

Polk County Public Schools

# Cleveland Court Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>            | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>22</b> |

# Cleveland Court Elementary School

328 EDGEWOOD DR E, Lakeland, FL 33803

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Emily Fite**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2016

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 88%   |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (62%)<br>2017-18: B (59%)<br>2016-17: A (66%)<br>2015-16: B (56%)<br>2014-15: B (57%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southwest   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   |   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A   |

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Polk County School Board on 12/20/2019.

## 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>22</b> |

## Cleveland Court Elementary School

328 EDGEWOOD DR E, Lakeland, FL 33803

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

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>KG-5                        | Yes                    | 77%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 53%  |

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Polk County School Board on 12/20/2019.

### 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.**

Every CCE student will be prepared academically and socially through rigorous learning experiences to become successful lifelong learners.

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

CCE, in partnership with family and community, will provide a safe and supportive learning environment where students strive for excellence in all they do.

### 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  |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--|
| RUTENBAR, CHERYL      | Principal           | The administration sets clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships). They share past and current data from many different sources with team members. As a team they discuss barriers and instructional strategies to decrease gaps and increase proficiency. They seek input from teacher leaders in all areas of school improvement. School leaders, in turn, provide teachers on their grade level information to help them understand barriers, determine the effectiveness of instructional strategies, and next steps needed to move the students forward. School Leaders suggest professional develop needs for the staff. The literacy coach facilitates collaborative planning and provides coaching to the teachers. The guidance counselor provides teachers with social/emotional data and strategies for Tier 1, 2, and 3 students. |
| Jacques-Ousley, Emily | Teacher, K-12       |  |
| Gainer, Linda         | School Counselor    |  |
| Kranek, Lee           | Assistant Principal |  |
| Pion, Debra           | Teacher, K-12       |  |
| Nolin, Lisa           | Teacher, K-12       |  |
| Alia, Sebrina         | Teacher, K-12       |  |
| Ortiz, Suggey         | Teacher, K-12       |  |
| Cruz, Barbara         | Teacher, K-12       |  |
| Hoskinson, Kathryn    | Teacher, K-12       |  |
| White, Courtney       | Teacher, K-12       |  |
| Foley, Amy            | Teacher, K-12       |  |

## 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     | 64          | 67 | 74 | 53 | 61 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 383   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 10 | 12 | 7  | 3  | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 40    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 1  | 4  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 3           | 5  | 5  | 0  | 11 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 24    |

**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           | 2 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |

**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     | 3           | 2 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

23

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 7/17/2019

**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     | 13          | 11 | 8  | 5 | 8  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 51    |
| One or more suspensions         | 12          | 5  | 10 | 4 | 9  | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 54    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 1  | 3 | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 7 | 20 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 44    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2           | 3 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |

**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     | 13          | 11 | 8  | 5 | 8  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 51    |
| One or more suspensions         | 12          | 5  | 10 | 4 | 9  | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 54    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 1  | 3 | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 7 | 20 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 44    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2           | 3 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 28 |

## 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             | 67%    | 51%      | 57%   | 66%    | 51%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 64%    | 51%      | 58%   | 71%    | 53%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 41%    | 49%      | 53%   | 73%    | 50%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 80%    | 57%      | 63%   | 73%    | 58%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 71%    | 56%      | 62%   | 77%    | 57%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 61%    | 47%      | 51%   | 46%    | 49%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 52%    | 47%      | 53%   | 59%    | 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     | 64 (0)                            | 67 (0)  | 74 (0) | 53 (0) | 61 (0)  | 64 (0)  | 383 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0 (13)                            | 10 (11) | 12 (8) | 7 (5)  | 3 (8)   | 8 (6)   | 40 (51) |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 (12)                            | 1 (5)   | 4 (10) | 0 (4)  | 0 (9)   | 2 (14)  | 7 (54)  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 3 (0)                             | 5 (0)   | 5 (1)  | 0 (3)  | 11 (0)  | 10 (2)  | 34 (6)  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)  | 0 (7)  | 13 (20) | 11 (17) | 24 (44) |

### 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 | 72%    | 52%      | 20%                        | 58%   | 14%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 72%    | 51%      | 21%                        | 57%   | 15%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 65%    | 48%      | 17%                        | 58%   | 7%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 54%    | 48%      | 6%                         | 56%   | -2%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 11%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 56%    | 47%      | 9%                         | 56%   | 0%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 55%    | 50%      | 5%                         | 55%   | 0%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 79%    | 56%      | 23%                        | 62%   | 17%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 88%    | 56%      | 32%                        | 62%   | 26%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -9%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 79%    | 56%      | 23%                        | 64%   | 15%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 74%    | 57%      | 17%                        | 62%   | 12%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -9%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 63%    | 51%      | 12%                        | 60%   | 3%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 64%    | 56%      | 8%                         | 61%   | 3%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -11%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 47%    | 45%      | 2%                         | 53%   | -6%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 67%    | 51%      | 16%                        | 55%   | 12%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -20%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 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                                       | 43       | 50     | 50          | 48        | 60      | 77           |          |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       | 35       | 67     |             | 53        | 67      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 50       | 56     | 40          | 65        | 62      |              | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 52       | 62     | 50          | 66        | 57      | 60           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 83       | 70     |             | 90        | 80      |              | 67       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 57       | 59     | 40          | 79        | 70      | 67           | 42       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 39       | 50     | 31          | 60        | 70      | 64           | 54       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 15       | 40     |             | 69        | 70      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 39       | 36     | 33          | 58        | 59      | 63           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 51       | 37     |             | 76        | 62      |              | 64       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 78       | 58     |             | 86        | 71      | 55           | 84       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 49       | 41     | 28          | 67        | 60      | 50           | 63       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 32       | 47     | 50          | 27        | 47      | 33           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 38       |        |             | 38        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 33       | 52     |             | 52        | 65      | 55           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 51       | 75     |             | 68        | 79      |              | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 85       | 75     |             | 83        | 82      |              | 81       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 48       | 63     | 67          | 60        | 72      | 50           | 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)  | N/A  |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 64   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 78   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 514  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |

| Students With Disabilities   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 55  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      |     |
| English Language Learners  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 60  |
| 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                                | 51  |
| 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  | 58  |
| 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   | 78 |
| 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                                | 61 |
| 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 data shows ELA Lowest 25% and Science showed the lowest performance. Contributing factors to this include ineffective small group instruction in ELA and ineffective whole group instruction in science.

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

Science achievement showed the greatest decline from 71% to 52%. The main factor that contributed to the decline was a change in teacher.

**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 component with the greatest gap is ELA lowest 25% as compared to the state. A contributing factor to this gap include ineffective small group instruction.

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

ELA Learning Gains showed the most improvement. Data analysis was conducted biweekly with 3rd-5th grade level teams, improved weekly collaborative planning and higher expectations and monitoring for Accelerated Reader (AR).

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

One area of concern is that we have 8 students in 5th grade who had an attendance rate below 90% last year, a failing grade in ELA or Math, and scored either a level 1 in either ELA or math.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25%
2. ELA Learning Gains
3. ELA Proficiency
4. Improving student behavior

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

| #1  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Title</b>  | ELA Learning Gains and Lowest 25%  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | <p>64% of 4th and 5th grade ELA students made learning gains.<br/> 41% of the lowest 25% of 4th and 5th grade ELA students made learning gains.<br/> 10 out of 16 level 1 students made learning gains.<br/> 9 out of 26 level 2 students made learning gains.<br/> 18 out of 25 level 3 students made learning gains.<br/> 25 out of 34 level 4 students made learning gains.<br/> 10 out of 11 level 5 students made learning gains.</p>   |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | <p>The percentage of ELA students making learning gains will be 71%.<br/> The percentage of the lowest 25% ELA students making learning gains will be 65%.</p>   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | CHERYL RUTENBAR (cheryl.rutenbar@polk-fl.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | <p>Using AR diagnostic reports and STAR reading assessments, teachers will monitor students' independent reading level weekly to determine whether they are successfully reading and testing on or above grade level. Teachers will adjust the ZPD of each student every two weeks in order to increase the students' reading level during the school year. Students will read and take AR tests weekly, with the goal that every student will earn a minimum of 50 points, at 85% accuracy, on grade level or higher by FSA ELA test date.</p>  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | <p>The strong correlation between STAR assessment scores, AR points/accuracy/book level, and FSA have been documented at CCE for 3 consecutive years. Students who earn 50 or more points at 85% accuracy, on or above grade level are more likely to be proficient and/or make learning gains on FSA ELA.</p>   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. AR Diagnostic Reports analyzed by all classroom teachers.</li> <li>2. Classroom observations, teacher implementation of the standards, student assessment data.</li> <li>3. Analysis of student formative and summative assessment data.</li> <li>4. Weekly collaborative planning with Literacy Coach for teacher Lesson Plans, formative assessment data, student products, and classroom observations. Literacy Coach will also meet with each grade level for Collaborative Planning Day once per year. Substitutes will be hired to cover classrooms on the collaborative planning day.</li> <li>5. Classroom observations looking at small group instruction to ensure that it is meeting the rigor of the standards and is based on student progress monitoring data. Student assessment data will be analyzed for improvements.</li> <li>6. Analyze student fluency data of students in tier 2 and 3 instruction.</li> <li>7. Sign in sheets, classroom evaluations to ensure that implementation of teacher learning in the classroom, and student assessment data.</li> <li>8. Literacy coach will print the AR Diagnostic Reports every Friday and the leadership team will analyze the data weekly to determine if students are on track of being at or above grade level by the end of the school year.</li> <li>9. Classroom walk-throughs to ensure that small group instruction is meeting the rigor of</li> </ol> |



the standard and the needs of the students, and students' assessment scores.

10. Analyze student data.

11. Title I Para will work daily with small groups of students in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades in the area of ELA to support instruction of standards

12. Teachers will use Brain Pop videos and activities to support instruction of standards.

13. Library books will be purchased to ensure that there are enough reading materials at all reading levels for students.

14. Select staff will attend LSI conference to increase knowledge of effective strategies that work in the classroom.

15. After school tutoring will be offered for students during second semester.

16. Students not making learning gains will meet and conference with their classroom teacher.

17. Teachers will make parent phone calls to inform parents of their child's status.

18. Students will be offered after school tutoring second semester.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Emily Jacques-Ousley (emily.jacquesousley@polk-fl.net)

---

| #2  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Title</b>  | Positive Learning Environment  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | In 2018-2019, administration processed 125 discipline referrals. Of those referrals, 31 were for disciplinary incidents on the bus after school, and 26 were for disciplinary incidents during the last hour of the school day.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | In the 2019-2020 school year, the number of discipline referrals will decrease by 20% to 100. Bus and afternoon referrals will also decrease by 20%.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Lee Kranek (lee.kranek@polk-fl.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | CCE implements a school-wide PBIS plan. Teachers provide lessons on classroom and common area behavior expectations, including bus expectations. Behavior expectations are modeled, taught, and practiced in all common areas of the school and monitored by all staff members on campus. Teachers also provide daily Sanford Harmony community building lessons, team building activities embedded within academics, and monthly character building lessons in each classroom.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | The CCE PBIS plan is a school-wide program that is simple and easy to follow for all students and staff members to implement. Students respond to positive reinforcement and feel prepared to learn when expectations are provided ahead of time. All CCE students are held to the same high expectations campus-wide and all CCE staff members are accountable for implementing the positive behavior plan.   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide the staff with ongoing professional development in CHAMPS</li> <li>2. Conduct monthly Student Success meetings with the PBIS team</li> <li>3. Provide parents with Parent Partnership agreement</li> <li>4. All teachers will join Remind, Class Dojo, or</li> <li>5. Teachers will send home communication folders on Tuesday. Student agendas, PBS cards and Behavior cards will go home daily for parents to review</li> <li>6. Grade level parent nights will be held to provide parents with information and resources on ways to support learning at home.</li> <li>7. Kindness Club Meetings will be held monthly. Kindness Club will participate in a community service project in collaboration with VISTE (Volunteers In Service To the Elderly) to put together care packages for elderly shut-ins.</li> <li>8. Positive messages on our morning shows--Manners Matter (Character Education each month)</li> <li>9. Monthly PBS Reward</li> <li>10. Reteach classroom/school/bus/expectations and appropriate responses to students receiving referrals.</li> <li>11. Sanford Harmony Program will be implemented in classrooms</li> <li>12. Students will collect personal hygiene items to donate to VISTE.</li> <li>13. Bus expectations presentation to all bus students twice per year; build positive relationships with bus drivers and attendants</li> <li>14. Monthly newsletter, PBS cards, and Title I newsletter are printed at the school and</li> </ol> |

distributed to students to to keep parents informed of their child's progress, activities that are taking place, and opportunities available outside of the school.

**Person Responsible** Lee Kranek (lee.kranek@polk-fl.net)

---

| #3  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Title</b>  | Math Proficiency and Lowest 25% Math Learning Gains  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Students not proficient in math by 4th grade, struggle to connect previous learning to new more complex expectations. As a school, we need to ensure that students are meeting grade level standards before being promoted to the next grade level. We see a drop in proficiency scores-3rd grade 85%, 4th grade 84%, and 5th grade 70%. Learning gains for students in the lowest 25% are 3rd grade 50%, 4th grade 67%, and 5th grade 57%.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | The percentage of the students proficient in math will be at least 80% in 3rd-5th grades. The percent of students making learning gains will be at least 70% in 3rd-5th grades. The in the lowest 25% making learning gains will be at least 70% in grades 3rd-5th.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | CHERYL RUTENBAR (cheryl.rutenbar@polk-fl.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Using STAR math assessments, teachers will monitor students' progress to determine whether they are on track to make learning gains on FSA. Teachers will adjust small group instruction based on the screening report.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | There is a strong correlation between STAR math assessment scores and Math FSA scores, which has been researched by Renaissance.   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Incorporate math into the daily routines of teachers</li> <li>2. bby calendar math completed daily</li> <li>3. Use math manipulatives</li> <li>4. Send teachers to math contact day training</li> <li>5. Teachers will collaboratively plan weekly</li> <li>6. Teachers will conduct progress monitoring, recording student data</li> <li>7. Hire substitute for classroom teachers to engage collaboratively in planning for small group instruction on collaborative planning day.</li> <li>8. Incorporate daily math fluency</li> <li>9. Students will be assigned to Reflex and Woot Math, as well as Freckle math programs. Teachers will use data from these technology programs to identify student deficiencies and address in small group instruction.</li> <li>10. Implement differentiated small group instruction</li> <li>11. Teachers will use Brain Pop videos and activities to support instruction of math standards.</li> <li>12. Teachers will use STAR data to make instructional decisions.</li> <li>13. Students will use white boards and EXPO Markers during whole group and small group instruction to enable the instructor to monitor individual student progress throughout the lesson.</li> <li>14. After school tutoring will be offered for students during second semester.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | CHERYL RUTENBAR (cheryl.rutenbar@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).**

n/a

**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 attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan for full details on how we plan to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of 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
- Drumbeat
- Sanford Harmony

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

- Kindergarten Round Up-CCE holds a kindergarten roundup each year in the spring. Parents of incoming kindergartners are provided with a packet of information, strategies to use with children from birth-six, and a tour of the campus. Materials shared with parents are obtained from United Way and the kindergarten teachers at CCE.
- 5th graders visit/tour middle schools-CCE invites the surrounding middle school counselors the opportunity to come to CCE to provide information to our 5th grade students and to answer any questions by the students.
- WE3 Expo-All CCE 5th grade students attend the WE3 Expo, which provides students the opportunity to explore middle school options within our district.

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

- Title I, Part A project funds school-wide services at our eligible and participating Title I schools. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions so that all students achieve academic success.
- Title I, Part C project funds assist students that are prioritized by the MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status, as defined by federal and state regulations.
- Title I, Part D project funds provide Transition Facilitators at select Neglected and Delinquent school sites to assist students who transition from Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facilities back into their zoned school.
- Title II funds provide professional development resources to build the capacity of teachers by funding consultants, district professional development personnel, including district/regional coaches, and curriculum specialists. The Title II project contributes to the recruitment/retention of teachers in the district by funding district recruitment personnel, recruitment initiatives both within and outside the school district.
- 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.**

Though we are an elementary school, students are exposed to different careers during the Great American Teach In, which is a yearly event at CCE.

## Part V: Budget

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

|        |        |   |        |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 1      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains and Lowest 25%                   | \$0.00 |
| 2      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Positive Learning Environment                       | \$0.00 |
| 3      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency and Lowest 25% Math Learning Gains | \$0.00 |
| Total: |        |   | \$0.00 |