Dundee Elementary Academy

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dundee Elementary Academy

215 FREDERICK AVE, Dundee, FL 33838

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

Demographics

Principal: Lana Tatom   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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)	99%
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: B (55%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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

Dundee Elementary Academy

215 FREDERICK AVE, Dundee, FL 33838

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

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	85%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

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.

Dundee Elementary Academy aims to develop influential citizens who are globally aware, internationally minded, and have a passion for lifelong learning. We work collaboratively as a highly qualified staff with all stakeholders to provide inquiry-based instruction in a safe a supportive environment.

Goal: Teachers will engage students in rigorous tasks aligned with the full intent of the standards in all content areas using proven instructional delivery techniques, including differentiated instruction.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing students to excel in a global society!

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
Headley, Lana	Principal	
Dettling, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Meek, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach
Royer, Renee	School Counselor	
Hulsey, Gail	Instructional Coach	Reading Interventionist and ELL Support
Gavin, Jessica	Teacher, ESE	LEA for school
Crosthwaite, Monica	Teacher, K-12	Former IB coordinator and AP pool candidate
Smith, Kaili	Teacher, K-12	IB Coordinator & Gifted Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Lana Tatom

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

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)	99%
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: B (55%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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	102	105	102	108	99	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	618
Attendance below 90 percent	13	10	2	4	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	11	3	7	14	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	6	3	9	5	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
STAR Reading Level 1 Dec	0	0	0	8	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
STAR Math Level 1 Dec	0	0	0	4	8	12	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	7	3	8	9	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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

Monday 6/8/2020

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	104	96	100	95	103	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	603
Attendance below 90 percent	13	5	8	5	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	2	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	8	16	19	22	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	2	8	13	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	2	2	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	104	96	100	95	103	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	603
Attendance below 90 percent	13	5	8	5	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	2	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	8	16	19	22	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	2	8	13	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	2	2	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	60%	51%	57%	56%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	51%	58%	57%	53%	57%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	49%	53%	38%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	57%	63%	62%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	61%	56%	62%	61%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	47%	51%	56%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	47%	53%	0%	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	68%	52%	16%	58%	10%
	2018	48%	51%	-3%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	48%	3%	58%	-7%
	2018	52%	48%	4%	56%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	62%	47%	15%	56%	6%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	56%	9%	62%	3%
	2018	54%	56%	-2%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	56%	7%	64%	-1%
	2018	61%	57%	4%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	60%	51%	9%	60%	0%
	2018					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	44%	45%	-1%	53%	-9%
	2018					
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	13	6		21	33	45					
ELL	43	42	43	57	68	75	26				
BLK	66	57		55	51	40	48				
HSP	48	46	47	59	63	65	29				
WHT	73	59	62	73	66	62	61				
FRL	51	47	45	54	57	56	29				

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	19			19							
ELL	27	27	41	53	40	10					
BLK	62	81		60	57						
HSP	36	35	42	51	41	8					
WHT	64	66		66	59						
FRL	44	51	50	54	45	17					

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
ELL	33	45		58	62						
BLK	61	50		39	44						
HSP	43	57	38	65	70	64					
WHT	70	59		75	63						
FRL	51	51	25	53	59	44					

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	457
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	53
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	54

Hispanic Students	
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	65
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	52
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.

Students with disabilities show the lowest performance. The contributing factors show a need for shared responsibility of the performance of students with disabilities. The coordination of support from general education and special education teachers would address this need. Progress monitoring data from Aug.-Dec. STAR showed that 29% of our ESE students met the minimum requirement of student growth percentile in reading.

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

There were no areas of decline all areas showed improvement.

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.

Science data is the only area that had a significant gap. This is contributed to the addition of 5th grade back to the school for the first time. Taking time to gather resources. When 5th grade left and FCAT science was no longer a priority at the school, the rigor of science instruction and target task alignment was lacking.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was lowest quartile in math, however, that is because it was significantly lower the previous year than in the past.

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

1. 4th and 5th grades have the highest numbers with two or more indicators.
2. Kindergarten and 1st grade attendance.

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

1. ESE
2. Science
3. ELL

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Target task alignment with intentional transdisciplinary connection to increase science. When teachers align tasks for students with transdiciplinary connections with the full intent of the standards, student achievement will increase in the area of science. This is a critical need because our science data was below the district and state averages.
Measurable Outcome:	We intend for our science data to increase from 43% to 48% proficient on FCAT science.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lana Headley (lana.headley@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Understanding the DOK level of the standards and creating assessments aligned to the standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers need to create an assessment year at a glance for science as they did for math aligned to the standards and vertically across grade levels which is also a recommendation from our IB evaluation. By the time students get to 5th grade and take FCAT science we want our students to be prepared with a solid conceptual understanding of the nature of science, life science, physical science, and earth science.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development on science concepts incorporating technology and the use of Stemscopes (K-5) as well Legends of Learning (3-5).

Person Responsible	Kaili Smith (kaili.smith@polk-fl.net)

Weekly collaborative planning with IB coordinator to effectively design and implement lessons using the new IB planner which includes technology integration.

Person Responsible	Kaili Smith (kaili.smith@polk-fl.net)

Unit planning days by grade level including incorporating technology into IB units. Substitute teachers will be paid for from Title I funds to cover these days.

Person Responsible	Kaili Smith (kaili.smith@polk-fl.net)

Review student data and create AY@G for science with Karen Bailey.

Person Responsible	Kaili Smith (kaili.smith@polk-fl.net)

Weekly learning walks by leadership team to monitor target task alignment and technology usage by teachers and students.

Person Responsible	Lana Headley (lana.headley@polk-fl.net)

Instructional supplies to support transdisciplinary lessons. Funds from Title I will be used for instructional supplies including ink and toner for printing resources.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Dettling (jennifer.dettling@polk-fl.net)

Family STEM night.

Person Responsible Jennifer Dettling (jennifer.dettling@polk-fl.net)

LSI summer training for teachers to improve target task alignment.

Person Responsible Jennifer Dettling (jennifer.dettling@polk-fl.net)

5th grade teachers to visit Brigham Academy to observe hands on science instruction in a transdisciplinary setting. Substitute teachers paid from Title I will cover classrooms.

Person Responsible Jennifer Dettling (jennifer.dettling@polk-fl.net)

Three days of professional development for teachers new to DEA on standards based instruction PYP IB; readers, writers, and phonics workshop.

Person Responsible Monica Crosthwaite (monica.crosthwaite@polk-fl.net)

Instructional classroom para will work with kindergarten and first grade classroom to support transdisciplinary instruction.

Person Responsible Gail Hulsey (gail.hulsey@polk-fl.net)

Extended learning program provided for students to support standards based instruction.

Person Responsible Gail Hulsey (gail.hulsey@polk-fl.net)

Summer collaborative planning to align core instruction to the standards.

Person Responsible Monica Crosthwaite (monica.crosthwaite@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A strong focus on reading instruction for our ESE subgroup as well as ELL/Hispanic subgroup in ELA. This is a critical need because our ESSA edudata shows a F for two years for ESE students and a C for ELL students.
Measurable Outcome:	We intend to increase our LQ in ELA from 51-56% which includes ESE and ELL students (which make up over half of this group). We intend to increase our ELA learning gains from 53-58% this includes ESE and ELL students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Meek (kimberly.meek@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction, conferring, and family engagement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers intentionally provide small group instruction with fidelity, confer with students, and engage families; student achievement will increase for all students (including ESE & ELL subgroups).

Action Steps to Implement

Support from Jeanne Tribuzzi to effectively implement the units of study and utilize the assessment tools that teachers have previously had training on. Utilize padlet resources effectively.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Meek (kimberly.meek@polk-fl.net)

Reading coach and consultant will model small group instruction and conferring. Teacher and students will use digital tools and technology.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Meek (kimberly.meek@polk-fl.net)

Teachers and leadership will monitor the use of running record data in the running record books & literacy bags, small group plans, and MTSS plans.

Person Responsible	Lana Headley (lana.headley@polk-fl.net)

Increase library to include mother tongue books and classroom libraries to support small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Meek (kimberly.meek@polk-fl.net)

Reading interventionist will specifically focus on ELL/Hispanic subgroups by providing training to paraprofessionals on small group reading strategies based on student data.

Person Responsible	Gail Hulsey (gail.hulsey@polk-fl.net)

Family engagement activities focused specifically on second language learning in the home during early dismissal days. Technology will be used to translate training for families and recorded.

Person Responsible	Gail Hulsey (gail.hulsey@polk-fl.net)

Kindergarten teachers to visit Lincoln Avenue Academy to observe ELA instruction to include small group, conferring, and assessment. Substitute teachers paid from Title I will cover classrooms.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Meek (kimberly.meek@polk-fl.net)

Instructional supplies to support ELA instruction and classroom libraries.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Dettling (jennifer.dettling@polk-fl.net)

Technology will be used to identify 4th and 5th grade students with two or more EWS indicators in order to create goals, track data, and provide additional support above and beyond the school day.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Dettling (jennifer.dettling@polk-fl.net)

Instructional classroom para will work with kindergarten and first grade classroom to support ESE and ELL students.

Person Responsible	Gail Hulsey (gail.hulsey@polk-fl.net)

Extended learning program provided for students to support ESE and ELL students.

Person Responsible	Gail Hulsey (gail.hulsey@polk-fl.net)

ESE team will specifically focus on ESE subgroup by providing support to teachers and progress monitoring literacy data throughout the year.

Person Responsible	Jessica Gavin (jessica.gavin@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. 4th and 5th grades have the highest numbers with two or more indicators-Included in ESSA subgroup area of focus
2. Kindergarten and 1st grade attendance-Included in positive culture & environment

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.

Our school builds capacity by building a positive school culture and environment in four specific ways.
1. Five committees have been established and include various stakeholders from our community. These committees include School Advisory Council, International Baccalaureate, Data Leadership, Positive

Behavior Intervention Support, and Parent Teacher Student Association. These committees build a positive school culture by building capacity within staff as well as community stakeholders. Each staff member participates on a committee and committee meetings are held monthly. Minutes of the committees are shared in the weekly newsletter for parents to review and provide input.

2. While each of the committees plays a vital role in creating and maintaining a positive culture and environment our school was recognized as a gold model PBIS school and a magnet school of excellence.

3. Use of the student agenda and homework folders to ensure open communication between school and home.

4. Harmony (social emotional learning program) used daily school wide first thing in the morning provides a positive school culture to increase daily attendance. Data reviewed during committee meetings and monitored through our school counselor's SAO..

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**