Bartow Elementary Academy

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bartow Elementary Academy

590 WILSON AVE S, Bartow, FL 33830

http://www.bartowacademy.com/

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Van Hook

Start Date for this Principal: 8/14/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (73%) 2015-16: A (71%) 2014-15: A (80%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	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.

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

Bartow Elementary Academy

590 WILSON AVE S, Bartow, FL 33830

http://www.bartowacademy.com/

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 KG-5	No	46%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

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

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.

Bartow Elementary Academy is a family partnership inspiring today's learners to become tomorrow's leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bartow Elementary Academy is a family partnership dedicated to inspiring and preparing learners to become productive global citizens. Our desire is for everyone to use life skills, technology, and innovative experiences to build tomorrow's leaders.

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
Nelson, Tracy	Principal	The Leadership Team serves as the school's climate committee, ensuring that a positive learning climate fosters learning gains and student achievement in a diverse setting. The committee works together to share the school vision and mission. The committee also analyzes the Successful Schools Survey completed by parents and students. The committee makes recommendations to the School Advisory Council as necessary, informing both of concerns, issues, and possible strategies to address the various areas. The committee serves as a liaison to gather input from other staff members. The Leadership Team participates in writing, monitoring, and evaluating the School Improvement Plan. This includes assisting with the areas of focus, rationale, intended outcomes, action steps, and evaluation for all curriculum areas. It also analyzes data, conducts needs assessments, and provides input for areas of need for staff development. Furthermore, we work to provide appropriate professional learning activities based on the instructional needs of each grade level team. Dr. Tracy Nelson is the Instructional Leader of the school. She holds a dual doctorate in Business Management and Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University. Dr. Nelson believes in the importance of building positive relationships with staff, students, parents and community members. She has facilitated several training opportunities including MTSS, The Reading Block, Differentiated Instruction, Working with Difficult Children, Data Analysis and Positive Behavior Intervention Supports. Dr. Nelson believes in shared decision making and using parent and staff surveys to help develop a plan of action for the coming school year. Mrs. Wallace is our guidance counselor and brings a great deal of knowledge to BEA. She is compassionate, understanding and truly listens when one speaks. Mrs. McFadyen easily builds positive working relationships with all school stakeholders. She conducts several groups such as grief counseling, peer mediation, bullying, social skills and works individually with students in need. She is scheduled to meet monthly with administration and our instructional staff to ensure MTSS is well documented and make changes as necessary. She also locates resources for teachers to use during MTSS based on student need and explains and assists in the monitoring process. Mrs. Jones is our new assistant principal. She comes to us from Carlton Palmore Elementary where is also served as an assistant principal. She has a positive attitude and comes to us with a masters and Specialist degree in Educational Leadership. She has faciliated numerous trainings for staff including small group instruction, engaging difficult students, differentiated instruction, data analysis, Positive Behavior and CHAMPS to name a few. Mrs. Wolfe has been a highly effective teacher at our school for three years and our instructional coach for the past year. She brings a wealth of best practices and content knowledge to the table. She thinks outside the box to assist teachers in pushing their children academically and helps set goals for students and our instructional staff. She has modeled in classrooms, assisted in lesson planning, participated in collaborative planning sessions, and analyzes and tracks data for the school. In addition, she assist teachers with

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		making decisions about instruction based on their individual data. Mrs. Katsoulis has been in the Polk County School system for many years. Mrs. Katsoulis has had years of experience as a teacher within our district. For the last several years she has been a technology manager and taught our students the ins and outs of our morning show production. In addition, she works closely with our instructional and administrative staff to ensure our technology is updated and working properly for our progress monitoring and testing that occurs in our two computer labs and classrooms. Mrs. Katsoulis is extremely professional, pays a great deal to detail and is proactive in getting her job completed. Steven Benfield has been at BEA for the past few years as our inclusion teacher. He has worked to build positive working relationships with staff, students and parents. He continually provides a variety of strategies to address the needs of ever child. He is detailed oriented when documenting the implementation of accommodations provided to each child based on his/her individual education plan (IEP). We have seen a reduction in our gap between our special education and regular education students since his arrival to our school. Our students love working with Mr. Benfield and making him proud, which is always is with our children. Lori Crowley has been a highly effective gifted teacher for us the past couple of years. She comes to us from Rochelle School of the Arts with a proven track record. She eagerly builds relationships with our students and gets them to think outside the box. Her expertise is on project based learning that creates self-directed teams that explore a variety of work: from science projects to kindness project that involve the entire school. The tasks she assigns encourages these students to be open minded, think about the "what ifs" and "what could be" and our students take it from there.
Wolfe, Shari	Instructional Coach	
Benfield, Steven	Teacher, ESE	
Crowley, Lori	Teacher, ESE	
Jones, Nikki	Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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)
26

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 7/1/2019

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	3	5	1	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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

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

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	77%	51%	57%	81%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	51%	58%	65%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	49%	53%	59%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	83%	57%	63%	85%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	61%	56%	62%	67%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	47%	51%	70%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	78%	47%	53%	84%	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	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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	83%	52%	31%	58%	25%
	2018	92%	51%	41%	57%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	48%	29%	58%	19%
	2018	81%	48%	33%	56%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
05	2019	73%	47%	26%	56%	17%
	2018	84%	50%	34%	55%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	87%	56%	31%	62%	25%
	2018	90%	56%	34%	62%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	56%	24%	64%	16%
	2018	91%	57%	34%	62%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	83%	51%	32%	60%	23%
	2018	75%	56%	19%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	78%	45%	33%	53%	25%
	2018	79%	51%	28%	55%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	45			67							

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
BLK	61	39	43	74	65	62	50				
HSP	72	41	18	80	56		73				
WHT	84	46	29	86	61	38	86				
FRL	66	36	19	77	48	43	70				

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
BLK	74	52	50	63	48	43	63				
HSP	76	69	62	88	66	82	73				
WHT	90	70	59	90	55	68	85				
FRL	77	62	57	75	48	55	71				

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
BLK	77	67	64	74	77	79	57				
HSP	75	70		94	83		92				
WHT	83	63	50	86	59	57	87				
FRL	68	58	63	80	73	75	82				

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	61
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	56
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	56
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
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	61
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	51
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.

The data component that performed the lowest was 5th grade ELA. Based on the data, we documented 70% proficiency. This percent is a nine percent decrease over the previous school year. This year, fifth grade performed better than fourth grade for the first time in more than five years.

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 is our fourth grade ELA scores. We fell four percentage points from 81% to 77%. This is the second year our fourth grade team documented a decline in proficiency numbers.

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 data component with the largest gap when compared to the state average was in the area of ELA learning gains of our lowest 25%. The state documented 53% and our school documented 31%.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was our 5th grade Math proficiency levels. Our percentage went from 75% to 83%, which is an eight percentage increase. The eight percent increase is the highest we have seen in the last five years. Introduced more manipulatives and use of interactive notebooks.

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

There are a couple of concerns we have regarding our Early Warning System data:
1.course failure
2.subgroup data

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

1. Improve core instruction in every classroom
2. Build capacity in grades three through five
3. Increase learning gains for African American, Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities

4. Positively address the needs of our lowest 25/30% of students
5. Continue to develop self-directed teams to enhance student mastery on content outcomes

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Improve Core Instruction in Every Classroom
Rationale	Based on our learning gains percentages, if teachers improve the core instruction (Tier 1) including small groups with differentiated instruction, then students will be authentically engaged in challenging work that would develop their levels of cognitive complexity and mastery of skills. This would enhance our overall performance that supports the PCSB District Strategic Plan: Goal 1 - District Grade and Goal 2 - Graduation Rate.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We expect to see higher complexity activitites being worked on by self-directed teams in all classrooms. Providing students with opportunities to collaborate, discuss, set goals, choose materials and organize the process, would lead to greater independence and higher levels of achievement. The ultimate outcome would be to move overall proficiency in ELA from 77% to 82%; learning gains from 45% to 50%; and our lowest 25% from 31% to 40%. We would like to move our science proficiency from 78% to 82%. Finally, we would like to move our overall proficiency in math from 83% to 88%; learning gains from 61% to 65% and our lowest 25% from 52% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tracy Nelson (tracy.nelson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	In order to address this area of focus our School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) and instructional staff need to dig into learning targets and scales, understand the depth of standards ensuring the task is aligned to the standard, and maintin pace with standards-based insruction (Order 1 Change). We will utilize our SBLT to monitor information obtained from LSI training/Trend Tracker to enhance our overall core instruction and instructional outcomes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We will use the following to monitor the effectiveness of implementation in the area of focus: Administrative team and instructional coach will monitor implementation of core instruction and differentiated instruction, structured blocks with schedules posted by content area in each classroom, utilization and CHAMPS, and positive classroom management (PBIS).

Action Step	
Description	1. Weekly collaborative planning sessions with administration and instructional coach 2. Common use of Marzano's Taxonomy 3. STAR, Freckle, iStation, Smarty Ants progress monitoring resulst 4. MTSS documentation and implementation 5. Quality assisgnments, grade recovery, interim and report cards
Person Responsible	Nikki Jones (nikki.jones@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Build Capacity, Improve and Maintain Proficiency Levels Grades 3-5
Rationale	Based on our proficiency levels, if teachers improve and/or maintain levels 3, 4, or 5 in grades 3-5 our overall school proficiency levels for those grade leveles will continue to grow. This would enhance our overall proficiency performance that supports the PCSB District Strategic Plan: Goal 1 - District Grade.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We expect to see higher complexity activities being worked on by self-direcyed teams in all classrooms. Providing students with opportunitites to collaborate, discuss, set goals, choose materials and organize the process, would lead to greater independence and higher levels of achievement. The ultimate outcome wold be to increase our number of students performaing proficiently and reduce the number of students still performaing below the state mandated proficiency level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tracy Nelson (tracy.nelson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	In order to address this area of focus, the SBLT and instructional staff will focus on teaching to the depth of the standard and beyond; as noted in all lesson plans, help teachers development and implement meta-cognitive skills and differentiated instruction to ensure all students are moving foward, address gender differences by subject area and grade level (gap analysis), providing additional time/support before, during and after school and assigning project based activitites/tasks to engage students in work of higher complexity levels while working in self-directed teams..
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on proficiency levels, if teacher improve and/or maintain levels 3, 4, or 5 in grades 3-5, our overall school proficiency levels for those grade levels will continue to grow. This would enhance our overall performance that supports the PCSB District Strategic Plan: Goal 1 - District Grade.

Action Step	
Description	1. Teach to the depth of each standard 2. Authentic student engagement 3. Differentiated tasks/assessments 4. Higher complexity levels for all tasks with documentation 5. Monitor progress of all subgroups
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Increase proficiency levels, learning gains and learning gains of the lowest 25% of subgroups: Economically disadvanged and African American children.
Rationale	Based on our ESSA Report, African American and Economically Disadvantaged students are falling below our school's overall Federal Index of 70%. Our Subgroup Federal Index for African Americans is 56% and 64% for our Economically Disadvantaged students.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We expect to increase proficiency within our African American subgroup from to 56% to 60%; we will increase proficiency within our Economically Disadvantaged subgroup from 51% to 55%. Additionally, we will increase learning gains and lowest 25 percent learning gains for both subgroups by four percent. Each academic teacher will provide small group differentiated instruction during their ELA blocks. MTSS interventions will be implemented to ensure consistent progress of each student in the above subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Nikki Jones (nikki.jones@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will use the following to monitor the effectiveness of implementation in this area of focus: administration will conduct monthly data chats with students and teachers, review MTSS documentation during monthly grade level meetings, monitor small group differentiated instruction during classroom observations and weekly lesson plans.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The strategies chosen will provide weekly progress reports to analyze data and make instructional decisions appropriate for each child learning pathway. Adjustments in instruction and interventions will be made in a timely manner thus assuring that all students are moving forward.

Action Step	
Description	1. Data chats with students and teachers 2. MTSS 3. Lesson plans and classroom observations 4. STAR, Freckle, ISIP 5. Weekly assessments in ELA, Math and Science
Person Responsible	Nikki Jones (nikki.jones@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).

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.

NA

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.

Kindergarten Big Step Day is held in May. During this time, parents and students rotate to a variety of activities to help familiarize them with the school and kindergarten expectations. Each student is observed completing various skill activities. Within the first 30 days of school, kindergartners are given the Florida Kindergarten Readiness Test (FLKRS). This tool is used to measure a student's readiness for school.

Fifth graders attend a transition meeting that is hosted by the guidance counselor from the feeder middle school. They receive information on middle school requirements, programs offered, and are afforded a question/answer session with middle school students. Elective schedules are sent home at the end of the session.

Boy and Girl Scouts will visit to discuss transitioning into middle school. In addition, Stephen Scheloske, principal of Union Academy is our partner in preparing our students for what is facing them as middle school students.

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

The process used by the leadership team to identify and align available resources:
1. Planning - The leadership makes decisions about the direction of the school and uses availalbe resources to achieve its goals. This stage provides the school stakeholders with a sense of direction and purpose.
2. Organizing - At this stage of the proccess, policies and procedures are developed and roles and responsibilites of stakeholders are assigned. The budget is aligned to ensure that funds are used to increase student achievement. The organization of the plan takes place at this stage.
3. Leading - The leading stage is where the leadership facilitates and carries out the plan that has been set in place to ensure things are taking place to meet the needs of the students.
4. Monitoring - At this stage, the school leadership reviews the plan and compares the expected outcomes to the actual outcomes. Personnel may do this with observations and walk throughs. It may also be done with a review of use of funds.

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.

N/A

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

NA

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improve Core Instruction in Every Classroom	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Build Capacity, Improve and Maintain Proficiency Levels Grades 3-5	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase proficiency levels, learning gains and learning gains of the lowest 25% of subgroups: Economically disadvanged and African American children.	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**