

Polk County Public Schools

# Scott Lake Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Scott Lake Elementary School

1140 COUNTY ROAD 540A E, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Tangela Durham**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (59%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

## Scott Lake Elementary School

1140 COUNTY ROAD 540A E, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

### 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	66%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

### 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.**

Scott Lake Elementary strives to ensure every student achieves academically, socially, and emotionally.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Every student matters, every moment counts, everyday!

### 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
Durham, Tangel	Principal	<p>Our Leadership Team consists of administrators, counselors, academic coaches, and teacher leaders. The team meets weekly to collaboratively plan with teachers as well as assist with interventions for students' success. The team is responsible for the analyzing weekly/monthly data and links that data to instructional decisions. In addition, the team reviews progress monitoring data with teachers to identify students who are at moderate or high risk for not meeting state standards. This team is also responsible for facilitating the process of making decisions about the implementation of effective interventions.</p> <p>Principal: The Principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. She leads and assists in setting up structures for high impact instruction, data-based decision-making, and a collaborative culture. She monitors the progress of intentional planning by attending weekly grade level collaborative planning sessions as well as PLCs. She also conducts daily walkthroughs, provides consistent formative feedback to support the professional growth of all teachers, and openly communicates with parents to build positive relationships.</p>
Kaufmann, Ron	Assistant Principal	<p>Assistant Principal: Assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, in the assessment of school staff, and assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas. He provides commentary on a weekly basis and works with the principal to make schedule adjustments as needed. The assistant principal also provides and supports common vision for PBIS and CHAMPS by enforcing protocol and policy. The Assistant Principal will also ensure that classrooms have the necessary materials/furniture/arrangements that are conducive to learning based on teacher discretion.</p>
Shim, Candace	School Counselor	<p>School Counselor: Provides training and support in the MTSS/RtI process annually and as needed; works with teachers through the problem solving cycle; facilitates leadership meetings related to MTSS/RtI. Teaches students through classroom guidance lessons, provides classroom guidance lessons; works with the Principal and/or Assistant Principal on issues of behavior; acts as a parent contact for parents who have academic and/or social concerns related to their child. Spearheads all aspects of PBIS.</p>
Thomas, Jackie	Instructional Media	<p>Media Specialist: Provides knowledge of availability and suitability of information resources to support curriculum initiatives, engages in the developmental process with the planning team, using knowledge of school curriculum and professional resources, facilitates the use of presentation tools in print, technology, and media for dissemination efforts, and serves as an expert in organizing, synthesizing, and communicating information.</p>
Single, Tracy	Other	<p>LEA Facilitator: Coordinates educational placement and appropriate services for students with disabilities. Also serves as the lead representative at</p>



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>staffings and IEP (Individual Education Plan) meetings and provides direct support to students with disabilities and their general education and ESE teachers to promote inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education environment.</p>
Payne, Mallory	Instructional Coach	<p>Participates in grade level collaborative planning with a standards-focus, monitoring for the rigor of the standards, and teaching with the most effective instructional strategies aligned with Marzano's framework. Delivers professional development aligned with our priorities, provide grade-level, and one-on-one coaching as well as additional support to both teachers and students in meeting the rigor of the standards. Also, gathers resources for support within all three tiers, follow up on individual student progress and identify professional development needs in order for interventions to be successful and provide coaching/mentoring support to strengthen core.</p>
Brennan, Chris	Other	<p>Analyzes reading and math data in order to identify students in need of extra support; uses supplemental resources to increase achievement; meet with targeted students; plan with teachers to determine additional needs/improvements of students, and provide small group instruction to students in the lowest quartile. Participates in grade level collaborative planning with a standards-focus, monitoring for the rigor of the standards, and teaching with the most effective instructional strategies aligned with Marzano's framework. Delivers professional development aligned with our priorities, provide grade-level, and one-on-one coaching as well as additional support to both teachers and students in meeting the rigor of the standards. Also gathers resources for support within all three tiers, follow up on individual student progress and identify professional development needs in order for interventions to be successful and provide coaching/mentoring support to strengthen core.</p>
Cannon, Nicole	Instructional Coach	<p>Participates in grade level collaborative planning with a standards-focus, monitoring for the rigor of the standards, and teaching with the most effective instructional strategies aligned with Marzano's framework. Delivers professional development aligned with our priorities, provide grade-level, and one-on-one coaching as well as additional support to both teachers and students in meeting the rigor of the standards. Also, gathers resources for support within all three tiers, follow up on individual student progress and identify professional development needs in order for interventions to be successful and provide coaching/mentoring support to strengthen core.</p>

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Tangelia Durham

**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.*

5

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

47

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (59%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	101	133	105	129	123	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	729
Attendance below 90 percent	25	23	9	14	10	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	3	8	4	2	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	16	13	13	19	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Course failure in Math	8	6	11	17	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	11	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	10	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Dec. Star Early Lit Data scoring <3	38	48	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
Dec. Star Reading Data scoring <3	0	0	16	43	39	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157
Dec. Star Math Data scoring <3	0	32	19	28	14	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154

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	7	3	13	8	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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

Thursday 5/21/2020

### 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	99	138	110	134	121	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	740
Attendance below 90 percent	8	32	11	16	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	13	9	4	11	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

**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	6	19	8	19	17	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	2	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

**Prior Year - Updated**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	99	138	110	134	121	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	740
Attendance below 90 percent	8	32	11	16	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	13	9	4	11	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	13	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

**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	6	19	8	19	17	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	2	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	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	57%	51%	57%	63%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	51%	58%	57%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	29%	49%	53%	40%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	70%	57%	63%	69%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	56%	62%	63%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	47%	51%	42%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	47%	53%	51%	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	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
	2018	61%	51%	10%	57%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	48%	4%	58%	-6%
	2018	60%	48%	12%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	56%	47%	9%	56%	0%
	2018	58%	50%	8%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	78%	56%	22%	62%	16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	60%	56%	4%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	56%	9%	64%	1%
	2018	66%	57%	9%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	65%	51%	14%	60%	5%
	2018	56%	56%	0%	61%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	60%	45%	15%	53%	7%
	2018	68%	51%	17%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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	30	25	13	45	55	52	33				
ELL	30	29		48	47						
BLK	34	33	25	44	54	54	30				
HSP	45	33	14	63	56	47	55				
MUL	69			54							
WHT	69	60	43	83	73	45	80				
FRL	41	40	24	57	53	40	53				
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	25	48	47	34	42	29	60				
ELL	19	53		33	47						
BLK	33	32	27	37	38	26	47				
HSP	48	54	65	50	50	45	60				
MUL	93	82		79	50						
WHT	71	60	60	75	64	32	79				
FRL	47	52	52	51	52	33	64				

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	17	38	32	27	43	25	9				
ELL	33	44	30	52	67	60					
BLK	32	33	24	43	48	36	22				
HSP	56	58	39	59	60	53	47				
MUL	92			92							
WHT	73	62	52	78	67	36	60				
FRL	47	50	40	54	53	41	32				

### 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	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	455
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	46
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	39
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	48
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	62
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	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	48
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.**

ELA bottom 25% showed the lowest performance. With the exception of 2017-2018, this component has been the lowest over the past five years.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year is ELA bottom 25%. This data component declined by 22%.

**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.**

The ELA Lowest 25th percentile had the greatest gap when compared to the state average showing a 22 point decrease from the previous year.

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

The Math Lowest 25th percentile showed the most improvement with a 14 point increase from the previous year.

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

Based on the EWS data, an area of concern for the school would be the number of students that earned a level 1 on the Florida Standards Assessments.

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

1. ELA Core Instruction
2. Students in the Lowest 25th Percentile
3. Students with Disabilities
4. Black/African American Students Subgroup
5. ELL

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** FSA ELA scores indicate a gap between the performance of African American students compared to students in other ethnicity groups. The overall number of white students scoring proficient in ELA was 68.9%, Hispanic 44.5%, Multiracial 66.7% and the number of African American was 39%. This is well below the overall school proficiency of 57%.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase proficiency within the African American subgroup by at least 10%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will use weekly/monthly data to plan for students interventions and small group instruction. Students in this group will receive daily small group instruction

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** To ensure we are meeting the needs of our African American students to move them towards grade level proficiency.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Administration and coaches will conduct weekly collaborative grade level planning sessions focusing on moving identified students, creating standards based and small group lesson plans, analyzing formative and summative assessment data, student products, and classroom observations.
2. Administration and coaches will conduct classroom observations focusing on small group instruction.
3. STAR & AR Diagnostic Data analyzed by Administration, Leadership Team, and classroom teachers.
4. Analyze student fluency data of students in tier 2 and 3 instruction.
5. Coaches, interventionist, and media para will provide content rich nonfiction text for classroom libraries and media/library books.
6. Students not making learning gains will meet and conference with administration, coaches, interventionist, and/or classroom teacher.
7. Continuously adjust instruction and/or supports based on data.
8. Coaches and Interventionist will provide enriched extended learning opportunities which will include hands on learning experiences for academic vocabulary.

**Person Responsible** Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** FSA scores indicate a gap between the performance of general education students and those identified as SWD. The overall percentage of SWD students scoring proficient in ELA was 36%. This is well below the overall school proficiency of 57%.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase SWD proficiency by at least 15%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Students will be identified through initial test scores, STAR, and AR Diagnostic Data and monitored through the MTSS process. Additionally, they will be provided small group instruction from the ELA Interventionist and ELA Coach.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Data on student with disabilities and district early warning system data through the MTSS processes and procedures.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Administration and coaches will conduct weekly collaborative grade level planning sessions focusing on moving identified students, creating standards based and small group lesson plans, analyzing formative and summative assessment data, student products, and classroom observations.
2. Administration and coaches will conduct classroom observations focusing on small group instruction.
3. STAR & AR Diagnostic Data analyzed by Administration, Leadership Team, and classroom teachers.
4. Analyze student fluency data of students in tier 2 and 3 instruction.
5. Coaches, interventionist, and media para will provide content rich nonfiction text for classroom libraries and media/library books.
6. Students not making learning gains will meet and conference with administration, coaches, interventionist, and/or classroom teacher.
7. Continuously adjust instruction and/or supports based on data.
8. Coaches and Interventionist will provide enriched extended learning opportunities which will include hands on learning experiences for academic vocabulary.

**Person Responsible:** Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** According to our current Spring 2019 FSA data, the percentage of bottom 25% students making learning gains in reading decreased from 51% to 29% with a decline of 22%.

**Measurable Outcome:** With this as a focus area, we will improve gains in the lowest quartile by at least 10%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Leadership Team will track student membership in the bottom quartile due to student mobility. Teachers will then use weekly/monthly data to plan for small group instruction. Students in this group will receive daily small group instruction

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** As a result of student mobility, the bottom quartile will change. By continuously tracking, we know the membership of the targeted population.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Administration and coaches will conduct weekly collaborative grade level planning sessions focusing on moving identified students, creating standards based and small group lesson plans, analyzing formative and summative assessment data, student products, and classroom observations.
2. Administration and coaches will conduct classroom observations focusing on small group instruction.
3. STAR & AR Diagnostic Data analyzed by Administration, Leadership Team, and classroom teachers.
4. Analyze student fluency data of students in tier 2 and 3 instruction.
5. Coaches, interventionist, and media para will provide content rich nonfiction text for classroom libraries and media/library books.
6. Students not making learning gains will meet and conference with administration, coaches, interventionist, and/or classroom teacher.
7. Adjust instruction and/or supports based on data.
8. Coaches and Interventionist will provide enriched extended learning opportunities which will include hands on learning experiences for academic vocabulary.

**Person Responsible** Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Develop and deepen classroom strategies where the focus of instruction is shifted from the teacher to the student, with the end goal of developing students who are autonomous and independent, by placing the responsibility of learning in the hands of the students.**

**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.

Scott Lake Elementary creates an environment where students, parents, and staff respect each other. Administrators are highly visible and maintain an open door policy to both students and parents. Teachers and parents work together to solve problems and plan for success. Teachers and administrators lead by example and demonstrate the leadership qualities we like to see in our students.

\*\*\*Please see the attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan for full details on how we plan to build positive relationships with parents and community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of all students.

#### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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

### **Part V: Budget**

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>