

Polk County Public Schools

James W. Sikes Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

James W. Sikes Elementary School

2727 SHEPHERD RD, Lakeland, FL 33811

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

Demographics

Principal: Kerry Chapman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2014

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)	91%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (60%) 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

James W. Sikes Elementary School

2727 SHEPHERD RD, Lakeland, FL 33811

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

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	83%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

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 Sikes Elementary, with the support of the home and the community, is to provide the highest quality education for our students by creating a caring and challenging atmosphere that encourages life long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In partnership with home and community, Sikes Elementary is committed to educating productive citizens of tomorrow.

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
Chapman, Kerry	Principal	Kerry Chapman, Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implement and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.
Williams, Kirsten	Psychologist	Kirsten Williams, School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical evaluation; assists in facilitation of data-based decision making activities.
Ewing, Dorothy	Assistant Principal	Dorothy Ewing, Assistant Principal: Leads the PBIS team, provides information on school-wide discipline data, ensures that school-based team is implementing MTSS, participates in implementation of intervention support and documentation and ensures adequate professional development to support assessment of MTSS knowledge and skills of staff.
Marcano, Erica	Instructional Coach	Erica Marcano, Math Coach: Supports teachers by modeling instruction, reviewing and analyzing data and leading collaborative planning sessions. She also leads monthly support meetings for teachers new to Sikes.
Dodge, Kristin	Other	Kristin Dodge as one of our Reading Interventionists, she supports identified lowest quartile ELA students through small group reading instruction.
Salas, Christina	Other	Christina Salas, as one of our Reading Interventionists, she supports identified lowest quartile ELA students through small group reading instruction.
Shipe, Megan	Teacher, ESE	Megan Shipe, ESE Facilitator: Coordinates and oversees ESE department and monitors compliance issues, participates in student data collection, supports teachers with strategies to use in tiered interventions specific to behaviors; collaborates with general education teachers.
Wheeler, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	Elizabeth Wheeler, Reading Coach: Supports teachers by modeling instruction, reviewing and analyzing data and leading collaborative planning sessions. She also leads monthly support meetings for teachers new to Sikes.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/29/2014, Kerry Chapman

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

3

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

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

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)	91%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (60%) 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	128	142	138	138	147	157	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	850
Attendance below 90 percent	10	19	14	6	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	4	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	11	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	21	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on Dec 2019 STAR Reading	0	0	15	19	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on Dec 2019 STAR Math	0	10	24	12	17	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	4	5	8	17	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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

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	118	132	124	145	143	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	817
Attendance below 90 percent	0	21	13	10	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	12	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	2	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	118	132	124	145	143	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	817
Attendance below 90 percent	0	21	13	10	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	1	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	1	2	7	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	54%	51%	57%	56%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	51%	58%	59%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	49%	53%	65%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	57%	63%	63%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	56%	62%	69%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	47%	51%	65%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	47%	53%	46%	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	59%	52%	7%	58%	1%
	2018	64%	51%	13%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	48%	3%	58%	-7%
	2018	50%	48%	2%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	45%	47%	-2%	56%	-11%
	2018	57%	50%	7%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	56%	9%	62%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	61%	56%	5%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	56%	3%	64%	-5%
	2018	55%	57%	-2%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	56%	51%	5%	60%	-4%
	2018	62%	56%	6%	61%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	45%	8%	53%	0%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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	15	29	35	30	37	35	12				
ELL	27	53	50	38	55	56	15				
BLK	43	54		52	36	20	33				
HSP	50	56	54	60	71	62	43				
MUL	61	40		56	67						
WHT	59	50	41	64	56	48	56				
FRL	45	53	56	49	55	50	40				
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	22	24	33	31	38	30	31				
ELL	37	51	70	44	45	32	40				
BLK	46	39	25	50	55	42	43				
HSP	55	61	59	58	48	33	50				
MUL	85	80		60	50						
WHT	64	58	50	67	59	39	72				
FRL	54	57	57	56	51	40	58				

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	20	52	55	23	55	58	21				
ELL	25	42	67	38	71	85	15				
BLK	33	40	44	51	53	36	15				
HSP	48	54	56	58	66	63	43				
WHT	67	66	82	68	73	79	57				
FRL	44	50	57	54	68	60	34				

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	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	435
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	44
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	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
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	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	53
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

For FSA data, the ELA Learning Gains and Lowest Quartile components were the lowest performing for the 2019-2020 school year. Learning Gains dropped 5 points from 57% to 52%. Lowest Quartile students did not make progress from the previous year as they remained at only 51% making gains. Our Lowest Quartile in Math increased significantly by 13%, this component was still one of the lowest performing with only 50% of students making gains.

With no current FSA data to review due to Covid-19, we analyzed our December 2019 STAR data. We have identified current groups of students who scored a Level 1 on the December ELA assessment:

21 fourth grade
19 third grade
15 second grade

One of our identified ESSA groups is our Students with Disabilities. We have identified the following ESE students who scored a Level 1 on the December STAR ELA assessment:

7 fourth grade
6 third grade
1 second grade

In addition, 66 second grade students still remained in the Early Lit assessment in December 2019.

We identified the following groups of students who scored a Level 1 on the December STAR for Math:

17 fourth grade
12 third grade
24 second grade
10 first grade

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

ELA scores dropped significantly for the 2018-2019 spring assessments. Proficiency levels declined 6 point to 54%. The second lowest percentage in the past four years.

Our Science data showed a significant decline from 61% to 53%. We noticed a trend which the Science data closely correlates to ELA proficiency scores as it is a reading test as well.

Factors that may have contributed to this decline could be a fifth grade teacher who was excessively absent due to medical reasons. One fourth grade teacher moved during the year and students started with a new teacher in November. We also had a significant number of students receiving ESE services in grades 3-5. Our ESE students have been identified as our ESSA group that is scoring below the general population of our school.

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.

Our largest gaps were with 5th grade ELA. Our fifth graders scores were 11% below the state average of 56%. This cohort of students scored low on the previous year's FSA assessment with only 54% being proficient.

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

Our Math Lowest Quartile component made the biggest gain during the 2018-2019 spring assessment. We increased 13% from 37% to 50%.

Comparing STAR scores, we made small increases from the Winter 2018 assessment to the Winter 2019 assessment. In both ELA and Math STAR, our fourth and fifth grade students increased proficiency by an average of 3%.

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

We have identified 20 upcoming fifth grade students who meet two or more early warning indicators. We have a significant number (21) of upcoming fifth graders who scored a Level 1 on the December ELA STAR assessment.

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

1. Increase the ELA performance of our ESE students as identified by ESSA to above 41% of the Federal Index.
2. Increase ELA proficiency for all students.
3. Support students emotionally during and after COVID-19 pandemic.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Research shows that teaching through small groups using explicit instructional strategies improves student learning. Instruction must be based upon student's targeted deficiency. This area of focus will help us identify our ESSA subgroup students and provide a systematic method to provide support for our Students with Disabilities. These subgroups were identified by the state using the FSA data in spring 2018. Our data supports continuing this focus after reviewing the STAR data from December 2019.

Measurable Outcome:

Through intentional planning and implementation of small group instruction, we will improve the achievement level of our identified ESSA subgroup (students with disabilities) to above the federal index of 41% in English Language Arts (ELA) as evidenced on the spring 2020 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Students will be provided small group instruction daily based on the their needs. Data from the STAR assessments as well as weekly Reading Wonders assessments and teacher made formative assessments will be used to plan instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Our struggling students need additional supports to increase ELA and Math proficiency. After reviewing our 2018-2019 FSA data, we noticed a trend that many of our lowest quartile students were also receiving ESE services. Based on the December 2019 STAR and STAR Early Lit data, we noticed a need to increase supports for our primary students especially in reading.

Action Steps to Implement

Two Reading Interventionists will provide daily small group interventions using Leveled Literacy Intervention kits (LLI) for identified students in grades 2 and 3 who are performing below grade level expectations on the STAR assessments.

Person Responsible

Kristin Dodge (kristin.dodge@polk-fl.net)

We will restructure our ESE Inclusion Teachers and ESE Paraprofessionals' schedules to maximize time spent with students in a small group setting.

Person Responsible

Megan Shipe (megan.shipe@polk-fl.net)

Weekly, we will track student Accelerated Reader (AR) participation for those students identified in our ESSA subgroup. The Reading Coach will support teachers by setting classroom and individual goals to increase reading fluency. Additional AR books will be purchased to supplement classroom libraries and the media center to ensure the availability of books.

Person Responsible

Elizabeth Wheeler (elizabeth.wheeler@polk-fl.net)

Grade level teams will plan weekly with the assistance of our Academic Coaches in Reading and Math. Focus will be target-task alignment, increasing student engagement and targeted small group instruction. Teachers will be provided one collaborative planning day, with substitutes, to assist with developing quality lesson plans with a focus on: target/task alignment, small group instruction and monitoring for learning.

Person Responsible

Erica Marcano (erica.marcano@polk-fl.net)

We will provide parents with content focused (Reading/Math) family nights to provide parents with ideas to use at home. Families will make instructional resources to use at home with their students to support their learning. We will also encourage reading at home through the school wide One Book, One School initiative.

Person Responsible Dorothy Ewing (dorothy.ewing@polk-fl.net)

We will provide extended learning tutoring opportunities for students in grades 1-3 in the area of Reading.

Person Responsible Christina Salas (christina.salas@polk-fl.net)

We will provide additional iPads in classrooms to assist instruction as well as use during testing. The Technology Teacher will support classroom teachers with implementing technology such as Google Classroom to enhance instruction.

Person Responsible Dorothy Ewing (dorothy.ewing@polk-fl.net)

We will use timely resources to enhance classroom instruction such as Scholastic News to support reading instruction and in-school program with the Museum of Science and Industry (MOSI) for science.

Person Responsible Erica Marciano (erica.marciano@polk-fl.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During this unprecedented time during the COVID-19 pandemic, our students have experienced trauma on a global scale. With the abrupt closure of schools in March, students have not had daily interaction with their teachers as well as their peers. We understand that the transition back to school in August will be a difficult one for many students. Students missed a significant amount of in person instruction from March 2020 through the end of May 2020.
Measurable Outcome:	Our office referrals will be reduced by 5% from the 2018-2019 school year, our last full school year with accurate data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dorothy Ewing (dorothy.ewing@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	During the 2020-2021 school year, teachers will implement two strategies from the Stanford Harmony curriculum: Morning Meet Ups and Buddy Up. These strategies teach students how to interact positively with classmates by getting to know them better. They also help students learn empathy towards others when supporting a friend.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on the office referrals during our last full school year in 2018-2019 as well as teacher feedback from the 2019-2020 year, we believe that the social/emotional needs of our students were not being met effectively. After reviewing the referral data, we noticed that many issues were due to students not knowing how to interact appropriately when they became upset over an incident or with another student.

Action Steps to Implement

New teachers will receive in depth training for Sanford Harmony. Teachers who used the program last year will review components of the two strategies. Teachers will implement the Morning Meet Up daily as well as the Buddy Up strategy through the Sanford Harmony curriculum.

Person Responsible Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

Tier 2 interventions for behavior will be lead by the school's ESE Facilitator. She will provide specific behavior strategies with teachers and review data collected.

Person Responsible Megan Shipe (megan.shipe@polk-fl.net)

We will implement quarterly student pep rallies to celebrate students who meet goals and to review school wide expectations. These pep rallies may be televised due to CDC guidelines for large groups.

Person Responsible Dorothy Ewing (dorothy.ewing@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All school wide improvement priorities identified in 2.E are addressed through the action steps listed above.

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.

In order to promote a collaborative environment at Sikes Elementary, we engage with different stakeholders to improve our school's culture. Teachers serve in various roles such as grade chairpersons, members of committees focused on academics, mentoring new teachers and sharing out best practices with colleagues. Teachers also serve on our School Advisory Council (SAC) and Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) to help make decisions that impact our students.

Feedback collected from our parents is used to make many decisions for our school. We plan events based on their needs. Parents also provide feedback on the Title 1 Compact to set expectations for teachers, our school and our families. We have a very active Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) that supports our students by celebrating their accomplishments, providing fellowship through family events and purchasing much needed materials for students.

Businesses and local Universities also support our students and staff. We are very fortunate to host interns each fall and spring to work collaboratively with our teachers. Interns share the very latest strategies they are learning about in college coursework. Local business owners serve on our School Advisory Council (SAC) to help make informed decisions to improve instruction and our school environment. The SAC also reviews school improvement goals and the data collected throughout the year. Many business members volunteer during the year especially on the Great American Teach In day.

By consulting with various stakeholders, we continue to build a positive culture where our students learn to be the best they can be.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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