Polk County Public Schools

Chain Of Lakes Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Chain Of Lakes Elementary School

7001 STATE HIGHWAY 653, Winter Haven, FL 33884

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

Demographics

Principal: Suzie Nelson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2010

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)	89%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Chain Of Lakes Elementary School

7001 STATE HIGHWAY 653, Winter Haven, FL 33884

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

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	67%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We believe each child is unique and has potential. We believe it is our responsibility to instill in each child the ability to think critically, work cooperatively, pursue knowledge, respect others and make responsible healthy choices.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Chain of Lakes Elementary is a family partnership committed to excellence. We expect everyone to cooperatively acquire the skills and knowledge necessary to become successful lifelong learners and productive citizens with respect for themselves, others and the world around them.

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
Duncan, Victor	Principal	
Nelson, Suzie	Assistant Principal	
Ford, Beth	Assistant Principal	
Nottage, Lavieria	School Counselor	
Drehmer, Melissa	Other	
Frost, Laura	School Counselor	
Albritton, Shawn	Instructional Media	
Brock, Jackie	Administrative Support	
Victor, Bruce	Dean	
Wilson, Kristi	Instructional Coach	
Scharff, Joanne	Instructional Coach	
Thomas, Brittany	Teacher, ESE	LEA

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2010, Suzie Nelson

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.*
6

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

63

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)	89%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	167	176	156	154	162	182	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	997
Attendance below 90 percent	20	12	10	29	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	4	0	4	2	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Dec. 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	1	5	17	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Dec. 2019 STAR Mathematics Level 1	0	4	13	5	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	6	12	18	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	5	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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

Wednesday 5/27/2020

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	3	9	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	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	3	9	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	68%	51%	57%	70%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	51%	58%	74%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	49%	53%	62%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	75%	57%	63%	79%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	56%	62%	84%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	47%	51%	73%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	47%	53%	53%	46%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	72%	52%	20%	58%	14%
	2018	62%	51%	11%	57%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	48%	20%	58%	10%
	2018	61%	48%	13%	56%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	59%	47%	12%	56%	3%
	2018	68%	50%	18%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	76%	56%	20%	62%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	72%	56%	16%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	56%	15%	64%	7%
	2018	70%	57%	13%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	74%	51%	23%	60%	14%
	2018	70%	56%	14%	61%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%
	2018	62%	51%	11%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
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	32	55	55	49	66	59	27				
ELL	51	73	62	63	55	45	43				
ASN	94	92		100	92						
BLK	67	67	58	66	67	58	39				
HSP	51	68	65	66	65	54	36				
MUL	73			87							
WHT	76	69	66	82	80	70	68				
FRL	62	68	65	71	74	65	46				

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	29	57	60	35	48	34	30				
ELL	55	69	54	65	61	46	46				
ASN	87			93							
BLK	64	59	57	61	54	31	39				
HSP	59	64	61	65	59	43	51				
MUL	53	45		67	55						
WHT	72	66	46	84	75	64	82				

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
FRL	59	57	58	69	61	45	59				

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	27	44	45	40	62	59	5				
ELL	43	61	58	61	80	76	25				
ASN	82			100							
BLK	55	75	65	67	75	46	27				
HSP	58	63	59	71	87	81	47				
MUL	71			86							
WHT	81	79	65	87	83	67	62				
FRL	60	67	53	71	78	65	38				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	535
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
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	95
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	60
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	60
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	80
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	73
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	66
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.

The data component showing the lowest performance is Fourth Grade, specifically the learning gains and bottom quartile cells, in both ELA and Mathematics. The contributing factor to last year's low performance was the absence of using data to engage in ongoing preplanning to reteach or accelerate students in specific content areas through small groups or mini-lessons. This contributed to the widening of student gaps, the inability for students to retain new content information, and students' lack of exposure to content in higher taxonomies. State assessment data has shown a higher percentage for fourth-grade learning gains and bottom quartile in ELA and Mathematics over the past two years.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year is mathematics in grades four and five. The contributing factor to last year's low performance was the absence of using data to engage in ongoing preplanning to reteach or accelerate students in specific content areas through small groups or mini-lessons. This contributed to the widening of student gaps, the inability for students to retain new content information, and students' lack of exposure to content in higher taxonomies.

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 data component having the greatest gap when compared to the state average was in the area of science. This year’s low performance was primarily due to our students’ lack of exposure to analyzing scientific data/information on a deeper level. The standards were taught this year but at a lower taxonomy. The content was not taught to be used for application or analyzing purposes. Our goal this year is to use rigorous materials that require students to analyze scientific data and apply that knowledge. As far as trends, our data do not support a trend. Our science scores continue to fluctuate each year (ie. High, low, high, low).

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

The data component showing the most improvement is third-grade mathematics. The continued and new actions our school took in this area were consistent and thorough planning of state standards and quality delivery of instruction. Third grade incorporates opportunities within their lessons for students to experience productive struggle allowing students to develop meaningful strategies. This grade level focused on data-driven results and implementing plans where gaps were noted.

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

After reflecting on our EWS data from Part I (D), one potential area of concern is attendance in grades one and three.

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

1. Fourth Grade ELA & Mathematics
2. Fifth Grade ELA & Mathematics
3. Reading Foundations Grades K & 1
4. Science Instruction Grades K through 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:	The area of focus is on planning and implementing small group instruction. The absence of preplanning for student misconceptions and misunderstanding of content leads to additional gaps and the students' inability to make connections to extend their learning. Planning for varied student responses to delivered instruction allows students to receive immediate feedback and alternate strategies to mastery standards.
Measurable Outcome:	Using ongoing data to plan and implement quality small groups our school should be able to increase or maintain ELA learning gains from 69% to 72% and increase the learning gains of our Lowest 25% from 65% to 68%. Additionally, in the area of mathematics, our school should be able to increase or maintain learnings from 74% to 77% and increase Lowest 25% from 61% to 64%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Ongoing planning for small group instruction -Implementing quality small group instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategies selected above have shown to be effective and have a high impact effect size on student progress. The criteria for selecting the above strategies are based on current resources and experience of success we have had in other academic areas.

Action Steps to Implement

-Academic Coaches and Administrative Team will revisit core instruction plans to ensure instructional delivery aligns with state standards

Person Responsible Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

-Academic Coaches and Administrative Team will train and model for teachers the instructional strategy of scaffolding and mini-lessons

Person Responsible Joanne Scharff (joanne.scharff@polk-fl.com)

-Academic Coaches and Administrative Team will train and model teachers on using data to plan and implement quality small group instruction and check and track implementation of plans

Person Responsible Kristi Wilson (kristi.wilson@polk-fl.net)

Academic Coaches and Administrative Team (Title I School Counselor) will conduct ongoing data reviews to determine student deficiencies and plan of action to provide support to teacher and students; also analyzing the RW printed assessment results, providing additional ink and supplies to support instruction

Person Responsible Laura Frost (laura.frost@polk-fl.net)

-Title I Para-Educator and Media Para will provide targeted small group reading and math small group instruction

Person Responsible Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

-Communicate student academic progress in parent's communication notebook, agenda, etc.

Person Responsible Jackie Brock (jackie.brock@polk-fl.net)

-Supplies will be provided to families to engage in activities involving the state standards during family academic nights and through the school website

Person Responsible Jackie Brock (jackie.brock@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus is on science. Students' lack of exposure to analyzing scientific data/ information on a deeper level. The standards were taught this year but at a lower taxonomy. The content was not taught to be used for application or analyzing purposes.
Measurable Outcome:	Our specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to increase our NGSSS assessment score from 50% to 53%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Beth Ford (beth.ford@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our goal this year is to use rigorous materials that require students to analyze scientific data and apply that knowledge.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing students with the opportunity to engage with similar science text such as the NGSSS assessment will provide them with exposure, and the development of the necessary skills to process the information, and apply knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement

-Academic Coaches and Administrative Team will collaborate with teachers to modify plans to align with science standards while engaging students in relevant labs requiring analysis of data and application of information.

Person Responsible Kristi Wilson (kristi.wilson@polk-fl.net)

-Use science progress monitoring data to determine learning gaps and interventions and ability group students based on content mastery.

Person Responsible Joanne Scharff (joanne.scharff@polk-fl.net)

-Administrative team will provide opportunities for vertical teams to discuss the progression of science standards kindergarten through 5th grade

Person Responsible Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

-Communicate student academic progress in parent communication notebook, agenda, etc.

Person Responsible Jackie Brock (jackie.brock@polk-fl.net)

-Supplies will be provided to families to engage in activities involving the state standards during family academic nights and through our school website

Person Responsible Jackie Brock (jackie.brock@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Increasing the effectiveness of our K and 1 phonetic instruction is a priority for our campus. Through the process of effective scheduling, teacher training, and aligned resources, students in grades K and 1 will leave their grade level with a strong reading foundation. The leadership team will provide support through curriculum planning, observation and feedback, modeling, and analyzing data for gains and growth areas.

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.

Chain of Lakes Elementary addresses building positive school culture and environment involving all stakeholders by building relationships with school families and community members in an ongoing, welcoming environment. This is a constant, flexible process with multiple avenues including, monthly grade chair meetings, weekly grade-level meetings, family involvement activities, and a comprehensive SAC committee that includes a sampling of all stakeholders. We actively seek input on Chain of Lakes Elementary's mission, protocols, and input on school plans for decision-making through our stakeholder meetings, surveys, and by family involvement surveys after each family activity. We participate actively in community and college events and support our community colleges by hosting interns, promoting summer activities on campuses, and hosting a summer showcase.

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: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00