

Polk County Public Schools

Scott Lake 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Scott Lake Elementary School

1140 COUNTY ROAD 540A E, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

Demographics

Principal: Tangela Durham

Start Date for this Principal: 8/21/2019

| | |
|--|--|
| 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) | 80% |
| 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (59%) 2014-15: A (67%) |
| 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Scott Lake Elementary School

1140 COUNTY ROAD 540A E, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

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 | 72% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 48% |

School Grades History

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

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.

Scott Lake Elementary strives to ensure every student achieves academically, socially, and emotionally.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student matters, every moment counts, everyday!

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 |
|----------------|---------------------|---|
| Durham, Tangel | Principal | <p>Our Leadership Team consists of administrators, counselors, academic coaches, and teacher leaders. The team meets weekly to collaboratively plan with teachers as well as assist with interventions for students' success. The team is responsible for the analyzing weekly/monthly data and links that data to instructional decisions. In addition, the team reviews progress monitoring data with teachers to identify students who are at moderate or high risk for not meeting state standards. This team is also responsible for facilitating the process of making decisions about the implementation of effective interventions.</p> <p>Principal: The Principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. She leads and assists in setting up structures for high impact instruction, data-based decision-making, and a collaborative culture. She monitors the progress of intentional planning by attending weekly grade level collaborative planning sessions as well as PLCs. She also conducts daily walkthroughs, provides consistent formative feedback to support the professional growth of all teachers, and openly communicates with parents to build positive relationships.</p> |
| Kaufmann, Ron | Assistant Principal | <p>Assistant Principal: Assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, in the assessment of school staff, and assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas. He provides commentary on a weekly basis and works with the principal to make schedule adjustments as needed. The assistant principal also provides and supports common vision for PBIS and CHAMPS by enforcing protocol and policy. The Assistant Principal will also ensure that classrooms have the necessary materials/furniture/arrangements that are conducive to learning based on teacher discretion.</p> |
| Shim, Candace | School Counselor | <p>School Counselor: Provides training and support in the MTSS/RtI process annually and as needed; works with teachers through the problem solving cycle; facilitates leadership meetings related to MTSS/RtI. Teaches students through classroom guidance lessons, provides classroom guidance lessons; works with the Principal and/or Assistant Principal on issues of behavior; acts as a parent contact for parents who have academic and/or social concerns related to their child. Spearheads all aspects of PBIS.</p> |
| Thomas, Jackie | Other | <p>Analyzes writing and science data in order to identify students in need of extra support; uses supplemental resources to increase achievement; meet with targeted students; plan with teachers to determine additional needs/improvements of students, and provide small group instruction to students in the lowest quartile. Participates in grade level collaborative planning with a standards-focus, monitoring for the rigor of the standards, and teaching with the most effective instructional strategies aligned with Marzano's framework. Delivers professional development aligned with our priorities, provide grade-level, and one-on-one coaching as well as additional support to both</p> |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|
| | | teachers and students in meeting the rigor of the standards. Also gathers resources for support within all three tiers, follow up on individual student progress and identify professional development needs in order for interventions to be successful and provide coaching/mentoring support to strengthen core. |
| Single, Tracy | Other | LEA Facilitator: Coordinates educational placement and appropriate services for students with disabilities. Also serves as the lead representative at staffings and IEP (Individual Education Plan) meetings and provides direct support to students with disabilities and their general education and ESE teachers to promote inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education environment. |
| Payne, Mallory | Instructional Coach | Participates in grade level collaborative planning with a standards-focus, monitoring for the rigor of the standards, and teaching with the most effective instructional strategies aligned with Marzano's framework. Delivers professional development aligned with our priorities, provide grade-level, and one-on-one coaching as well as additional support to both teachers and students in meeting the rigor of the standards. Also, gathers resources for support within all three tiers, follow up on individual student progress and identify professional development needs in order for interventions to be successful and provide coaching/mentoring support to strengthen core. |
| Widner, Deborah | Instructional Media | Media Specialist: Provides knowledge of availability and suitability of information resources to support curriculum initiatives, engages in the developmental process with the planning team, using knowledge of school curriculum and professional resources, facilitates the use of presentation tools in print, technology, and media for dissemination efforts, and serves as an expert in organizing, synthesizing, and communicating information. |
| Brennan, Chris | Other | Analyzes reading and math data in order to identify students in need of extra support; uses supplemental resources to increase achievement; meet with targeted students; plan with teachers to determine additional needs/improvements of students, and provide small group instruction to students in the lowest quartile. Participates in grade level collaborative planning with a standards-focus, monitoring for the rigor of the standards, and teaching with the most effective instructional strategies aligned with Marzano's framework. Delivers professional development aligned with our priorities, provide grade-level, and one-on-one coaching as well as additional support to both teachers and students in meeting the rigor of the standards. Also gathers resources for support within all three tiers, follow up on individual student progress and identify professional development needs in order for interventions to be successful and provide coaching/mentoring support to strengthen core. |
| Cannon, Nicole | Instructional Coach | Participates in grade level collaborative planning with a standards-focus, monitoring for the rigor of the standards, and teaching with the most effective |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|-------|---|
| | | instructional strategies aligned with Marzano's framework. Delivers professional development aligned with our priorities, provide grade-level, and one-on-one coaching as well as additional support to both teachers and students in meeting the rigor of the standards. Also, gathers resources for support within all three tiers, follow up on individual student progress and identify professional development needs in order for interventions to be successful and provide coaching/mentoring support to strengthen core. |

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 | 99 | 138 | 110 | 134 | 121 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 740 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 32 | 11 | 16 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |
| One or more suspensions | 13 | 9 | 4 | 11 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |

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 | 6 | 19 | 8 | 19 | 17 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 |

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 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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

45

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 | 26 | 20 | 19 | 20 | 17 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 |
| One or more suspensions | 16 | 6 | 17 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 22 | 4 | 7 | 22 | 12 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 31 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 |
| Over-age 2 or more year for the grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 24 | 8 | 14 | 26 | 28 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |

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 | 26 | 20 | 19 | 20 | 17 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 |
| One or more suspensions | 16 | 6 | 17 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 22 | 4 | 7 | 22 | 12 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 31 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 |
| Over-age 2 or more year for the grade | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 24 | 8 | 14 | 26 | 28 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |

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 | 57% | 51% | 57% | 63% | 51% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 49% | 51% | 58% | 57% | 53% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 29% | 49% | 53% | 40% | 50% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 70% | 57% | 63% | 69% | 58% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 64% | 56% | 62% | 63% | 57% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 47% | 51% | 42% | 49% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 63% | 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 | 99 (0) | 138 (0) | 110 (0) | 134 (0) | 121 (0) | 138 (0) | 740 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 (26) | 32 (20) | 11 (19) | 16 (20) | 10 (17) | 12 (13) | 89 (115) |
| One or more suspensions | 13 (16) | 9 (6) | 4 (17) | 11 (10) | 6 (13) | 10 (10) | 53 (72) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 8 (22) | 3 (4) | 0 (7) | 0 (22) | 1 (12) | 0 (16) | 12 (83) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 13 (36) | 13 (31) | 35 (30) | 61 (97) |

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 | 61% | 52% | 9% | 58% | 3% |
| | 2018 | 61% | 51% | 10% | 57% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 52% | 48% | 4% | 58% | -6% |
| | 2018 | 60% | 48% | 12% | 56% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 56% | 47% | 9% | 56% | 0% |
| | 2018 | 58% | 50% | 8% | 55% | 3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 78% | 56% | 22% | 62% | 16% |
| | 2018 | 60% | 56% | 4% | 62% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 18% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 65% | 56% | 9% | 64% | 1% |
| | 2018 | 66% | 57% | 9% | 62% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 65% | 51% | 14% | 60% | 5% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 56% | 56% | 0% | 61% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 60% | 45% | 15% | 53% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 68% | 51% | 17% | 55% | 13% |
| 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 | 30 | 25 | 13 | 45 | 55 | 52 | 33 | | | | |
| ELL | 30 | 29 | | 48 | 47 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 33 | 25 | 44 | 54 | 54 | 30 | | | | |
| HSP | 45 | 33 | 14 | 63 | 56 | 47 | 55 | | | | |
| MUL | 69 | | | 54 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 69 | 60 | 43 | 83 | 73 | 45 | 80 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 40 | 24 | 57 | 53 | 40 | 53 | | | | |
| 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 | 48 | 47 | 34 | 42 | 29 | 60 | | | | |
| ELL | 19 | 53 | | 33 | 47 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 32 | 27 | 37 | 38 | 26 | 47 | | | | |
| HSP | 48 | 54 | 65 | 50 | 50 | 45 | 60 | | | | |
| MUL | 93 | 82 | | 79 | 50 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 71 | 60 | 60 | 75 | 64 | 32 | 79 | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | 52 | 52 | 51 | 52 | 33 | 64 | | | | |
| 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 | 17 | 38 | 32 | 27 | 43 | 25 | 9 | | | | |
| ELL | 33 | 44 | 30 | 52 | 67 | 60 | | | | | |
| BLK | 32 | 33 | 24 | 43 | 48 | 36 | 22 | | | | |
| HSP | 56 | 58 | 39 | 59 | 60 | 53 | 47 | | | | |
| MUL | 92 | | | 92 | | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| WHT | 73 | 62 | 52 | 78 | 67 | 36 | 60 | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | 50 | 40 | 54 | 53 | 41 | 32 | | | | |

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 | 57 |
| 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 | 75 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 455 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 36 |
| 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 | 46 |
| 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 |

| Asian Students | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 39 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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 | 62 |
| 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 | 65 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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.

ELA bottom 25% showed the lowest performance. With the exception of 2017-2018, this component has been the lowest over the past five years.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year is ELA bottom 25%. This data component declined by 22%.

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.

The ELA Lowest 25th percentile had the greatest gap when compared to the state average showing a 22 point decrease from the previous year.

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

The Math Lowest 25th percentile showed the most improvement with a 14 point increase from the previous year.

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

Based on the EWS data, an area of concern for the school would be the number of students that earned a level 1 on the Florida Standards Assessments.

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

1. ELA Core Instruction
2. Students in the Lowest 25th Percentile
3. Students with Disabilities
4. Black/African American Students Subgroup
5. ELL

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| #1 | |
|---|---|
| Title | ELA Bottom 25% |
| Rationale | According to our current Spring 2019 FSA data, the percentage of bottom 25% students making learning gains in reading decreased from 51% to 29% with a decline of 22%. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | With this as a focus area, we will improve gains in the lowest quartile by at least 10%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Leadership Team will track student membership in the bottom quartile due to student mobility. Teachers will then use weekly/monthly data to plan for small group instruction. Students in this group will receive daily small group instruction |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | As a result of student mobility, the bottom quartile will change. By continuously tracking, we know the membership of the targeted population. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify all students in the bottom 30% 2. Administration and Coaches will conduct weekly collaborative grade level planning sessions with the focus on moving identified students. 3. Along with the curriculum coaches, interventionist, and classroom teachers, collaboratively design small group instruction. 4. Teachers will provide targeted, face-to-face small group instruction on a daily basis with the identified students being the first group each day. 5. Administration and Curriculum Coaches will closely monitor the identified students on a weekly/monthly basis. 6. Coaches and interventionist will provide content rich nonfiction text for classroom libraries. 7. Adjust instruction and/or supports based on data. 8. Coaches and Interventionist will provide enriched extended learning opportunities which will include hands on learning experiences for academic vocabulary. |
| Person Responsible | Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net) |

| #2 | |
|---|---|
| Title | Students with Disabilities |
| Rationale | 36% of our Students with Disabilities are on track to proficiency. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Increase SWD proficiency by 15%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Teachers will use weekly/monthly data to plan for small group instruction. Students in this group will receive daily small group instruction. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | To ensure we are meeting the needs of SWD students to move them towards grade level proficiency. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify all SWD students. 2. Administration and Coaches will conduct weekly collaborative grade level planning sessions with the focus on moving identified students. 3. Along with the curriculum coaches, interventionist, and classroom teachers, collaboratively design small group instruction. 4. Inclusion and classroom teachers will provide targeted, face-to-face small group instruction on a daily basis with the identified students. 5. Administration and Curriculum Coaches will closely monitor the identified students on a weekly/monthly basis. 6. Coaches and interventionist will provide content rich nonfiction text for classroom libraries. 7. Adjust instruction and/or supports based on data. 8. Coaches and Interventionist will provide enriched extended learning opportunities which will include hands on learning experiences for academic vocabulary. |
| Person Responsible | Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net) |

| #3 | |
|---|--|
| Title | Black/African American Students |
| Rationale | 39% of the identified demographic are on track to proficiency. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Increase proficiency within the black/African American subgroup by at least 10%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Teachers will use weekly/monthly data to plan for students interventions and small group instruction. Students in this group will receive daily small group instruction |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | To ensure we are meeting the needs of our Black/African American students to move them towards grade level proficiency. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify students within the Black/African American subgroup. 2. Administration and coaches will conduct weekly collaborative grade level planning sessions with the focus on moving identified students. 3. Curriculum coaches, interventionist, and classroom teachers will collaboratively design small group instruction. 4. Teachers will provide targeted, face-to-face small group instruction with the identified students. 5. Administration and Curriculum Coaches will closely monitor the identified students on a weekly/monthly basis. 6. Coaches and interventionist will provide content rich nonfiction text for classroom libraries. 7. Adjust instruction and/or supports based on data. 8. Coaches and Interventionist will provide enriched extended learning opportunities which will include hands on learning experiences for academic vocabulary. |
| Person Responsible | Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@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).

Develop and deepen classroom strategies where the focus of instruction is shifted from the teacher to the student, with the end goal of developing students who are autonomous and independent, by placing the responsibility of learning in the hands of the students.

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.

***Please see the attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan for full details on how we plan to build positive relationships with parents and community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of all students.

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
- Stanford Harmony

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
- Middle school parent event for incoming 6th graders
- 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.
- 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 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.

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

Scott Lake uses a variety of strategies to advance college and career awareness. The school focuses on the many colleges and universities in Florida and the schools that the staff has attended for students to consider attending after high school graduation. A bulletin board has been set up in a prominent hallway with college pennants as a catalyst for discussions between students, parents, and teachers. Classroom teachers are also encouraged to post information in their classrooms about their own Alma Mater for the students to see and discuss. The school provides exposure to various careers through participation in a Career Day, The Great American Teach-In, and Take Your Child to Work Day with follow-up writing activities that encourage the students to analyze and synthesize the information taken away from these experiences.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ELA Bottom 25% | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Black/African American Students | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |