North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 6/6/2017

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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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

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)	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	78%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sealey , Kim	Principal	The principal is the educational leader of the school, and its chief administrative and supervisory officer. Operating under the applicable state laws and regulations of the School Board, she is the delegated representative of the Superintendent, responsible for supervision and control of students, programs and personnel in her school as well as the management and maintenance of the building, grounds, and equipment. She works to make the school a vital and understandable force for the good of the community.
Anderson, Cassandra	Instructional Coach	This position exists to focus on student learning by providing support and assistance to teachers and school-based administration. Provides extensive, responsible leadership in literacy curriculum development, content delivery, and analysis of curriculum and school performance.
Clark, Angela	Other	This position exists to assist leadership with the development of individual, class and school wide behavior interventions and to deliver appropriate teacher-to-teacher professional learning and support, resulting in improved effectiveness of classroom instructional practices, increased learning time for students and enhanced student achievement.
Vuto, Ariel	Instructional Coach	This position exists to focus on student learning by providing support and assistance to teachers and school-based administration. Provides extensive, responsible leadership in math curriculum development, content delivery, and analysis of curriculum and school performance.
Wiedenman, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Assists the school principal by providing leadership for and management of programs and processes related to instruction, school operations, personnel management, business management, student support services, student activities and community involvement.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/6/2017, Talley Miller

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.*
0

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
36

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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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.	

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	109	128	101	135	109	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	718
Attendance below 90 percent	25	22	23	22	10	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	3	8	0	5	13	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA	3	0	1	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	16	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	21	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Dec. 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	1	5	39	14	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
Dec. 2019 STAR Math Level 1	0	9	20	27	19	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116

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	5	10	27	22	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	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

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	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	10	7	12	7	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
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

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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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	
	(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	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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%	1
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%	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	42
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	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	52
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	42
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.

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. Focusing on ELA with tutoring and interventions may be contributing to this data trend.

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. Focusing on ELA with tutoring and interventions may be contributing to this data trend.

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.

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

Third grade ELA and Mathematics proficiency increased slightly. The third 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?

18% of students have an attendance rate below 90%. 33% of students have D or F in a math or ELA course. 25% of Fifth 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. Hispanic subgroup
3. ELL 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. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In review of our subgroup data, we noticed the Hispanic subgroup math learning gains for the bottom 25%ile was 14%.
Measurable Outcome:	The hispanic subgroup for the bottom 25%ile in Math should be at 41% as shown on the 20-21 Math FSA Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Additional small group instruction (Tier 3) with our math interventionist will give students a chance to preview new math standards before they are presented in class.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Previewing math content in small groups before it is presented in class will give students more time to connect their new learning to the classroom learning. This strategy gives the math student more time to develop content knowledge which prepares them for deeper learning of the standards in the classroom setting.

Action Steps to Implement

Our math interventionist will work with the bottom 25% of Hispanic students in 4th and 5th grade in a small group every day.

Person Responsible	Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)

Plan for ESOL professional development for all classroom teachers to reinforce strategies for multi-cultural learning.

Person Responsible	Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our 18-19 ESSA data reflects the federal index for Students with Disabilities (SWD) is 22% which reflects a critical need to focus on how we are teaching English Language Arts (ELA) to our SWD students. This area of focus includes all students who have an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) who are taught in regular education classrooms with ESE inclusion services, our ESE Resource classrooms and our ESE separate classrooms, in the least restrictive environment to teach our students. The SIP committee reviewed previous year's data and found a trend in the SWD ELA data that shows our SWD students are not making gains in ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	The SWD ESSA subgroup will be 41% or higher as shown on the 20-21 FSA ESSA Report Card.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy being used is the Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our data reflects that SWD have difficulty with reading skills, as shown by their level 1 or 2 scores on STAR Reading. This resource will advance the literacy learning of SWD students not meeting grade level expectations in reading. Additionally, the program will improve student engagement with texts that improve academic knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement

Implementing the Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) program for SWD students who scored a level 1 or 2 as shown on the December 2019 STAR Reading Assessment.

Person Responsible	Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)

During pre-planning week, the inclusion, grade level teachers and LEA Facilitator will meet to review relevant information from student IEPs regarding students' educational progress and appropriate accommodations.

Person Responsible	Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	English Language Arts (ELA) provides the foundation for all other academics. When students are able to recognize words and create meaning from the text then students are able to gain insight and knowledge about literature, science, social studies and mathematics. Improving the ELA proficiency of students in 3rd - 5th grades will set their feet firmly on the path to educational success. The rationale to improve the ELA proficiency of 3rd, 4th and 5th graders is to ensure they are ready to think critically and comprehend text for the rigorous tasks after leaving elementary school.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency will be improved by 6% from the 18-19 FSA data to the 20-21 data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All instructional staff members will plan for the appropriate depth of knowledge (DOK) of the standards and ensure alignment of the learning using standards-based Instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers collaboratively plan for the appropriate depth of knowledge of the ELA standard then students will improve their ability to analyze and synthesize text.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will use the LSI Standards Tracker in order to track student learning for the success criteria of the daily standard. Using the data from the tracker, teachers will make in the moment shifts to ensure students are learning the intended target(s). Data monitoring will take place each week while teachers keep a spreadsheet of student RW tests with the standard breakdowns on the school Sharepoint site. Administration and the Literacy coach will review the spreadsheets weekly to discuss classroom / grade level trends and plan for student learning.

Person Responsible	Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)

Plan for an additional grade level planning throughout the school year for all K-5 ELA teachers will give teachers additional collaborative planning time to review data, plan for instruction and student learning. When rich conversations occur during planning, teachers have a deeper understanding of what students need to know or be able to do for each of the content standards.

Person Responsible	Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)

Implement a professional learning plan where all teachers self-select their learning focus for the year. Instructional staff will group together with other teachers studying similar topics and plan for book studies, webinars, and professional development sessions that provide additional learning towards their own intended learning goal. This plan will be introduced during pre-planning week and a calendar of PLC times will be given to all instructional staff members for the whole year. Administration and Coaches will be involved in each of the PLCs to assist with the PD and staff learning. A communication log will be given to each group to be turned into administration each quarter. Additionally, a clinical supervision course will be offered to instructional staff so they can be eligible to supervise pre-service teachers in order to strengthen instructional continuity on campus.

Person Responsible Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)

Additional afternoon ELA tutoring for students in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades.

Person Responsible Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)

Professional learning for administration and instructional staff members to continue learning about research-based strategies to improve student achievement. Administrators and instructional staff members will attend the LSI annual conference.

Person Responsible Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)

The Literacy Coach will work closely with new teachers to support ELA instructional practices by completing coaching cycles, discussions about ELA standards, and supporting ELA tutoring after school.

Person Responsible Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)

The Reading Interventionist will support 2nd and 3rd grade students with reinforcing foundational reading skills in order to improve reading proficiency. The interventionist will also be assisting in students in 4th and 5th grades to

Person Responsible Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)

The Title 1 K-2nd grade para will support ELA students with word recognition and reading fluency by providing daily one-on-one support with repeated readings. Students will be assessed at the beginning of the month and at the end of the month with reading running records to monitor for reading growth. Administration will review the student scores monthly with the reading coach to ensure the intervention is helping our MTSS Tier 2 and 3 students. The Title 1 3rd - 5th grade ELA para will help support our Tier 2 and 3 students by previewing the Reading Wonders text with the students before the text is presented the following week in class. In this way, the students can focus on the reading standard when the teacher presents the content the following week. Reading Wonders weekly assessments will be posted in Sharepoint to ensure the intervention is helping our students.

Person Responsible Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improve the Math proficiency of 3rd - 5th grade students. Trends in Math FSA data indicate the math proficiency has continued to lag behind district percentages.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve the Math proficiency of 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students by 6% from 2018-2019 FSA scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-based Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers collaboratively plan for the appropriate depth of knowledge of the Math standard then students will improve their ability to analyze and solve math problems. The math interventionist will work with small groups of students for additional support of learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly planning time scheduled with coaches
2. Create a schedule for the math interventionist to work with the bottom 25% students every day
3. Teachers will analyze student tasks for the appropriate standards to ensure the student product is aligned with the depth of knowledge for the standard through ASL (Analyze student learning) during planning.
4. Plan for remediation, acceleration and differentiation through collaborative conversations from student work samples
5. Use formative assessments after reteach to ensure student learning

Person Responsible	Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)

Provide additional collaborative planning time during the school year for all K-5 math teachers in order to review data, plan for instruction and improve student learning. Monitor for effectiveness through Trendtracker data each week to ensure the tasks are aligned to the DOK of the standard.

Person Responsible	Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)

Additional after school math tutoring for students in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades using Ready materials for additional math support. Using STAR and classroom assessment data, provide students additional instruction in grade level math standards. Review Math Module Assessment data to track student progress.

Person Responsible	Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)

Purchase additional ipads in order to assist students with learning math concepts using online math platforms. Review weekly Freckle data to plan for student and classroom learning progress and next steps for small group remediation.

Person Responsible	Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)

The Math Coach will support learning by providing coaching cycles, math resources, modeling lessons, and the after school math tutoring. Monitor for effectiveness through Trendtracker data each week to ensure the tasks are aligned to the DOK of the standard. Review Math Module Assessment data to gather grade and classroom trends in order to support remediation plan.

Person Responsible   Kim Sealey (kim.sealey@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Student Attendance is an area of focus at North Lakeland Elementary. After reviewing the previous year's student attendance data, the leadership team will send home a positive letter to parents of students who were absent 90% or more from school last year. The informational letter will give parents information and research on how important student attendance is for student learning. Additionally, the student list will be reviewed each week by the leadership team to see if any students from the list were absent. If absences begin to form a pattern, the leadership team will call parents to see what the school can do to assist parents with ensuring students are in attendance each day.

Additionally, student course failures in ELA and Math are a focus, as well. The school leadership team will address this by monitoring student interim and quarter grades. After reviewing student interim grades, if a student has a D or F in ELA or Math, the leadership team will have a conversation with the teacher about providing additional opportunities for mastery of the skill deficiencies, as evidenced by the grade of D or F. The leadership team will follow-up with the teacher after two weeks to ensure fidelity of the skill recovery or to plan next steps.

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.

North Lakeland Elementary has a vision of student-centered classrooms where all stakeholders are involved in collaboration for student achievement. Through work of various committees such as PBIS and Hospitality, the school staff will concentrate on building connections and relationships between teachers and students, among colleagues, and within the community to strengthen the organization for the achievement of the team. Members of administration, each grade level or representative group on campus are invited to join the committees.

Building upon the foundations of connections, the support roles of school counselor and behavior interventionist will guide the team in ensuring understanding of a safe school environment where students and teachers feel confident to attempt new learning and new tasks, make mistakes, and try again with support. Through school communication and external events such as the SAC meetings and Parent Information Nights, school staff will consult and receive feedback on the progress of the culture and environment.

School discipline data, attendance data, as well as achievement data have been reviewed by school staff stakeholders. These members recognize the importance of growth to continue effective efforts that are supporting the vision and meeting the needs of the community, as well as the need to adjust ineffective activities. Formal student feedback such as student surveys as well as additional outreach opportunities within the community are two areas which the staff stakeholders have indicated a need for improvement. Additionally, the School Advisory Council will provide feedback as well.

A positive school culture is essential in building a supportive learning environment, where all students and adults work together to reach our school's goals.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Hispanic				$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$24,516.80
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0201 - North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice			$1,700.00
			Notes: LSI Standards Tracker			
			0201 - North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice			$3,916.80
			Notes: Substitutes for additional grade level collaborative planning			
			0201 - North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice			$2,953.60
			Notes: Professional learning books for teacher professional development during the school year			
			0201 - North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice			$3,046.40
			Notes: Expense for teacher substitutes in order to attend professional learning during the school year toward their intended PD goal.			
			0201 - North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice			$3,000.00
			Notes: PD Registration fees for teachers to attend professional learning during the school year toward their intended PD learning goal.			

			Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0201 - North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice			$2,200.00
			Notes: Administrative cost for attending Summer Learning Conference 2021			
			0201 - North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice			$7,700.00
			Notes: Instructional staff cost for attending Summer Learning Conference 2021			
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$13,849.71**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0201 - North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice			$5,000.00
			Notes: Purchase Math Tutoring materials for after school tutoring			
			0201 - North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice			$5,880.00
			Notes: Purchase iPads for additional online math learning for students			
			0201 - North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice			$699.00
			Notes: iPad cases to protect the technology from breakage			
			0201 - North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice			$1,617.91
			Notes: iPad Cart for storage			
			0201 - North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice			$652.80
			Notes: 5th grade team planning for math/science instruction			
					Total:	**$38,366.51**