Alturas Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Alturas Elementary School

420 4TH ST, Alturas, FL 33820

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

Demographics

Principal: Charles Pemberton, Jr

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2011

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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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

Alturas Elementary School

420 4TH ST, Alturas, FL 33820

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

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	33%

School Grades History

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

The mission of Alturas Elementary School is for all of our students to demonstrate academic achievement at or above the expected level of performance as defined by the Florida Department of Education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Working collaboratively with the community to develop life long learners.

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
Reinacher, Shelley	Assistant Principal	Principal/Assistant Principal: The administration team leads the development of and monitors the implementation of the School Improvement Plan with fidelity. Chance/Technology: Ensures and monitors that the school technology plan is implemented with fidelity. He ensures teachers have access to all technology resources. Stinson/Media: Ensures and monitors that the school's reading focus is implemented with fidelity. This includes teacher access to books for instructional purposes, implementing the AR program, and access to books for students' instructional and independent levels.
Pemberton Jr., Charles	Principal	
Stinson, Terry	Instructional Media	
Chance, Brian	Instructional Technology	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/1/2011, Charles Pemberton, Jr

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

25

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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	52	63	51	69	56	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	343
Attendance below 90 percent	14	21	5	20	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	2	8	1	8	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	3	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	2	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Dec 2019 STAR Rdg Level 1	0	0	0	15	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Dec 2019 STAR Math Level 1	0	0	0	10	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	3	16	3	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/9/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	48%	51%	57%	50%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	51%	58%	57%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	49%	53%	62%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	57%	63%	56%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	69%	56%	62%	56%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	47%	51%	50%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	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	55%	52%	3%	58%	-3%
	2018	49%	51%	-2%	57%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%
	2018	51%	48%	3%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	33%	47%	-14%	56%	-23%
	2018	48%	50%	-2%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	56%	2%	62%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	56%	6%	64%	-2%
	2018	57%	57%	0%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	63%	51%	12%	60%	3%
	2018	69%	56%	13%	61%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	45%	4%	53%	-4%
	2018	69%	51%	18%	55%	14%
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			36							
ELL	12	35		64	82		27				
BLK	31			63							
HSP	29	38	64	67	78		50				
WHT	59	53	64	61	63	40	47				
FRL	45	46	65	68	71	56	48				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	13	42	40	48	68		50				
ELL	20	25		30	50						
BLK	45			64							
HSP	44	42		60	74		64				
WHT	56	56	20	64	72	67	78				
FRL	46	49	18	60	70	63	67				

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	16	45	55	23	32	36					
ELL	41	82		33	60						
BLK	47	71		53	79						
HSP	58	70		59	55		57				
WHT	48	47	57	55	48	40	54				
FRL	47	53	65	46	58	56	45				

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	54
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	36
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	429
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
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	47
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	52
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	55
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	55
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.

5th Grade Math due to the district unexpectedly pulling our highly effective math teacher in the first 9 weeks. We had a substitute for a month. Then, we hired a teacher that was outside the Polk County School System which had a different curriculum.

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

5th Grade Math due to the district unexpectedly pulling our highly effective math teacher in the first 9 weeks. We had a substitute for a month. Then, we hired a teacher that was outside the Polk County School System which had a different curriculum.

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.

5th Grade Math due to the district unexpectedly pulling our highly effective math teacher in the first 9 weeks. We had a substitute for a month. Then, we hired a teacher that was outside the Polk County School System which had a different curriculum.

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

ELA proficiency showed the most improvement due to the fact that there was more emphasis placed on independent reading. There were more incentives built in to motivate students. We hired a new 5th grade reading teacher that has experience with the Daily 5 (a framework focused on reading strategies).

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

Attendance school-wide, but specifically 3rd grade is an area of concern.

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

1. Increase student motivation and achievement in ELA
2. A focus on 5th Grade ELA and Math proficiency, learning gains, and bottom 25% as they are 81% of our school grade
3. Student Attendance
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The focus is student motivation and achievement in K-5 ELA. We noticed school-wide a lack of motivation and desire to read. Teachers were focused more on students completing tasks instead of actual time reading text. We want to move towards a framework focused on independent reading time with instructional reading strategies(Daily 5 framework/Title 1 Use of Funds).
Measurable Outcome:	A 3-5% increase in ELA proficiency, learning gains, and bottom 25% including students with disabilities (ESSA).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Charles Pemberton Jr. (charles.pembertonjr@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Daily 5 (a framework for teaching independent reading strategies) The Daily 5 is designed to teach children to build their stamina and independence in each of the Daily 5 tasks so they can fully engage in meaningful, authentic reading and writing for an extended time. The Daily 5 tasks are steeped in choice, which increases motivation and student intellectual engagement. While students are engaged in this authentic reading and writing, teachers are then able to work with children, conducting individual conferences and working with small groups based on their needs as a result of assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Daily 5 is designed to teach children to build their stamina and independence in each of the Daily 5 tasks so they can fully engage in meaningful, authentic reading and writing for an extended time. The Daily 5 tasks are steeped in choice, which increases motivation and student intellectual engagement. While students are engaged in this authentic reading and writing, teachers are then able to work with children, conducting individual conferences and working with small groups based on their needs as a result of assessments. With our focus being on increasing student motivation and achievement in ELA, this framework works to get students more engaged in and reading text to increase proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Attend a Daily 5 virtual conference, Daily 5 module trainings will be provided throughout the year, and the school based Daily 5 team will support implementation.

Title 1 Expenditures: Classroom Libraries, Daily 5 Training/Substitutes, Reading Intervention Resources, Primary/Intermediate Journals, Daily 5 Staff Development Books, Parent Nights/Agendas, Two Paraprofessionals

Person Responsible	Shelley Reinacher (shelley.reinacher@polk-fl.net)

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

A. The school leadership team will address 5th grade ELA and K-5 Math proficiency, learning gains, and bottom
25% by adding additional resources (para), targeted small group instruction utilizing paras, and tracking and
analyzing student data.
Title 1 Expenditures: Christina Tondevold Trainings, Math Number Sense Manipulatives, Math Intervention
Resources, Reflex, Parent Nights/Agendas, Two Paraprofessionals

B. Continue K-5 Science Support to increase proficiency
Title 1 Expenditures: Science hands-on equipment

C.The school leadership team will address student attendance concerns by incorporating attendance incentives.

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.

Alturas Elementary works to build a positive culture by communicating and providing training on the importance of positive relationships. We celebrate student achievement based on student ability throughout the school year. We create a school environment that is welcoming to students, staff, parents, and the community. Passion and love for our students is our priority as it transcends into student motivation and achievement.

Alturas Elementary works to build positive relationships with families by offering a variety of school events including a variety of academic nights. The mission of Alturas Elementary School is for all of our students to demonstrate academic achievement at or above the expected level of performance as defined by the Florida Department of Education. This is communicated through high expectations for both students and staff, effective communication with families, and engaging students in rigorous lessons designed by highly qualified teachers.

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: -- Select below --:	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**