

Polk County Public Schools

North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

| Table of Contents | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Title I Requirements | 16 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 18 |

North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice

410 ROBSON ST W, Lakeland, FL 33805

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

Demographics

Principal: Talley Miller

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2018-19 Title I School | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (51%) 2014-15: C (45%) |
| 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 | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Title I Requirements | 16 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 18 |

North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice

410 ROBSON ST W, Lakeland, FL 33805

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

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 | 100% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 79% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Polk County Public Schools is to provide rigorous and relevant learning experiences for all students. The community of North Lakeland Elementary will provide an educational environment in which all students will increase academic performance and become personal, academic, and professional leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

North Lakeland Elementary—a total learning community where we believe that all students can and will be ready to learn and willing to work; and, where all students are prepared to be promoted with the ability to read on grade level.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Sealey , Kim | Principal | |
| Anderson, Cassandra | Instructional Coach | |
| Clark, Angela | Other | |
| Vuto, Ariel | Instructional Coach | |
| Wiedenman, Jennifer | 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 | 119 | 122 | 94 | 140 | 107 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 709 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 34 | 32 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 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 | 15 | 17 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 |

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 | 24 | 12 | 41 | 29 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 |

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 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 23 | 20 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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

50

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/14/2019

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 | 13 | 37 | 15 | 29 | 13 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 38 | 24 | 67 | 41 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 233 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 17 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 |

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 | 24 | 12 | 41 | 29 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 |

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 | 45% | 51% | 57% | 44% | 51% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 43% | 51% | 58% | 47% | 53% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 42% | 49% | 53% | 63% | 50% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 51% | 57% | 63% | 49% | 58% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 42% | 56% | 62% | 52% | 57% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 34% | 47% | 51% | 48% | 49% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 40% | 47% | 53% | 39% | 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 | 119 (0) | 122 (0) | 94 (0) | 140 (0) | 107 (0) | 127 (0) | 709 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 34 (0) | 32 (0) | 20 (0) | 15 (0) | 15 (0) | 19 (0) | 135 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 2 (0) | 4 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (0) | 6 (0) | 14 (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) | 15 (0) | 17 (0) | 45 (0) | 77 (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 | 50% | 52% | -2% | 58% | -8% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 51% | -4% | 57% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 37% | 48% | -11% | 58% | -21% |
| | 2018 | 38% | 48% | -10% | 56% | -18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 40% | 47% | -7% | 56% | -16% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 50% | -3% | 55% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 60% | 56% | 4% | 62% | -2% |
| | 2018 | 59% | 56% | 3% | 62% | -3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 46% | 56% | -10% | 64% | -18% |
| | 2018 | 55% | 57% | -2% | 62% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -13% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 43% | 51% | -8% | 60% | -17% |
| | 2018 | 45% | 56% | -11% | 61% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -12% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 34% | 45% | -11% | 53% | -19% |
| | 2018 | 50% | 51% | -1% | 55% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -16% | | | | |
| 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 | 20 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 21 | 28 | 13 | | | | |
| ELL | 45 | 37 | | 47 | 37 | | 33 | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | 44 | 54 | 40 | 40 | 47 | 29 | | | | |
| HSP | 45 | 42 | 33 | 49 | 40 | 14 | 42 | | | | |
| WHT | 53 | 40 | | 68 | 48 | | 50 | | | | |
| FRL | 39 | 42 | 41 | 46 | 42 | 34 | 34 | | | | |
| 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 | 21 | 44 | 50 | 19 | 44 | 37 | 8 | | | | |
| ELL | 29 | 38 | 56 | 55 | 47 | 38 | 39 | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | 50 | 50 | 51 | 63 | 56 | 50 | | | | |
| HSP | 42 | 46 | 50 | 63 | 57 | 44 | 48 | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 57 | | 69 | 53 | | 78 | | | | |
| FRL | 48 | 51 | 49 | 58 | 57 | 45 | 54 | | | | |

| 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 | 9 | 36 | 48 | 14 | 36 | 32 | 15 | | | | |
| ELL | 33 | 39 | 68 | 51 | 56 | 33 | 31 | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | 50 | 57 | 39 | 54 | 63 | 12 | | | | |
| HSP | 40 | 37 | 67 | 52 | 55 | 32 | 47 | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 57 | 70 | 56 | 43 | 46 | 46 | | | | |
| FRL | 34 | 44 | 61 | 43 | 50 | 52 | 35 | | | | |

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 | 44 |
| 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 | 55 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 352 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 22 |
| 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 | 42 |
| 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 | 42 |
| 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 | 40 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 42 |
| 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.

Mathematics Lowest 25th percentile is the lowest performing data component at 34%. This is a data trend because during the 18-19 school year this was also the lowest performing component.

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

With a 16% decrease, mathematics learning gains had the greatest decline from the prior year.

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.

Mathematics Learning Gains is the greatest gap at 20 points below the state average of 61%.

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

3rd grade ELA and Mathematics proficiency increased slightly. The 3rd grade team was aligned in their collaborative planning which provided consistent Tier 1 instruction across the grade level.

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

18% of students have an attendance rate below 90%. 33% of students have D or F in a math or ELA course. 25% of 5th grade students have been retained at least once.

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

1. SWD subgroup
2. ELL subgroup
3. Hispanic subgroup
4. Tier 1 mathematics instruction
5. Differentiated mathematics instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| #1 | |
|---|--|
| Title | SWD subgroup |
| Rationale | Trends in FSA data indicate that the SWD subgroup has remained stagnant over the past two years. Research demonstrates the need for improvement and increase in every subgroup. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | North Lakeland Elementary will increase the learning gains of the SWD subgroup to 30%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Through Collaborative Planning, instructional coaches will lead teachers in purposeful planning for student teaming. Students will have equitable and inclusive roles and tasks when working with peers. Reading and Math Interventionists as well as an Instructional Paraeducator will work with small groups of students for additional support of learning. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | During planning, teachers and ELA and Math coaches will analyze student work samples together to calibrate expectations of meeting student success criteria across the grade level. Additionally, teachers will be able to determine if proficiency of the learning standard has been achieved. Teachers and counselor will meet monthly for MTSS problem solving discussions to track student progress. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. weekly planning time scheduled with coaches 2. interventionist and instructional paraeducator schedules with identified students 3. administrative walk throughs with specific feedback related to student teaming 4. LSI consultant will lead a faculty PD on Student Teaming 5. walk throughs with the LSI consultant and LSI leadership team checking for fidelity of implementation |
| Person Responsible | Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net) |

| #2 | |
|---|---|
| Title | ELL subgroup |
| Rationale | Trends in FSA data indicate that the ELL subgroup has primarily decreased in Math with only slight increase in ELA. Research demonstrates the need for improvement and increase in every subgroup and every subject. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | North Lakeland Elementary will increase learning gains of the ELL subgroup to 45%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Through Collaborative Planning, instructional coaches will lead teachers in purposeful planning for student teaming. Students will have equitable and inclusive roles and tasks when working with peers. Additionally, instructional coaches will provide support to teachers in selecting equitable and varied literature for classroom libraries. Through science planning for "hands on" learning, teachers will be able to engage all learners despite their English proficiency. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | During planning, teachers and ELA and Math coaches will analyze student work samples together to calibrate expectations of meeting student success criteria across the grade level. Teachers and counselor will meet monthly for MTSS problem solving discussions to track student progress. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. weekly planning time scheduled with coaches 2. administrative walk throughs with specific feedback related to student teaming 3. walk throughs with the LSI consultant and LSI leadership team checking for fidelity of implementation 4. preparation for 5th grade science planning day and arrangements for substitutes 5. coaches prepare book list order with teachers |
| Person Responsible | Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net) |

| #3 | |
|---|--|
| Title | Mathematics |
| Rationale | Trends in mathematics data indicate a decline in each data set. A decline in each component is an indication that across the school, there is a Tier One instructional deficit. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | North Lakeland Elementary will increase mathematics proficiency and learning gains by 10%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Collaborative Planning with Instructional Coaches using weekly agenda items of Target & Task Alignment, Differentiation, and Monitoring for Learning that will move instruction from Teacher Centered to Student Centered as defined by LSI's School Instructional Maturity Model. Administrators will participate in planning and provide walkthrough feedback to ensure implementation with fidelity. Administrators and selected staff members will attend the annual LSI Conference to further their knowledge of School Instructional Maturity Model. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Strengthening Tier One instruction begins with consistent and purposeful planning for goal outcomes. Teachers must have full understanding of the complexity level and plan purposeful tasks which will meet the standards and needs of students. Additionally, interventions and differentiated tasks will ensure all students are learning and will make gains. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. weekly schedule for collaborative planning 2. administrator schedule for weekly walkthroughs 3. instructional coaching cycles for tiered teacher support 4. supplies for differentiation such as manipulatives or other resources 5. Administrators and teachers attend LSI Annual Conference |
| Person Responsible | Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@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).

North Lakeland will continue efforts of reaching all learners through the book study, "Rich Teaching, Poor Students" to reinforce principles of relationship building, student achievement, and beliefs about students. ESOL supports will continue through the use of iPads with designated applications for Non-English Speakers as well as ESOL tutoring after school. Our ESOL para will work with the non-english speaking students to assist with vocabulary development in K-5 classrooms.

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.

North Lakeland Elementary ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met in various ways. First, through the implementation of our Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) process via a team of professionals which is led by both our school psychologist and school counselor. Additionally, the elementary school counselor holds small group sessions on a variety of topics such as divorce, bullying, and getting along with peers. Teachers and the school counselor infuse lessons into the classroom curriculum that encourage students to make connections between the curriculum and real-world events. Every student is encouraged to identify their own strengths and set obtainable goals, both personally and academically. 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 Individual Education Plan (IEP) also identifies and addresses social emotional goals for all of our students. Our school also utilizes the following resources:

- Sanford Harmony: a social emotional learning program for daily class meetings in order to build the classroom community
- PBIS: Positive Behavior Intervention Support for Tier 1 schoolwide incentives to celebrate student achievement when following school expectations
- DRUMBEAT: Discovering Relationships Using Music, Beliefs, Emotions, Attitudes, and Thoughts for a small group of students who are identified as needing additional Tier 2 support in their social-emotional needs

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

PreK - Kindergarten

North Lakeland Elementary (NLE) is a participant in the Polk School Readiness Program, which is funded through the Florida Partnership for School Readiness and is designed as a dropout prevention program for economically disadvantaged 3 and 4 year old children at-risk for school failure. It is the philosophy of NLE and Polk County Public Schools that quality early childhood programs provide a safe and nurturing environment that promotes the physical, social, emotional and cognitive development of young children while responding to the needs of their families. Our school provides a date in April for the Kindergarten Round-up when families have an opportunity to enroll their kindergarten student for the next school year. In this way, we are able to provide resources for summer learning to parents to ensure our incoming kindergarten cohort are ready for school and to provide tours of the school.

5th Grade - Middle School

North Lakeland Elementary students are provided with information to attend orientation to their zoned middle school prior to starting the new year. The "feeder" middle schools recruit students for band and other electives. Additionally, 5th grade students attend a field trip to the School Showcase where they can view display booths for local middle schools and high schools that they may have an opportunity to apply for and attend in the future.

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 funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions for students with academic achievement needs, support for after-school, supplemental instructional materials, resource teachers, technology for students, professional development for the staff, and resources for parents. NLE's Interventionists track resources.

Title I, Part C- Migrant students enrolled in NLE will be assisted by the school and by the District Migrant Education Program (MEP). Students will be prioritized by MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status. They provide support to both students and parents in locating services necessary to ensure the academic success of students whose education may be interrupted by numerous moves.

Title I, Part D, provides Transition Facilitators to assist students with transition from Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facilities back into their zoned school. They communicate with the counselors at schools to facilitate the transfer of records and appropriate placement.

Title II Professional development resources are available to Title I schools through Title II funds to 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, as well as professional learning opportunities for school staff. North Lakeland's ESOL paraeducator, along with the assistant principal, keep track of resources.

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.

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------|------------------------------|--|-----------------|-----|------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: SWD subgroup | | | | \$4,800.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | | | 0201 - North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice | Title, I Part A | | \$1,800.00 |
| | | | Notes: Rich Teaching, Poor Students Book Study for Instructional Staff members | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------|-----|--------------------|
| | | | 0201 - North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice | Title, I Part A | | \$3,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Student agendas for communication between home and school.</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ELL subgroup | | | | \$5,404.31 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | | | 0201 - North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice | Title, I Part A | | \$962.12 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Classroom Library books with diverse characters and cultures.</i> | | | |
| | | | 0201 - North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice | Title, I Part A | | \$4,442.19 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Parent Night activities to build capacity for academic learning</i> | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Mathematics | | | | \$27,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | | | 0201 - North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice | Title, I Part A | | \$18,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Learning Sciences International professional learning and checking for implementation follow-up sessions.</i> | | | |
| | | | 0201 - North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice | Title, I Part A | | \$9,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: LSI Summer Conference professional learning for instructional staff members</i> | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | \$37,204.31 |