Medulla Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Medulla Elementary School

850 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

Demographics

Principal: Gale Macleod

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2015

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: B (60%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (47%) 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	N/A

> * 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

Medulla Elementary School

850 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

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	94%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

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

Medulla Elementary provides a safe, rigorous, academic environment. Each child will reach his/her fullest potential and become a respectful and productive citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As a part of the Medulla community, Medulla Elementary provides a safe, supportive environment that fosters curiosity, inquiry, and a life-long pursuit of knowledge.

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
Richardson, Myra	Principal	
Aranda, Ginnie	School Counselor	
MacLeod, Gale	Assistant Principal	
Hill, Cathy	Teacher, ESE	
Martin, Victoria	Instructional Coach	
LaFay, Julie	Teacher, K-12	
Brown, Sandra	Teacher, K-12	
	Instructional Coach	

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	87	80	97	98	119	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	587
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	16	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

48

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/19/2019

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	10	18	26	18	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	3	13	11	17	7	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	2	1	13	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	4	23	21	35	59	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176

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	53%	51%	57%	53%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	51%	58%	47%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	49%	53%	31%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	57%	63%	63%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	56%	62%	68%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	47%	51%	57%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	47%	53%	42%	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	87 (0)	80 (0)	97 (0)	98 (0)	119 (0)	106 (0)	587 (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)	16 (0)	22 (0)	15 (0)	53 (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	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
	2018	47%	51%	-4%	57%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	48%	12%	58%	2%
	2018	54%	48%	6%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
05	2019	47%	47%	0%	56%	-9%
	2018	39%	50%	-11%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	56%	-1%	62%	-7%
	2018	54%	56%	-2%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	56%	15%	64%	7%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
05	2019	56%	51%	5%	60%	-4%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	30	44	53	40	52	56	41				
ELL	41	52		61	69	50	40				
BLK	37	49	80	42	56	62	35				
HSP	53	57	68	63	66	45	55				
MUL	54	64		67	71						
WHT	62	59	50	67	77	83	62				
FRL	47	56	69	52	66	50	48				
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	37	35	28	42	45	34				
ELL	43	59	69	55	45		25				
BLK	33	38	33	41	49	38	35				
HSP	49	53	70	58	54	29	48				
MUL	61	44		57	44		60				
WHT	52	38	20	56	48	50	65				
FRL	44	42	40	52	47	37	49				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	17	25	33	28	50	62	17				
ELL	30	41	35	48	59	56	10				
BLK	34	38	25	56	66		38				
HSP	50	45	36	61	66	57	33				
MUL	60	55		77							
WHT	67	53	30	67	68	50	56				
FRL	45	44	30	58	70	63	36				

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	60
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	478
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	53
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	52
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	59
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	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	66
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	56
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.

Fifth Grade ELA

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

No Decline in any components

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.

Fifth Grade ELA by 9 pts. Inability to completely unpack all standards.

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

Fourth grade math. Intentionally upacking standards and making sure tasks were aligned to the standard.

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

ELA in all areas
Gains in all area

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

1. ELA
2. ELA Lowest quartile
3. ELA Gains
4. Math
5. Math Lowest quartile

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Improve student achievement in ELA by 5% in each grade level
Rationale	In grades three and five, our student proficiency in ELA was below the state.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	This year, the goal is to improve the ELA scores, in each grade level by 3% - 7%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Myra Richardson (dr.richardson@att.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	I will ensure that small group instruction is tailored to the needs of the students. We will have afterschool to solidify concepts taught during the school day with a focus on integrating knowledge and craft/structures. We will focus on writing using a "Day 6" model shifting from "Week 6". This combination of instructional changes shoud provide the academic lift we are working for.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Day 6 - provides frequency of practice and revisions Afterschool Tutorial - Remediation
Action Step	
Description	1. Move from week 6 to day 6 2. Invite students to tutorial based on lagging FSA and current star data 3. Visit all classrooms weekly 4. Coach tier 2 & tier 3 teachers to success 5.
Person Responsible	Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Gains for students performing in the lowest quartile
Rationale	In the area of student achievement, in the lowest quartile, our percentages grew. However, they are not were they need to be.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Growth in the lowest quartile will improve in all areas by 3% - 7%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Myra Richardson (dr.richardson@att.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will use "Student pull-outs" to create small groups with similar needs. The interventionist will use data to determine the needs of the students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction
Action Step	
Description	1. Indentify lowest quartile 2. identify students with common needs 3. Create schedule for small groups 4. Intervene 5.
Person Responsible	Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@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).

Through classroom walkthroughs and campus data monitoring.

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, §§ 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.

See school Parent Involvement Plan submitted online to the LEA September 17, 2013.

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.

All staff members provide for the social-emotional needs of our students. Selected members of the school staff provide additional mentoring for identified students using a check in/check out system. Students are provided access to mental health counseling. A school social worker is also available.

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

Head start and Pre K teachers meet with kindergarten teachers to understand kindergarten standards. Kindergarten Round Up is held each year to familiarize and educate the families of our preschoolers and better prepare them for kindergarten. Screenings are done to assess preschoolers' academic needs and to help parents know how to better prepare their children for elementary school. Summer book check out is also made available to entering kindergarten families.

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 school-wide services to Medulla Elementary. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions for students with academic achievement needs. Title I, Part A, supports after-school and summer instructional programs, supplemental instructional materials, resource teachers, technology for students, professional development for the staff, and resources for parents. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III to ensure that staff development needs are addressed accordingly.
Title I, Part C
Migrant students enrolled in Medulla Elementary will be assisted by the school and by the District Migrant Education Program (MEP). Students will be prioritized by the MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status. MEP Teacher Advocates, assigned to schools with high percentages of migrant students, monitor the progress of these high need students and provide or coordinate supplemental academic support. Migrant Home-School Liaisons identify and recruit migrant students and their families for the MEP. They provide support to both students and parents in locating services necessary to ensure the academic success of these students whose education has been 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. The Transition Facilitators communicate with the Guidance Counselors at schools to facilitate the transfer of records and appropriate placement.
Title II
Professional development resources are available to all schools through Title II funds. In addition, School Technology Services provide technical support, technology training, and licenses for software programs and web-based access via Title II-D funds as made available. Funds available to Medulla Elementary are used to purchase technology and provide professional development.
Title III
Provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their teachers in Title I schools, and learning opportunities for school staff.

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

Medulla Elementary advances college and career by ensuring that students are equipped readers and capable of computations upon entering the secondary stage of education.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improve student achievement in ELA by 5% in each grade level	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Gains for students performing in the lowest quartile	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**