Cleveland Court Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cleveland Court Elementary School

328 EDGEWOOD DR E, Lakeland, FL 33803

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

Demographics

Principal: Emily Fite

Start Date for this Principal: 5/24/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
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: A (62%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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

Cleveland Court Elementary School

328 EDGEWOOD DR E, Lakeland, FL 33803

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

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 KG-5	Yes	84%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

School Grades History

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

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.

Every CCE student will be prepared academically and socially through rigorous learning experiences to become successful lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

CCE, in partnership with family and community, will provide a safe and supportive learning environment where students strive for excellence in all they do.

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
RUTENBAR, CHERYL	Principal	The administration sets clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships). They share past and current data from many different sources with team members. As a team they discuss barriers and instructional strategies to decrease gaps and increase proficiency. They seek input from teacher leaders in all areas of school improvement. School leaders, in turn, provide teachers on their grade level information to help them understand barriers, determine the effectiveness of instructional strategies, and next steps needed to move the students forward. School Leaders suggest professional develop needs for the staff. The literacy coach facilitates collaborative planning and provides coaching to the teachers. The guidance counselor provides teachers with social/emotional data and strategies for Tier 1, 2, and 3 students.
Jacques-Ousley, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Reading Coach Collaborative Planning Coaching Cycle Data Analysis SIP Planning Family Engagement Title I Budget
Gainer, Linda	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor Oversee the MTSS process LEA Counsels Students
Kranek, Lee	Assistant Principal	The administration sets clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships). They share past and current data from many different sources with team members. As a team they discuss barriers and instructional strategies to decrease gaps and increase proficiency. They seek input from teacher leaders in all areas of school improvement. School leaders, in turn, provide teachers on their grade level information to help them understand barriers, determine the effectiveness of instructional strategies, and next steps needed to move the students forward. School Leaders suggest professional develop needs for the staff. The literacy coach facilitates collaborative planning and provides coaching to the teachers. The guidance counselor provides teachers with social/emotional data and strategies for Tier 1, 2, and 3 students.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pion, Debra	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Nolin, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Ortiz, Suggey	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Cruz, Barbara	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Monserrat, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Byrd, Theresa	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Collier, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Mullens, Kelley	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Monge, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 5/24/2016, Emily Fite

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.*
1

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
32

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
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: A (62%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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	61	70	78	55	64	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	390
Attendance below 90 percent	4	7	10	8	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	5	4	10	5	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	1	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Dec. STAR 2019 ELA Level 1s	0	0	0	6	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Dec. STAR 2019 Math Level 1s	0	0	0	1	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	3	8	5	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	2	9	4	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 5/22/2020

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	64	67	74	53	61	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	383
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	12	7	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	5	5	0	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	2	5	0	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	2	7	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	64	67	74	53	61	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	383
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	12	7	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	5	5	0	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	2	5	0	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	2	7	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	67%	51%	57%	66%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	51%	58%	71%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	49%	53%	73%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	80%	57%	63%	73%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	71%	56%	62%	77%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	47%	51%	46%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	47%	53%	59%	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	72%	52%	20%	58%	14%
	2018	72%	51%	21%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	48%	17%	58%	7%
	2018	54%	48%	6%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	56%	47%	9%	56%	0%
	2018	55%	50%	5%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	79%	56%	23%	62%	17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	88%	56%	32%	62%	26%
Same Grade Comparison	-9%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	56%	23%	64%	15%
	2018	74%	57%	17%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison	5%					
Cohort Comparison	-9%					
05	2019	63%	51%	12%	60%	3%
	2018	64%	56%	8%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison	-11%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	47%	45%	2%	53%	-6%
	2018	67%	51%	16%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison	-20%					
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	43	50	50	48	60	77					
ELL	35	67		53	67						
BLK	50	56	40	65	62		33				
HSP	52	62	50	66	57	60	43				
WHT	83	70		90	80		67				
FRL	57	59	40	79	70	67	42				
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	39	50	31	60	70	64	54				
ELL	15	40		69	70						
BLK	39	36	33	58	59	63	50				
HSP	51	37		76	62		64				
WHT	78	58		86	71	55	84				
FRL	49	41	28	67	60	50	63				

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	32	47	50	27	47	33					
ELL	38			38							
BLK	33	52		52	65	55	36				
HSP	51	75		68	79		55				
WHT	85	75		83	82		81				
FRL	48	63	67	60	72	50	38				

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	64
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	78
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	514
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
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	60
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	51
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	78
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	61
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.

Lowest 25% in ELA and Lowest 25% in Math
Contributing factor for ELA is new teachers in 4th and 5th grade ELA, though we are seeing an upward trend in ELA scores.
Contributing factor for math is that all standards had not been taught at the time of assessment; we are seeing an upward trend in Math scores.

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

Lowest 25% in math
Contributing factor for math is that all standards had not been taught at the time of assessment; we are seeing an upward trend in Math scores.

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.

Lowest 25% in ELA
Contributing factor for ELA is new teachers in 4th and 5th grade ELA, though we are seeing an upward trend in ELA scores.

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

Lowest 25% in ELA
Literacy coach's support of teachers in writing and implementing differentiated small group lessons; identifying students and pairing them with adult mentors on campus for accountability with AR; data analysis during PLCs to target students in need of specific interventions given by teacher, ESE inclusion teacher, and classroom para.

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

The number of students not proficient in ELA going from 3rd grade to 4th grade (18 out of 55).

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

1. All students reading at or above grade level.
2. Identify skill deficits due to 9 weeks of school closure.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Area of Focus

ELA Proficiency and 5th Grade ELA Learning Gains
The 2020-2021 school report card is based on proficiency of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students, as well as "prior prior" learning gains for 5th grade students and previously retained 3rd grade students. All classrooms will be engaged in rigorous, standards-based instruction during the daily ELA block in order to meet previous and current grade level expectations. Students may have gaps in their learning due to 9 weeks of distance learning.

Rationale
22 incoming 3rd Graders out of 78 are not proficient in ELA, which is 28%.
18 incoming 4th Graders out of 55 are not proficient in ELA, which is 33%.
20 incoming 5th Graders out of 64, are not proficient in ELA, which is 31%.

63% of the 2020-2021 state report card will be based on the performance of our 5th grade students.

Measurable Outcome:

The percentage of proficient ELA students at each grade level will be 70% or higher on each STAR assessment and on FSA. 80% of fifth graders' STAR assessment scores will indicate that their current levels are at or above their 3rd grade FSA ELA scores. Learning gains and lowest 25% learning gains on FSA will be 80% or higher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lee Kranek (lee.kranek@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Monitoring AR diagnostic reports, which allow teachers to track students' independent reading level weekly to determine whether they are successfully reading and testing on or above grade level. Teachers will adjust the ZPD of each student every 2-3 weeks in order to increase the students' reading levels throughout the school year. Students will read and take AR tests weekly, with the goal that every student will earn a minimum of 50 points, at 85% accuracy, on grade level or higher by the FSA ELA test date.
Monitoring STAR data, which will be used to compare students' current levels to those they achieved on FSA ELA in 3rd grade.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The strong correlation between STAR assessment scores, AR points/accuracy/book level, and FSA have been documented at CCE for 3 consecutive years. Students who earn 50 or more points at 85% accuracy, on or above grade level are more likely to be proficient and/or make learning gains on FSA ELA.
The use of AR diagnostic and STAR reports will allow teachers the ability to make weekly and/or quarterly adjustments to individual student's learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. AR Diagnostic and STAR Reports analyzed by classroom teachers.
2. Classroom observations and teacher implementation of the standards by administration.
3. Analysis of student products, formative and summative assessment data, .
4. Weekly collaborative planning with Literacy Coach.
5. Literacy Coach will meet with each grade level for a Collaborative Planning Day once per year. Substitutes will cover classrooms during planning days.
6. Title I Paras will work daily with small groups of students in K-5th grades in the areas of ELA to support instruction of standards.

7. Teachers will use Brain Pop to support instruction.

8. Library books will be purchased to ensure enough reading materials at all reading levels.

9. After school tutoring will be offered for students.

10. Teachers will make parent phone calls to inform them of their child's academic and behavioral status.

11. Staff members will attend a summer education Conference.

Person Responsible Lee Kranek (lee.kranek@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus Math Proficiency and 5th Grade Math Learning Gains The 2020-2021 school report card is based on proficiency of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students, as well as "prior prior" learning gains for 5th grader students and previously retained 3rd grade students. All classrooms will be engaged in rigorous, standards-based math instruction during the daily math block in order to meet previous and current grade level expectations. Students may have gaps in their learning due to 9 weeks of distance learning. Rationale: 17 incoming 3rd Graders out of 76 are not proficient in Math, which is 22%. 8 incoming 4th Graders out of 55 are not proficient in Math, which is 16%. 15 incoming 5th Graders out of 63, are not proficient in Math, which is 24%. 64% of the 2020-2021 state report card will be based on the performance of our 5th grade students.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of proficient Math students at each grade level will be 80% or higher on each STAR assessment and on FSA. 80% of fifth graders' STAR assessment scores will indicate that their current levels are at or above their 3rd grade FSA Math scores. Learning gains and lowest 25% learning gains on FSA will be 80% or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lee Kranek (lee.kranek@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Monitoring STAR assessment data, which will be used to compare students' current levels to those they achieved on FSA Math in 3rd grade 2018-2019. Monitoring math module data so that teachers have the ability to provide individual students remediation as needed based on their lack of proficiency by standard.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The strong correlation between STAR assessment data and FSA has been researched and documented. The STAR reports will allow teachers the ability to make quarterly adjustments to individual student's learning. The math module results will allow teachers the ability to provide individual students remediation as needed based on their lack of proficiency by standard.

Action Steps to Implement

1. STAR Reports analyzed by administration and classroom teachers.
2. Classroom observations and teacher implementation of the standards by administration.
3. Analysis of student products, formative and summative assessment data.
4. Each grade level will meet for a Collaborative Planning Day once per year. Substitutes will cover classrooms during planning days.
5. Title I Paras will work daily with small groups of students in K-5th grades in the areas of math to support instruction of standards.
6. Teachers will use Brain Pop to support instruction.
7. Teachers will use Reflex to support mathematical fluency.
8. After school tutoring will be offered for students.
9. Teachers will make parent phone calls to inform them of their child's academic and behavioral status.
10. Staff members will attend a summer education Conference.

Person Responsible   Lee Kranek (lee.kranek@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Teachers will identify ELA, Math, and Science Standards not taught to students in person due to school closure. Grade levels will meet in vertical teams to share this information. Math and science teachers will plan lessons that integrate missing standards into current lesson plans. Since all ELA standards had been taught before the school closure, ELA teachers will identify standards that will need additional attention by the next grade level teachers to help students get back on track for grade level proficiency by the end of the 2020-2021 school year.

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.

CCE implements a school-wide PBiS plan. Teachers provide lessons on classroom and common area behavior expectations, including bus expectations. Behavior expectations are modeled, taught, and practiced in all common areas of the school and monitored by all staff members on campus.
Teachers provide daily Sanford Harmony community building lessons, team building activities embedded within academics, and monthly character building lessons in each classroom.
Our PTO members provide grants for the teachers, pay for field trips and transportation, purchased equipment for recess and provide gifts to show appreciation to the school staff throughout the school year
SAC Committee includes staff members, parents, and community members which meet monthly to discuss the areas of strengths and needs of our school, analyze student data, and make financial decisions that would best meet the needs of our students.
Great American Teach In is a day we dedicate to our students to learn about careers and hobbies by welcoming in a variety of community business owners to share their expertise.
Business Partners invest in our school as sponsors to provide resources such as iPad carts, library books, and on-line learning subscriptions to further learning.
Volunteers dedicate their time to assist in classrooms, work with small group of students and read with students individually.
Annual Parent Meeting at the beginning of the year to discuss school expectations, Title I funding, Compact and Parent Family Engagement Plan.
Family nights throughout the year to discuss curriculum, FSA state testing, classroom and school

expectations.
All stakeholder groups are asked for feedback and suggestions on how to improve the whole school experience at CCE. This includes parents (family nights, PTO meetings, SAC meetings), community members (SAC meetings), volunteers (volunteer orientation), social worker (school visits), universities (field studies and internship programs), and students (PBiS surveys).

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**