

Polk County Public Schools

Combee Academy Of Design And Engineering



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	14
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	0

Combee Academy Of Design And Engineering

2805 MORGAN COMBEE RD, Lakeland, FL 33801

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

Demographics

Principal: Tammy Farrens

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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: D (40%)
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	14
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Combee Academy Of Design And Engineering

2805 MORGAN COMBEE RD, Lakeland, FL 33801

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

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 staff at Combee Academy of Design and Engineering will facilitate opportunities for students to access curriculum through the use of varied instructional strategies, learning modalities, technology and the arts to increase student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Combee Academy of Design and Engineering is to create a learning environment where all children are encouraged to become lifelong learners as they strive to reach their maximum potential in order to become productive members of society.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Farrens, Tammy	Principal	<p>This principal provides the vision and leadership necessary to develop and administer educational programs that optimize the human and material resources available. These programs will ensure implementation of learning processes for all students leading to enhanced student achievement within the context of providing a safe and successful school for students, staff, parents, and community in support of enhanced student learning.</p>
Bargeron, Lori	Instructional Media	<p>This position exists to ensure that all students learn the basic and essential skills at each grade level. Essential Functions of this Job: Plans and implements a library media program, which aligns to the mission and vision of the district; providing equal access to all students. Creates and maintains a library media center that is organized, welcoming, and conducive to learning. Delivers library media services by providing resources and instruction for students and teachers to become independent users of information. Plans, prepares, and provides instruction in the skills necessary to access, evaluate, analyze, and organize information in all formats to ensure optimal student achievement. Implements large group, small group, and individual settings. Plans prepares, and provides literature activities to promote a love of reading and lifelong learning for students. Uses, models, and assists users with instructional applications and use of technology for academic learning.</p>
Wright, Michael	Assistant Principal	<p>This position exists to assist the school principal in providing the vision and leadership necessary to develop and administer educational programs that optimize the human and material resources available. These programs will ensure implementation of learning processes for all students leading to enhanced student achievement within the context of providing a safe and successful school for students, staff, parents, and community in support of enhanced student learning.</p>
Baker, Mary Ann	Instructional Coach	<p>This position exists to deliver appropriate teacher-to-teacher professional learning and coaching support, resulting in improved effectiveness of classroom instructional practices and enhanced student achievement. This position will serve in a specified school within the district. This position will be assigned to a Math, Reading or Science content area, for which s/he must be fully qualified. The School-based Coach is responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching,</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. This position will also be responsible for coaching teachers about: data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools.</p>
<p>Filarecki, Steven</p>	<p>School Counselor</p>	<p>This position exists to provide a comprehensive counseling program that addresses academic, personal/social, and career development by designing, implementing, evaluating and enhancing a program that promotes student achievement. (The objectives of the guidance program are outlined in the Polk County Developmental Guidance Plan and include services to students, parents, staff and the community.) The comprehensive developmental school counseling program provides education, prevention, intervention, and advocacy.</p> <p>The School Counselor aligns with the district’s mission to support the academic achievement of all students, insuring equity and access to all. The counselor implements federal, state and local mandates; facilitates the successful transition and progression of students throughout the system; develops and maintains a written plan for effective delivery of the school counseling program, communicating the goals to educational stakeholders. Direct services address guidance curriculum, individual student planning, preventive and responsive services. The counselor works with students individually and in groups and provides consultation to teachers and other school personnel regarding students and makes referrals as appropriate</p>
<p>Styron, Michelle</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>This position exists to assist leadership with the development of individual, class and schoolwide behavior interventions and to deliver appropriate teacher-to-teacher professional learning and support, resulting in improved effectiveness of classroom instructional practices, increased learning time for students and enhanced student achievement.</p> <p>The Intervention Facilitator is responsible for teacher-to-teacher classroom support, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote better behavior management strategies for teachers and students. This position will also be responsible for supporting teachers in data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based strategies and programs; and school improvement.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cox, Kristi	Other	<p>This position exists to coordinate educational placement and appropriate services for students with disabilities. The person in this role will serve as the LEA (Local Education Agency) representative at staffings and IEP (Individual Education Plan) meetings at the assigned school. Simultaneously, this staff member will provide 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> <p>Coordinates the referral, staffing, placement, and re-evaluation process for exceptional student education at the school level. Serves as a member of individual educational plan (IEP) meetings as the LEA representative. Provides the level and frequency of direct support to students and teachers based upon general educators' and students' need for assistance. Arranges for classroom and testing accommodations for students with disabilities. Assists in the development and adaptation of curriculum and testing materials to meet the needs of teachers and students. Serves as a resource to school personnel regarding ESE rules and regulations.</p>
Lindquist, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	<p>Instructs students and facilitates their learning in accordance with state guidelines. Guides students in educational activities designed to promote intellectual, social, and physical growth through an inquiry-based educational model. Early engineering experiences will be integrated across the curriculum. Students in grades K-5 will be encouraged to investigate the world around them in a technology rich environment. Utilization of 21st century skills (collaboration, creativity, communication, critical thinking) will be supported through STEM enrichment and project-based Learning.</p>
Armstrong, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	<p>Provide identified gifted and talented students with appropriate learning experiences that develop potential and lead to advanced academic achievement. Provide services for gifted and talented students in Kindergarten through 5th grade, working in collaboration with administrators and teachers to provide a supplemental support for increasing advanced student achievement for all students, specifically gifted and talented students through staff development, instructional planning, and classroom support for teachers through both a pull-out and push-in program.</p>
Hooker, Alyson	Instructional Coach	<p>This position exists to deliver appropriate teacher-to-teacher professional learning and coaching support, resulting in improved effectiveness of classroom instructional practices and enhanced student achievement.</p> <p>This position will serve in a specified school within the district. This position will be assigned to a Math, Reading or Science content area, for which s/he must be fully qualified. The School-based Coach is responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching,</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. This position will also be responsible for coaching teachers about: data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools.		

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/29/2014, Tammy Farrens

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.*

2

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students

School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: D (40%)
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	112	88	98	95	93	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	584
Attendance below 90 percent	16	19	15	23	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	12	0	17	9	23	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Course failure in ELA	6	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	18	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 December STAR Reading	0	0	0	23	23	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 December STAR Math	0	0	0	13	10	19	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	1	1	9	15	23	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

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	9	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/8/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	117	98	107	98	101	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	622
Attendance below 90 percent	8	9	14	14	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
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	13	18	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	9	1	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	117	98	107	98	101	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	622
Attendance below 90 percent	8	9	14	14	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	2	3	4	12	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	18	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	

Students with two or more indicators 4 0 2 5 13 20 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 44

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	

Retained Students: Current Year 9 1 6 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 29

Students retained two or more times 0 0 0 2 1 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8

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	40%	51%	57%	33%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	51%	58%	47%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	49%	53%	63%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	57%	63%	44%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	56%	56%	62%	56%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	47%	51%	46%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	47%	53%	28%	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	46%	52%	-6%	58%	-12%
	2018	38%	51%	-13%	57%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	34%	48%	-14%	58%	-24%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	35%	48%	-13%	56%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	35%	47%	-12%	56%	-21%
	2018	49%	50%	-1%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	46%	56%	-10%	62%	-16%
	2018	42%	56%	-14%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	56%	-9%	64%	-17%
	2018	49%	57%	-8%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	48%	51%	-3%	60%	-12%
	2018	57%	56%	1%	61%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	45%	-4%	53%	-12%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
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	12	28	25	26	60	55	14				
ELL	24	46	50	36	67	72	25				
BLK	37	37		46	63		27				
HSP	34	46	54	43	53	56	38				
WHT	45	44	40	53	55	39	50				
FRL	35	45	54	43	53	50	35				

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	10	31	32	12	38	39	20				
ELL	23	41	31	31	26	29					
BLK	38	57	60	43	40	18	62				
HSP	36	41	43	42	37	29	43				
WHT	44	46	46	57	68	47	68				
FRL	37	45	49	47	46	28	53				
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	8	50	63	16	52	33	8				
ELL	21	46	77	42	51	60	22				
BLK	32	50	38	35	54	33	14				
HSP	30	42	75	49	62	64	33				
WHT	35	49	68	47	56	45	27				
FRL	30	47	59	42	56	45	29				

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
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	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	42
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	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	47
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	47
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 that performed the lowest is the SWD and ELL subgroups. The SWD subgroup increased from 10% to 12% proficiency and the ELL subgroup increased from 12% to 24% proficiency.

This is a trend, as these two subgroups have had a consistent level of low achievement over the past several years.

According to the December 2019 STAR ELA data, 12% of SWD subgroup was on track for proficiency and 8% of the ELL subgroup was on track for proficiency.

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

The science component showed the greatest decline from the prior year from 58% to 40% proficiency. The factor that contributed to this decline was reading proficiency levels within the cohort of students.

According to the Quarter 2 Science progress monitoring data, 36% of the students were on track for proficiency.

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 that had the biggest gap when compared to the state average was the ELA achievement levels. Data showed the school at 40% proficiency with the state at 57% proficiency. The factors that contributed to the gap was school readiness, attendance, and comprehension skill deficits. The trend shows ELA proficiency gradually increasing or maintaining.

According to the December 2019 STAR ELA data, 45% of students were on track to proficiency.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was mathematics learning gains with the bottom 25%. Learning gains increased from 30% to 51%. The new actions the school took in this area was to prioritize standards, provide opportunities to improve math fluency, after school tutoring, and small group interventions by teachers and support staff.

According to the December 2019 STAR Math data, 47% of students in the bottom 25% were on track to make a learning gain.

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

Potential areas of concern on the early warning system data are the number of students (244) with course failure in ELA or Math and the number of students (127) with attendance below 90%.

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

1. Increase ELA proficiency
2. Increase science proficiency
3. Increase learning gains of students with disabilities (SWD)
4. Reduce the number of students with less than a 90% attendance rate

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Student engagement is a driving factor in the learning process and also in holding teachers accountable for ensuring success for all students. To achieve engagement, teachers will implement accountability tools to improve student achievement in core content areas. In years past, all teachers were not using common formative and summative assessments based on priority standards and depth of knowledge levels. Inconsistent pacing and student accountability measures negatively impacted learning outcomes. According to the 2018-2019 FSA ELA data, 60% of the students earned a level 1 or 2 and on FSA Math, 52% of the students earned a level 1 or 2.

Measurable Outcome:

As a result of using accountability tools in core content areas, 46% of the students in ELA, 54% in Math, and 46% in science will be proficient on the 2021 FSA. Student learning will be monitored through grade level common formative and summative assessments and district progress monitoring tools, reflective writing opportunities, data folders, digital portfolios and reading workshop reciprocal journals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Farrens (tammy.farrens@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Grade level, standards based, common formative and summative assessments will be consistently utilized based on target-task alignment work completed in PLCs. Collaboration through reflective practices during grade level meetings will be implemented to determine best practices for instructional strategies and curricular decisions. Progress monitoring data will be used to determine the effectiveness of the strategy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Reviewing student data and participating in reflective practices allows teachers to assess effectiveness of their instruction and determine next steps for student success (ie: student grouping, small group instruction, curricular decisions, alternate instructional strategies) The Florida state standards and test item specifications for ELA, Math, and Science will be used to create the common formative and summative assessments. Curriculum maps and pacing guides will be used to maintain instruction momentum.

Action Steps to Implement

- Reading Wonders assessments align with Reading Workshop lessons
- Implement reading journals school-wide as a student reflective practice activity
- Incorporate a reading skill of the month across content areas

Person Responsible

Mary Ann Baker (maryann.baker@polk-fl.net)

- Write to Reflect (WTR) across content areas
- Student data folders for goal setting and accountability

Person Responsible

Michelle Styron (michelle.styron@polk-fl.net)

- School based coaches will work with teachers and students by providing coaching cycles and small group instruction.
- Behavior interventionist will work with teachers and students to help maintain positive classroom environments and classroom management systems.
- A paraprofessional will provide assistance with the additional hour of reading and assist in classrooms.
- Substitutes used for teachers to attend collaborative planning days.
- Extended learning opportunities for students will be available. Teachers will be paid and materials may be purchased.

- Seesaw will be purchased for parent/teacher communication and used for students to compile a digital portfolio that will follow them through the grade levels.
- Studies Weekly will be purchased for grades 3-5 to provide supplemental reading and writing opportunities in the content areas.
- Scholastic News will be purchased for grade K-2 to provide supplemental reading and writing opportunities in the content areas.

Person Responsible Tammy Farrens (tammy.farrens@polk-fl.net)

- Sight word cards will be copied for parents to use at home to assist with the educational process.
- Handwriting books for K-2 will be copied for students to increase legibility and writing stamina.
- Instructional supplies will be purchased to assist with the learning process.
- Parent involvement nights will be held to increase the home-school connection
- Student agendas will be purchased to increase communication between home and school.

Person Responsible Kristi Cox (kristi.cox@polk-fl.net)

- Grade level, standards based, common formative and summative assessments will be developed for ELA, math, and science based on target-task alignment work.
- Use reflective practices to evaluate the reliability of the assessments and make instructional decisions.
- Create teacher math manipulative kits for hands on learning.

Person Responsible Michael Wright (michael.wright@polk-fl.net)

- Provide weekly science labs for 3rd-5th grades
- Monitor/dissagregate quarterly science data in PLCs
- Ensure project-based learning units are aligned to core content standards

Person Responsible Alyson Hooker (alyson.hooker@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

All students will receive differentiated instruction to improve student achievement in core content areas. Based on reflective practices and data, teachers will create flexible groupings to differentiate instruction. Previously, data-based groupings were not consistently implemented or adjusted based on individual student need. According to the 2018-2019 data, 60% of the students on FSA ELA, 52% of the students on FSA Math, 88% of the SWD subgroup on ELA, and the 76% of the ELL subgroup on ELA earned a level 1 or 2.
According to the December 2019 STAR ELA data, 12% of SWD subgroup was on track for proficiency and 8% of the ELL subgroup was on track for proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

As a result of differentiated based instruction implemented in core content areas, all components of the school grade will increase by 5% (ELA-40 to 45, Math-48 to 53, Science-40 to 45, ELA gains-44 to 49, Math gains-56 to 61, ELA bottom 25%-48 to 53, Math bottom 25%-51 to 56).
Student learning will be monitored using district progress monitoring data, running records, standards assessments in Renaissance, and extra reading hour data (Tier 2).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Farrens (tammy.farrens@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

After collaboration and reflective practices, instructional strategies and curricular decisions will be determined to assist students in need of additional, targeted instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Reviewing student data and participating in reflective practices allows teachers to assess effectiveness of their instruction and determine individual student need for targeted instruction (ie: student grouping, small group instruction, curricular decisions, alternate instructional strategies).
Resources used may include Renaissance, iStation, Education Galaxy, running records, formative/summative assessments, LLI materials, Freckle, Reflex, and leadership team.

Action Steps to Implement

- School based coaches will work with teachers and students by providing coaching cycles and small group instruction.
- Behavior interventionist will work with teachers and students to help maintain positive classroom environments and classroom management systems.
- A paraprofessional will provide assistance with the additional hour of reading and assist in classrooms.
- Substitutes used for teachers to attend collaborative planning days.
- Extended learning opportunities for students will be available. Teachers will be paid and materials may be purchased.
- Seesaw will be purchased for parent/teacher communication and used for students to compile a digital portfolio that will follow them through the grade levels.
- Studies Weekly will be purchased for grades 3-5 to provide supplemental reading and writing opportunities in the content areas.
- Scholastic News will be purchased for grade K-2 to provide supplemental reading and writing opportunities in the content areas.

Person Responsible

Tammy Farrens (tammy.farrens@polk-fl.net)

- Sight word cards will be copied for parents to use at home to assist with the educational process.
- Handwriting books for K-2 will be copied for students to increase legibility and writing stamina.

- Instructional supplies will be purchased to assist with the learning process.
- Parent involvement nights will be held to increase the home-school connection
- Student agendas will be purchased to increase communication between home and school.

Person Responsible Kristi Cox (kristi.cox@polk-fl.net)

- Implement reading journals school-wide as a student reflective practice activity
- Incorporate a reading skill of the month across content areas
- Reading/Phonics Workshop implemented school-wide- reading levels/tasks assigned based on individual student needs

Person Responsible Mary Ann Baker (maryann.baker@polk-fl.net)

- Write to Reflect (WTR) across content areas
- Student data folders for goal setting and accountability

Person Responsible Michelle Styron (michelle.styron@polk-fl.net)

- Professional development on the MTSS process and data collection
- Monthly MTSS meetings
- Data and teacher generated referrals to MTSS
- Continue Tier 2/3 plans and interventions
- Leadership team will review data on a consistent basis
- Establish non-negotiable expectations for professional learning communities

Person Responsible Steven Filarecki (steven.filarecki@polk-fl.net)

- Differentiate small group instruction for ESE and ELL students using resource staff to reduce the student/teacher ratio and provide explicit instruction.

Person Responsible Mary Ann Baker (maryann.baker@polk-fl.net)

- Review multiple sources of data during monthly leadership and MTSS meetings to monitor appropriate student placement in additional reading hour groups (Power Hour).

Person Responsible Steven Filarecki (steven.filarecki@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

NA

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.

To build a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved, Combee Academy uses a tiered approach.

Tier 1:

- Eric Jensen's Teaching with Poverty in Mind (teachers participate in a book study and are expected to embed the strategies).
- Florida PBIS initiatives/CHAMPS
- Sanford Harmony/Positive Action: fifteen minute daily school-wide social/emotional curriculum
- Child Safety Matters: student safety

Tier 2:

- Holyoake Drumbeat: building resilience through rhythm
- Peer Mediation: conflict resolution sessions led by students
- Zones of Regulation: self-regulation to identify emotions and tools
- Safer Smarter Kids
- Small group counseling

Tier 3:

- Check in/Check out
- In class supports (teacher and student modeling of behavior expectations)
- Peer Mentoring
- Positive Behavior Intervention Plans
- Individual counseling

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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