Spessard L Holland Elementary

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Spessard L Holland Elementary

2342 EF GRIFFIN RD, Bartow, FL 33830

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

Demographics

Principal: Lacey Golden

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)	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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (45%) 2014-15: B (58%)
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

Spessard L Holland Elementary

2342 EF GRIFFIN RD, Bartow, FL 33830

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

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	78%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	51%

School Grades History

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

The mission of Spessard L. Holland Elementary is to provide high quality education for all students in an environment where students are eager to learn, willing to serve, and preparing to lead.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Spessard L. Holland is that every student will achieve at his or her maximum potential in engaging learning environments in preparation for the next grade level.

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
Butler, Melody	Principal	Principal - as defined by Polk County Public Schools job description
Jeske, Ross	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal - as defined by Polk County Public Schools job description
Buchanan, Melanie	Other	LEA Facilitator - as defined by Polk County Public Schools job description
Koon, Mary Ann	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor - as defined by Polk County Public Schools job description
Willis, Kacy	Instructional Coach	Math Instructional Coach - as defined by Polk County Public Schools job description
Hilgenberg, Craig	Instructional Coach	Reading Instructional Coach - as defined by Polk County Public Schools job description
Villeneuve, Kerry	Instructional Coach	Reading Interventionist - as defined by Polk County Public Schools job description
Rodgers, Erin	Dean	Dean - as defined by Polk County Public Schools job description

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	114	115	99	145	101	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	703
Attendance below 90 percent	18	14	11	18	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	1	2	9	13	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	19	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

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	1	0	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	5	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
54

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 8/21/2019

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	16	11	13	8	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	3	1	3	3	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	13	15	26	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	53	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

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	5	3	4	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	16	11	13	8	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	3	1	3	3	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	13	15	26	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	53	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

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	5	3	4	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	55%	51%	57%	64%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	51%	58%	55%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	49%	53%	34%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	57%	63%	69%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	56%	62%	64%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	47%	51%	47%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	47%	53%	58%	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	114 (0)	115 (0)	99 (0)	145 (0)	101 (0)	129 (0)	703 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	18 (16)	14 (11)	11 (13)	18 (8)	9 (13)	13 (25)	83 (86)
One or more suspensions	1 (3)	2 (1)	9 (3)	13 (3)	8 (6)	11 (9)	44 (25)
Course failure in ELA or Math	4 (10)	0 (13)	0 (15)	9 (26)	0 (6)	0 (2)	13 (72)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	16 (9)	19 (53)	36 (33)	71 (95)

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	65%	52%	13%	58%	7%
	2018	79%	51%	28%	57%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	48%	5%	58%	-5%
	2018	39%	48%	-9%	56%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
05	2019	35%	47%	-12%	56%	-21%
	2018	61%	50%	11%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-26%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	65%	56%	9%	62%	3%
	2018	81%	56%	25%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	56%	8%	64%	0%
	2018	53%	57%	-4%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
05	2019	44%	51%	-7%	60%	-16%
	2018	61%	56%	5%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	37%	45%	-8%	53%	-16%
	2018	59%	51%	8%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-22%				
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	34	39	32	53	46	15				

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	13	43	58	42	50	55	18				
BLK	37	28	46	49	63	39	19				
HSP	51	54	41	59	50	58	21				
WHT	63	54	38	68	58	43	56				
FRL	44	41	42	49	53	50	33				

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	26	18	19	37	31	29	35				
ELL	35	36		71	64						
BLK	54	40	24	46	35	24	40				
HSP	54	46	60	68	43	38	64				
MUL	64			55							
WHT	63	50	41	72	48	39	63				
FRL	55	52	44	59	45	41	58				

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	28	16	17	30	45	42	21				
ELL	42	43	50	48	67	60	20				
BLK	51	49	40	57	51	46	39				
HSP	61	50	38	61	66	53	42				
WHT	70	60	23	76	65	44	71				
FRL	58	55	37	57	55	47	38				

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	53
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	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	425
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	44
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	40
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	52
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
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	49
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.

Our 5th grade ELA showed the lowest performing proficiency with a 4% decrease from their 4th grade year (39% to 35%). After review of the data, a trend with this particular cohort was identified for students that were in a more restrictive learning environment (i.e. resource and self-contained classrooms) scored lower in terms of proficiency. Contributing factors to this trend include: two first year teachers added to the grade level, two other long term maternity leaves with substitutes filling those voids, and an unusually high number of students identified with disabilities in that particular cohort of students.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year of FSA proficiency was the same grade cohort going from 3rd grade to the 4th grade in ELA. This cohort went from a 79% proficiency rate to 53%. Contributing factors to this decline were as follows: the added calculation of the writing component factored into the reading ability of the student, one first year teacher that ultimately contributes to half of the grade level data, and a lack of rigor and creative use of resources with too much of a reliance on the text instead of standards-driven instruction.

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 5th grade ELA showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average with the school average being 21% lower than the state. After review of the data, a trend with this particular cohort was identified for students that were in a more restrictive learning environment (i.e. resource and self-contained classrooms) scored lower in terms of proficiency. Contributing factors to this trend include: two first year teachers added to the grade level, two other long term maternity leaves with substitutes filling those voids, and an unusually high number of students identified with disabilities in that particular cohort of students.

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

The same grade comparison in 4th grade showed an improvement in both ELA and Math with an increase of 14% and 11% respectively. Although this was an improvement from a same grade perspective, the school recognizes that the cohort was a major contributing factor to these two increases.

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

One potential area of concern is the number of level 1 students in ELA and Math and closing the achievement gap by moving these students towards proficiency and/or moving them up into a high subcategory so they can display a learning gain. Our two other potential concerns, as identified by ESSA are our students with disabilities and black student population.

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

1. ELA Proficiency Grades 3-5
2. Science Proficiency Grade 5
3. Students with Disabilities
4. Black Student Population
5. Achieving Learning Gains in Math and ELA Grades 3-5

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Improvement of Core Instruction
Rationale	In order to increase overall student achievement, an intentional plan will be used to monitor and provide feedback regarding standards-driven lesson plans, student teaming, and success criteria.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By focusing on the improvement of core instruction, the school plans to achieve an increase in each of the same cohort comparisons of overall proficiency in both ELA and Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Melody Butler (melody.butler@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	*Target-Task Alignment *Student Teaming *Success Criteria *Student-Centered Classrooms *Collaborative Planning *High Performing Professional Learning Communities *Tiered Supports for Teachers *Feedback via Journey and Trend Tracker Entries *Monitoring Conditions for Learning *Coaching for Implementation *Continue the implementation of Accelerated Reader
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting the strategies above will result in successful conditions and the amount of rigor for optimal learning. These strategies will ensure engaging, student-led learning environments, where students are equipped to apply their knowledge, question new content, and demonstrate their mastery of each standard.
Action Step	
Description	1. Trend Tracker Instructional Leadership Walks 2. Grade level and Individual Feedback of Classroom Visits 3. Actively participate in Collaborative Planning with Administration debriefing afterwards 4. Continuation of the LSI School Maturity Model with expending funds on items including: staff books, 5. Teachers will plan lessons using resources such as: lexile readers, periodicals(scholastic news, social studies weekly, super science, technology, AR books, manipulatives). 6. Grade level chairs will plan for enhanced learning experiences outside of the classroom by attending field trips that align with the given grade level standards in Science, Mathematics, and ELA. 7. Weekly collaborative planning facilitated by academic coaches for both ELA and Mathematics using the adult learning model and coaching cycle for identified areas paid for with Title I funds.
Person Responsible	Melody Butler (melody.butler@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Increase Learning Gains in ELA and Mathematics
Rationale	Data shows a downward trend in in same cohort comparisons for proficiency in ELA and Mathematics. To address this trend, strategies and action steps will be initiated to target the learning gains component of the school grade calculation.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increased learning gain percentages in both ELA and Mathematics Grades 3-5. Third grade retained students will show 100% learning gains in both reading and math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ross Jeske (ross.jeske@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	*Target-Task Alignment *Student Teaming *Success Criteria *Student-Centered Classrooms *Collaborative Planning *High Performing Professional Learning Communities *Tiered Supports for Teachers *Feedback via Journey and Trend Tracker Entries *Monitoring Conditions for Learning *Coaching for Implementation *Continue 3-Act tasks, 5E model, and use of manipulatives in all classrooms *Reading interventionist will target specific populations of students in the lowest quartile and the identified ESSA subgroups with Black students at 40% and Students with Disabilities at 35% using MTSS based interventions as outlined in the Power Hour resource materials.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting the strategies above will result in successful conditions and the amount of rigor for optimal learning. These strategies will ensure engaging, student-led learning environments, where students are equipped to apply their knowledge, question new content, and demonstrate their mastery of each standard.
Action Step	
Description	1. Trend Tracker Instructional Leadership Walks 2. Grade level and Individual Feedback of Classroom Visits 3. Actively participate in Collaborative Planning with Administration debriefing afterwards 4. Continuation of the LSI School Maturity Model with expending funds on items including: staff books, 5. Teachers will plan lessons using resources such as: math focused books, manipulatives, technology, other materials needed. 6. Grade level chairs will plan for enhanced learning experiences outside of the classroom by attending field trips that align with the given grade level standards in Mathematics and ELA. 7. Parent and Family Engagement with sharing resources that can be made at evening events and taken home to assist children with deficiencies in Mathematical and ELA standards. 8. School to home communication using a variety of tools such as: school newsletter, Tuesday folders, student agenda, technology, and celebrating achievements on school based social media.

9. Tutoring offered for targeted at-risk students in both ELA and Mathematics.
10. Reading interventionist will work directly with retained third grade students as well as the identified ESSA subgroups and their deficiencies with specific reading standards to increase learning gains paid for with Title I funds.

Person Responsible   Ross Jeske (ross.jeske@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).

By following the MTSS process with fidelity for attendance, academics, and behavior, a positive impact towards student achievement will be evident. With the students with disabilities subgroup, a significant reduction in the number of students served in a more restrictive environment took place (i.e. resource and self-contained classrooms). Additionally, the inclusion based teachers are now in a model of looping up with their case load for the children they served the previous year to further enrich relationships, knowledge of these students' academic performances, and their needed accommodations to be successful in the classroom.

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.

Spessard L. Holland works at building positive relationships with families using the following methods:
1. Daily communication in students' agendas and student Tuesday folders.
2. Back to School and Parent Orientation Nights
3. Classdojo School Story and school's Facebook page are used to communicate important events.
4. Parent/Teacher Conferences
5. Volunteer orientation, training, and implementation program
6. Chorus, Gator News Network, Tivitz, A-Team, Art club, Uke Club, and Red Ribbon Run with parent participation
7. Family Literacy, FSA, and Curriculum Nights
8. The school website highlights the mission, vision, and school events.
9. The school brochure communicates specific information on the school.
10. Social media with Twitter, Facebook, and Classdojo
11. Parent Compact for Learning
12. School Advisory Council
13. United Way Campaign participation
14. Multicultural Night
15. Parent Family Engagement Plan
16. Great American Teach-In

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.

Guidance services are provided by a certified guidance counselor and school psychologist housed on campus. Lessons on conflict resolution, social skills, and bullying take place. Guidance implements social skills groups, anger management classes, and assists when teaching of anti-bullying lessons. Specific needs such as grief counseling, divorce, and suicide are dealt with on a case-by-case basis. A threat assessment is given when students demonstrate an indication of harm to self or others. The Sanford Harmony social emotional program will be implemented with K-5 students. In addition, fourth and fifth grade students are provided health classes annually by a nurse with lessons pertaining to social-emotional health. Internet safety classes are also provided annually. Resources are available for parents who need or request them. Parent workshops and literature on bullying are given annually by school and district personnel. Mental health counseling is provided by a highly qualified therapist. Regularly scheduled sessions take place weekly with documentation. DrumBeat, a program with a mix of at-risk who collaborate playing the drums in an effort to support the social-emotional needs of the at-risk children. Mental health services are provided for students with supports in place on a 504 Plan or an Individual Education Plan (IEP) as well as those students without these services from our newly appointed mental health liaison and social worker.

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

Spessard L. Holland Elementary has two Pre-K units providing early education on campus with special family events in preparation for the Kindergarten transition. Pre-K students and families are invited to participate in media nights, chorus events, and all open house events as well as an end of the year program. Kindergarten Roundup is offered in the spring for all incoming kindergarten students and parents. Packets of information, a tour of the campus, and presentations by the principal and teachers take place to orient the families. Articulation meetings take place throughout the year for students with special needs when transitioning to middle school level. Middle school guidance counselors, band directors, and other various elective teachers visit the school annually sharing informational packets with students on the core curriculum and electives. The middle school band comes to the school for a concert to acclimate students regarding the opportunities in music at the middle school level. Information on sporting events are shared by teachers to build connections as the students transition. Feeder middle school principals are invited to all school-wide evening events in order to bridge the gap as a pathway to middle school.

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.

The instructional leadership team meets weekly to align all available resources (personnel, instruction, curricular) by district allocated FTE funds, Title One funds, Title II funds, and district supports to maximize student outcomes using the following:
-Coaching & Reading Interventionist support in ELA & Math funded by Title One
-Reading Wonders core curriculum with formative assessments
-Star Early Literacy and STAR baseline and ongoing assessments by district supports
-Hearth support and resources by district supports
-Homeless Student Advocates funded by the district
-School Psychologist support funded by the district
-FSA and ACCESS assessments

-Accelerated Reader ZPD reading and comprehension by district supports
-District Writing assessments
-Science lab materials and consumables for 5E lessons by district support
-Inquiry based activities in math and science by district support
-Extended after school tutoring with highly qualified teachers funded by Title One
-Digital tools, technical support, training, and licensed software program support through the district
School Technology Services (STS)
-ESE inclusion and self-contained teachers
-ESOL para-professional by district supports
-Go Math as a resource by district supports
-STEMScopes science materials
-Social Studies readers with written response guides
-Field Trips paid for with Title One Funding
-Lexiled Readers paid for with Title One Funding
-Staff Development Conferences supporting content and LSI
-Mental Health Therapist funded by ESE
-Professional Development books for teachers provided by Title One
-Math manipulatives purchased by Title One
-Technology resources purchased by Title One
- Monitor the action steps for each of the areas of focus outlined

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

Spessard L. Holland Elementary participates in the Great American Teach-In and Take Your Child to Work Day giving the students opportunities to use speaking and listening skills sharing experiences. Middle school and high school students from local schools are given the opportunity to shadow teachers and administrators as they prepare for college and career. Throughout the year, visitors such as dental hygienists, firefighters and police officers, and authors are visible on campus sharing information with students on their specific careers. Polk State College brings the baseball team annually to the school to read to students and to talk about the importance of elementary school in preparing for college. The local police department partners with the Triple A safety patrol program. The local fire department comes during Fire Safety Week with presentations to students in K - 2. Students in fifth grade attend the WE3 Expo where they become acquainted with the academies at local middle and high schools. An annual tradition of inviting past elementary students who are in the process of graduating will take place in May to celebrate and encourage current elementary students to aspire to graduate.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improvement of Core Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Learning Gains in ELA and Mathematics	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00