

Polk County Public Schools

Southwest Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Southwest Elementary School

2650 SOUTHWEST AVE, Lakeland, FL 33803

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

Demographics

Principal: Julie Sloan

Start Date for this Principal: 6/20/2015

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Southwest Elementary School

2650 SOUTHWEST AVE, Lakeland, FL 33803

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 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	58%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Southwest Elementary will nurture academic excellence and integrity by promoting a passion for learning in a safe environment while providing a high quality education for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

S.A.I.L. Students Active In Learning

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
sloan, julie	Principal	Monitor and facilitate common planning, observations with feedback. Analyze assignments and task alignment, monitor test and progress monitoring data. Data chats, Participate in MTSS meetings, PBS rewards, leadership team meetings and delegation, plan and provide professional development. Monitor, observe and provide feedback on small group instruction. Lead LSI team and school wide implementation.
Lawton, Kyle	Instructional Technology	Implement electronic devices and instructional apps to reinforce learning. Member of leadership team, LSI team, and on check in/out committee of bottom 25th. Tutors bottom 25th% in Math for grades 4/5.
Beardsley, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	facilitates common planning, assist with aligning tasks to the standards, provides examples and coaching. Mentors new teachers. Models lessons, provides observations with non evaluative feedback. Monitors test and progress monitoring data. Member of LSI team, leadership team. Provides and plans professional development, participates in MTSS meetings, data chats, and PBS meetings. Plans and coordinates parental involvement activities.
Looney, Laquita	School Counselor	Faciliates schoolwide MTSS process, and coordinates new ESE referrals. Leads Mental health support team. Leads data chats and MTSS meetings. Conducts student observations for academic or behavioral needs. Member of leadership team and lead of PBS team.
Draper, Brady	Assistant Principal	Monitor and facilitate common planning, observations with feedback. Analyze assignments and task alignment, monitor test and progress monitoring data. Data chats, Participate in MTSS meetings, PBS rewards, leadership team meetings and delegation, plan and provide professional development. Monitor, observe and provide feedback on small group instruction. Lead LSI team and school wide implementation.
Runnels, Lindsey	Instructional Coach	Member of LSI team, PBS team, leadership team. Provides reading interventions in small groups based off of progress monitoring data and test data. Monitors students growth. Attends common planning and data chats. Models lessons and helps provide coaching cycles to teachers.
Pickrell, Tauni	Other	LEA, manages the IEP and 504 status for students. Provides assistance to ESE teachers, parents and students. Monitors IEP review dates and helps to select appropriate accommodations for students. Member of leadership team and PBS team. Participates in MTSS meetings and PBS meetings.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 6/20/2015, Julie Sloan

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

22

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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 .	

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	70	64	68	71	75	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	408
Attendance below 90 percent	10	5	11	13	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	5	5	9	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Dec 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	0	14	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Dec 2019 STAR Math Level1	0	0	0	6	12	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	1	1	7	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 5/20/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	62	68	64	70	76	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400
Attendance below 90 percent	6	2	3	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
One or more suspensions	3	3	3	6	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	38	24	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	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	
Number of students enrolled	62	68	64	70	76	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400
Attendance below 90 percent	6	2	3	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
One or more suspensions	3	3	3	6	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	38	24	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	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	51%	51%	57%	48%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	51%	58%	51%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	49%	53%	41%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	66%	57%	63%	69%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	83%	56%	62%	80%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	47%	51%	69%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	61%	47%	53%	47%	46%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
	2018	39%	51%	-12%	57%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%
	2018	51%	48%	3%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	38%	47%	-9%	56%	-18%
	2018	40%	50%	-10%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	56%	-4%	62%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	44%	56%	-12%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	56%	18%	64%	10%
	2018	56%	57%	-1%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		30%				
05	2019	61%	51%	10%	60%	1%
	2018	73%	56%	17%	61%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	45%	8%	53%	0%
	2018	47%	51%	-4%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	36	36	55	42	74		38				
ELL	50	37		67	70	50					
BLK	30	30		48	77		43				
HSP	48	38		72	82	50	73				
WHT	65	53	46	73	89	75	68				
FRL	41	38	39	56	78	65	57				
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	17	31	27	30	50	30					
ELL	40	50		53	75						
BLK	29	34	50	50	63		50				
HSP	41	41		48	77	50	46				
WHT	60	55		76	77	60	59				
FRL	43	43	33	58	72	57	55				

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	21	7	8	31	50	42	20				
ELL	21	27		74	88		50				
BLK	38	41	30	60	79	90	27				
HSP	42	47		76	77		48				
WHT	57	61		69	79	62	50				
FRL	44	48	41	72	83	85	37				

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	56
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	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	451
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

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.

Performance data on 2019 FSA shows that Southwest Elementary's ELA achievement proficient was 51%, ELA Learning Gains was 43% and Learning gains of the bottom 25th % was 40%. While these areas show the lowest numbers they are an increase from the prior year.

Another area to note is Learning gains on Math for ELL students has not increased. The same was noted for 2019 ELA, ELL students were the only subgroup that did not make learning gains. An increase in ELL population because of emergency displacement and non English speaking students being tested lead to these results.

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

The only area that we saw a decline was ELA learning gains decreased from 44% to 43%.

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.

ELA Learning gains showed the biggest gap between SWE and the state average with SWE being 43% and the state was 58%. However, in Math SWE learning gains 83% and the state average was 62%.

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

The area that we showed the most improvement was math learning gains. Implementation of Three Act tasks and teacher modeling and coaching helped to facilitate this growth .

Also, SWD showed a gain from 27% to 55% in ELA Learning gains

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance
Suspensions

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

1. Increase ELA achievement percent proficient
2. Increase ELA Learning gains
3. Improve Daily attendance average
4. Decrease number of office referrals and suspensions.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The Instructional Leadership Team will work together to continue the work of LSI within the school. Using cognitive rigor in all instructional delivery methods is imperative to continue the existing upward trend of student achievement. Our intensive data review indicates a need for students to monitor their own learning as well as a laser focus on increasing the depth of knowledge for tasks that teachers require of students. The Instructional Leadership Team will accomplish this by communicating instructional information learned to staff in a timely manner, by hosting professional developments when needed, by modeling lessons, by providing teachers with coaching around these desired goals, and by providing feedback loops between the instructional leadership team and the staff further promoting productive collaboration.

Measurable Outcome:

By May 2021, the leadership team will see 90% implementation across all classrooms in the release of learning to the students and to see 90% of classrooms increase the depth of knowledge of students tasks evidenced by trendtracker.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

By utilizing LSI strategies including Teaming or other cooperative structures release of learning to the students completing rigorous tasks will take place. This will be observed through Rigor Walks conducted by the leadership team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Noted in the most recent Instructional review conducted by the district indicated the above two areas as important to focus on. By utilizing Rigor Walks and analyzing results through trend tracker the leadership team will be able to note trends and growth. Criteria used to determine this need was teacher interest through surveys, Professional development offered and the net connect course, and based on our work though the LSI delivery models.

Action Steps to Implement

1. continue PD with Teaming and other cooperative structures
2. continue analyzing Rigor walk results through trend tracker
3. continue offering model classrooms
4. Continue to focus on depth of knowledge and task alignment to the standards through cooperative planning

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	collaboratively planning lessons and tasks to meet the full intent of the standards. Incorporating a seamless MTSS process focusing on small group instruction. Students will be identified for small group instruction based off of STAR scores, prior data and teacher recommendation. Interventionist will utilize standards report in STAR to determine interventions to provide. Monthly progress monitoring will be conducted to monitor effectiveness of interventions and student progress.
Measurable Outcome:	By May of 2021, when teachers align Learning Targets and task complexity, work collaboratively, allow for release of learning to students, then student achievement will increase as follows: ELA Proficiency from 51% to 56% ELA Learning Gains from 43% to 50% ELA Learning Gains Bottom 25th % from 40% to 48%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	collaborative planning with Reading Coach small group reading instruction delivered by reading interventionist with researched based materials and strategies. Reading interventionist will provide monthly progress monitoring and analyze results with the leadership team in order to measure effectiveness of interventions provided. Interventionist will monitor results and make changes necessary in strategies and students served.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To teach and have students show evidence of the full depth of standard, utilize small group instruction Expected % of proficiency for ELA to rise from 51% to 56 % Learning Gains 40% to 48 % Lowest 25% from 32% to 40%

Action Steps to Implement

1. Make use of Instructional coaches in collaborative planning and resources with modeling in the classroom. Teachers will plan using curriculum maps and modules while providing small group instruction. teachers will have weekly common planning with the literacy coach as well as two curriculum planning days during the school year
2. Teachers will use District Progress Monitoring Data in UNIFY to lead instruction.
3. Title 1 paras will be used to provide math and reading interventions in small groups within the classroom setting.
4. News ELA, Scholastic and other resources will be utilized to provide the instruction via direct instruction and the use of IPADS and other technology devices
5. The school will also offer extended learning opportunities by providing after school tutoring for students in grades 3-5 for both reading and math.
6. Small group instruction will be provided by the Reading Interventionist
7. Provide professional development on LSI methods, Teaming and cooperative structures
8. Increase time with eyes on text by increasing classroom libraries and media center books

Person Responsible Tiffany Beardsley (tiffany.beardsley@polk-fl.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

When analyzing supportive environment data such as, attendance, discipline etc, it is evident that additional supports must be utilized in order to improve relationships.

Measurable Outcome:

By May 2021 we will reduce the gap between African American students and other subgroups for discipline referrals by 10% By May 2021 we will reduce the amount of tardies and absences for all students by 10%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brady Draper (brady.draper@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

PBIS system, Champs, Sanford Harmony and mentors

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

There will be 100% Teacher participation in supporting the PBS Plan with fidelity with 80% or higher of students reaching the PBS Goal including 100% completion of all MTSS Checklists. Leadership team will monitor attendance and the Early Warning System to communicate the importance of attendance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Actions and steps to be taken to reach the stated goal are to incorporate and follow through with CHAMPS, PBS System,
2. Check in Check out,
3. assign mentors,
4. seamlessly incorporate the MTSS Checklist & Process.
5. Monitor and use the Early Warning System and have consistent communication with parents and social workers discussing attendance.
6. Staff will effectively implement the Sanford harmony Program

Person Responsible

Brady Draper (brady.draper@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

By utilizing PBS, Champs and Sanford Harmony the leadership will focus on decreasing office referrals and suspensions. A school wide attendance incentive will be created.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Southwest Elementary promotes a positive environment for all stakeholders. The staff diligently focuses on improving student academic achievement with the support of a campus wide family atmosphere. Parents feel welcomed into our Southwest family as we strive to build strong family and school partnerships. Students are the ultimate recipients of the positive environment Southwest offers. We believe every child can learn and we work together to ensure student learning is engaging, meaningful, and successful. Southwest Elementary positively impacts all who enter.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00