweezey, Gina	Teacher, K-12	K Math teacher
mcluckey, alexander	Assistant Principal	
Nance, Sharon	Instructional Coach	Math Coach

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	103	135	115	138	101	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	708
Attendance below 90 percent	6	14	10	19	11	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	8	5	6	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	10	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	8	5	6	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	2	2	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

51

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/12/2019

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	23	22	17	16	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	4	6	7	8	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	4	6	7	8	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	23	22	17	16	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	4	6	7	8	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	4	6	7	8	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	63%	51%	57%	71%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	51%	58%	67%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	49%	53%	63%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	75%	57%	63%	79%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	56%	62%	78%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	47%	51%	67%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	47%	53%	62%	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	103 (0)	135 (0)	115 (0)	138 (0)	101 (0)	116 (0)	708 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	6 (23)	14 (22)	10 (17)	19 (16)	11 (16)	21 (13)	81 (107)
One or more suspensions	0 (4)	8 (6)	5 (7)	6 (8)	3 (12)	9 (8)	31 (45)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (3)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (2)	5 (11)	15 (7)	30 (20)

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	67%	52%	15%	58%	9%
	2018	75%	51%	24%	57%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	48%	19%	58%	9%
	2018	57%	48%	9%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	52%	47%	5%	56%	-4%
	2018	78%	50%	28%	55%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-26%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	56%	18%	62%	12%
	2018	84%	56%	28%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	56%	18%	64%	10%
	2018	76%	57%	19%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	68%	51%	17%	60%	8%
	2018	86%	56%	30%	61%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	51%	45%	6%	53%	-2%
	2018	75%	51%	24%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
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	23	38	40	33	62	63	14				

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
ELL	40	58	73	66	80		25				
BLK	45	51	44	55	63	57	21				
HSP	48	43	56	72	68	60	35				
MUL	36			45							
WHT	74	60	45	82	69	53	63				
FRL	47	50	46	60	56	52	29				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	25	28	21	45	57	48					
ELL	37	37	25	73	79						
BLK	40	37	21	51	52	53	10				
HSP	63	60	47	77	81	69	57				
WHT	81	61	43	92	87	83	90				
FRL	60	51	36	76	74	66	67				
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	31	33	36	38	62	53	25				
ELL	33	59	71	67	78	81					
BLK	35	51	56	54	65	56	30				
HSP	56	58	59	79	82	86	42				
WHT	84	74	76	86	80	53	76				
FRL	54	61	65	68	74	68	40				

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	61
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	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	484
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
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	41
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	64
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	52
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.

Learning gains of the Lowest Quartile in both ELA and Math performed the lowest with ELA 49 percent and Math 53 percent. When comparing 2018 data to 2017 data, ELA gains and proficiency held steady with little change, however math gains overall decreased. Math proficiency and gains remain higher than ELA overall.

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

Math gains overall showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Overall Math gains decreased by 7 percent and our Lowest Quartile decreased by 14 percent.

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.

Our overall numbers indicate that we are higher than the state in two category (ELA and Math achievement). Highlands Grove ELA and Math achievement scores outperformed the state. The state was at 57 percent proficiency in ELA and we are at 63 percent proficiency. The state was at 63 percent proficiency in Math and we are at 75 percent proficiency.

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

We saw a slight increase in our bottom 25% in fifth grade ELA. The increase can be correlated to the enrichment period we developed last year.

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

After reviewing the ESSA data, our students with disabilities is the only area of concern.

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

1. Math Learning Gains
2. ELA Learning Gains
3. SWD achievement
4. ELL achievement
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Lowest 25
Rationale	The highest priority need that is the focus based on data components from Florida Standards Assessment is math learning gains of the lowest 25 percentile and students with disabilities. 55% of students achieved math learning gains from the lowest 25 percentile on 2019-2020 FSA assessments. In comparison to the 2018-2019 school year, where 69% of students achieved math learning gains from the lowest 25 percentile. This is a decrease of 14% in the amount of students from the lowest 25 percentile achieving math learning gains.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The intended outcome is to increase the percentage of students identified in the lowest 25% subgroup with achieving math learning gains. The percentage of identified students from the lowest 25% subgroup with achieving math learning gains will increase to 65% for the 2019-2020 school year. This will indicate a percentage of 10 point increase from the 2018-2019 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ben Henry (benjamin.henry@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *The use of structured peer-assisted learning activities *Systematic and explicit instruction using visual representations *Modifying instruction based on data from formative assessment of students (such as classroom discussions or quizzes) *Providing opportunities for students to think aloud while they work
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our school's instructional and academic coach's will be included during intervention block of instruction for 4th and 5th grade students to provide remedial math instruction for an identified group of students. The identified students will receive intervention support through MTSS tiered level of instruction. Intervention groups will be based on common assessment data, STAR diagnostic assessments, and review of student sub-group populations.
Action Step	
	1. Our HGE school team will attend regular district trainings. They will then plan and lead professional development for teachers and coaches based on knowledge gained at the trainings. The leadership team will support the collaborative PLC process which will include analysis of student work, assessments, and instructional needs. We will support open classroom observation processes by conducting instructional rounds. Through this process, we will (a) identify classrooms in which additional support is needed and (b) identify model classrooms that can be used for peer observations.
Description	<p>We will be using title one funds to support this strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curriculum Development Ready Florida Instruction Teachers Manual - Math Scholastic Education Books - Math Brain Pop Jr. & Brain Pop Nearpod LSI conference Hand2Mind - Guided Math Curriculum SeeSaw Plus iPads LSI conference

Person Responsible Ben Henry (benjamin.henry@polk-fl.net)

#2

Title Math Learning Gains

Rationale A priority need that is the focus based on data components from Florida Standards Assessment is math learning gains. 67% of students achieved math learning gains on Rationale 2018-2019 FSA assessments. In comparison to the 2017-2018 school year, 81% of students achieved math learning gains. This is a decrease of 14% in the amount of students who achieved math learning gains.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve The intended outcome is to increase the percentage of students to achieve math learning gains. The percentage students to achieve math learning gains will increase to 75% for the 2019-2020 school year. This will indicate a percentage of a 8 point increase from the 2018-2019 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Sharon Nance (sharon.nance@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy

- *The use of structured peer-assisted learning activities
- *Systematic and explicit instruction using visual representations
- *Modifying instruction based on data from formative assessment of students (such as classroom discussions or quizzes)
- *Providing opportunities for students to think aloud while they work

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Our school's instructional and academic coach's will be included during intervention block of instruction for 4th and 5th grade students to provide remedial math instruction for an identified group of students. The identified students will receive intervention support through MTSS tiered level of instruction. Intervention groups will be based on common assessment data, STAR diagnostic assessments, and review of student sub-group populations.

Action Step

Description Our HGE school team will attend regular district trainings. They will then plan and lead professional development for teachers and coaches based on knowledge gained at the trainings. The leadership team will support the collaborative PLC process which will include analysis of student work, assessments, and instructional needs. We will support open classroom observation processes by conducting instructional rounds. Through this process, we will (a) identify classrooms in which additional support is needed and (b) identify model classrooms that can be used for peer observations.

Person Responsible Ben Henry (benjamin.henry@polk-fl.net)

#3	
Title	ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	A priority need that is the focus based on data components from Florida Standards Assessment is ELA learning gains. 54% of students achieved ELA learning gains on Rationale 2018-2019 FSA assessments. In comparison to the 2017-2018 school year, where 57% of students achieved ELA learning gains. This is a decrease of 3% in the amount of students who achieved ELA learning gains.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The intended outcome is to increase the percentage of students to achieve ELA learning gains. The percentage students to achieve ELA learning gains will increase to 60% for the 2019-2020 school year. This will indicate a percentage of a 6 point increase from the 2018-2019 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Gina Brackman (gina.brackman@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Phonemic awareness activities for foundational reading skills. Phonics instruction in vowel teams, segmenting/blending activities, instruction in open/closed syllables to decode multisyllabic words, manipulating words and building word families. 2. Building background knowledge and increasing vocabulary. 3. Fluency reading and reader's theatre. 4. Strategies for increasing comprehension are Stop and Jot, graphic organizers, higher order thinking questions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rational: in order to read words, students need to know how to decode sounds and break apart or chunk word parts. We will use best practices given by Wiley Blevins and Collaborative Classroom/SIPPS. Early STAR, BEAR diagnostics, and fluency reading will help to identify areas needing instruction and remediation. 2. Rational: Students hook themselves better into text when they have background knowledge of the subject matter and can understand vocabulary in the text. Marzano has strategies to build vocabulary and research behind increasing background knowledge. 3. Rationale: For students to successfully comprehend they need to read with prosody. Students need opportunities to practice fluency. Fluency assessments will be given and errors will be analyzed to reteach phonics patterns, phrasing, and expression. 4. Rationale: monitoring comprehension and organizing thought patterns help students to better understand what they read. Discussion with partners and using assessments with higher order thinking questions will help to evaluate if students comprehend the text. Additional resources to use besides Reading Wonders is Florida Ready and Reading A to Z.
Action Step	
Description	Our HGE school team will attend regular district trainings. They will then plan and lead professional development for teachers and coaches based on knowledge gained at the trainings. The leadership team will support the collaborative PLC process which will include

analysis of student work, assessments, and instructional needs. We will support open classroom observation processes by conducting instructional rounds. Through this process, we will (a) identify classrooms in which additional support is needed and (b) identify model classrooms that can be used for peer observations.

We will be using title one funds to support this strategy with the following items:

Curriculum Development
Curriculum Associates consultant
Wiley Blevin
Brain Pop and Brain Pop Jr.
SIPPS
Ready Florida materials
Step Up to Writing Program
Scholastic News
Nearpod
LSI conference
iPads
Performance Coach materials
RAZ Kids Plus
Handwriting without Tears
Story Works
STARS and CARS booklets

Person Responsible Ben Henry (benjamin.henry@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).

NA

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, 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.

Our school utilizes our PTO, weekly news video, teacher conferences and our remind 101 text messenger program. The parent portal is promoted for parents to keep informed of their child's progress between interim and report card dates. Parent nights and orientation day are planned for parents to become acquainted with their child's teacher and classroom. Evening student performances for parents encourage a positive relationship with families.

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
- DrumBeats
- Sanford Harmony

Highlands Grove has a Problem Solving team that meets weekly to address students academic, social, emotional or behavior concerns. The team consists of ESE teachers, school counselor, school psychologist, school administration and teachers. Interventions are implemented and monitored. ESE teachers and the counselor offer social skills counseling. The school psychologist, counselor and social worker counsel individually with students and offer assistance to parents with community agency referrals. The school social worker will make home visits as needed to help with families who may need assistance. We also, have a mentoring program called Helping Heroes where students who need more support are matched with a staff member and use the check in check out system.

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

PRE-K
Kindergarten Round Up
5th graders visiting/touring middle schools
WE3 Expo

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.

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

Career inventories will be used at all grade levels to help students identify skills and interests for college and career planning

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Lowest 25	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00