

Polk County Public Schools

# Sandhill 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>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>20</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>21</b> |

# Sandhill Elementary School

1801 TYNER RD, Haines City, FL 33844

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Kathy Conely**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (43%)<br>2017-18: C (47%)<br>2016-17: C (42%)<br>2015-16: C (41%)   |
| <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>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>21</b> |

## Sandhill Elementary School

1801 TYNER RD, Haines City, FL 33844

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

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 84%  |

### 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.**

Sandhill Elementary - a family of teachers and students learning in an encouraging environment where high expectations result in productive citizens.

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

Sandhill Elementary staff will create a safe community of collaborative learners where students persevere through a productive struggle to meet learning targets while engaging in rigorous tasks.

CRANES believe that ....

Caring about the learning environment is important so we can grow as a community of learners.

Respect of self and others is important.

ALL students can be leaders in a positive way.

Nurturing staff and families lead to successful students.

Every student can and will learn in an encouraging environment.

Safety is important for success.

### 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   |
|--------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Conely, Kathy      | Principal                | The school Leadership Team meets weekly to review data and make adjustments to instruction to increase student achievement. |
| Beasley, Cindy     | Instructional Coach      |   |
| Glasgow, Jennifer  | Instructional Coach      |   |
| Lewis, Sarah       | School Counselor         |   |
| Chapman, Sally     | Teacher, K-12            |   |
| Glasgow, Jeff      | Instructional Technology |   |
| Renesca, Lindsay   | Assistant Principal      |   |
| Pelletier, Matthew | Instructional Coach      |   |
| Morris, Sierra     | Teacher, K-12            |   |
| Bhoj, Mohanie      | Teacher, K-12            |   |
| Singleton, Tiffany | Teacher, K-12            |   |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Kathy Conely

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

0

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

3

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

49

#### Demographic Data

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File) | Active |
|--|--------|



|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (43%)<br>2017-18: C (47%)<br>2016-17: C (42%)<br>2015-16: C (41%)   |
| <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> .   |  |

## 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               | 143         | 155 | 155 | 172 | 186 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 979   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 33          | 28  | 29  | 33  | 26  | 29  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 178   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 4           | 3   | 3   | 2   | 5   | 7   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 24    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 20          | 19  | 37  | 32  | 35  | 25  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 168   |
| Course failure in Math                    | 22          | 12  | 25  | 27  | 27  | 13  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 126   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 14  | 26  | 41  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 81    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 15  | 27  | 55  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 97    |
| Dec 2019 STAR Reading Level 1             | 0           | 0   | 27  | 72  | 106 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 314   |
| Dec 2019 STAR Math Level 1                | 0           | 0   | 60  | 73  | 125 | 79  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 337   |

**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 | 4           | 3 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50    |

**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     | 7           | 6 | 10 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 53    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0  | 2  | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |

**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     | 124         | 141 | 153 | 163 | 175 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 910   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 14          | 36  | 30  | 38  | 26  | 53  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 197   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0   | 4   | 3   | 3   | 6   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 26  | 17  | 37  | 34  | 36  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 150   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 16  | 23  | 65  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 104   |

**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           | 15 | 8 | 23 | 22 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 101   |

**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     | 5           | 4 | 3 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2  | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |

**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     | 124         | 141 | 153 | 163 | 175 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 910   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 14          | 36  | 30  | 38  | 26  | 53  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 197   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0   | 4   | 3   | 3   | 6   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 26  | 17  | 37  | 34  | 36  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 150   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 16  | 23  | 65  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 104   |

**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           | 15 | 8 | 23 | 22 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 101   |

**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     | 5           | 4 | 3 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2  | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |

**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            | 42%    | 51%      | 57%   | 43%    | 51%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains         | 44%    | 51%      | 58%   | 46%    | 53%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 50%    | 49%      | 53%   | 45%    | 50%      | 52%   |

| School Grade Component      | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Achievement            | 45%    | 57%      | 63%   | 53%    | 58%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 40%    | 56%      | 62%   | 45%    | 57%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 45%    | 47%      | 51%   | 29%    | 49%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 36%    | 47%      | 53%   | 30%    | 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 | 52%    | 52%      | 0%                         | 58%   | -6%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 46%    | 51%      | -5%                        | 57%   | -11%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 30%    | 48%      | -18%                       | 58%   | -28%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 43%    | 48%      | -5%                        | 56%   | -13%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -13%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -16%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 36%    | 47%      | -11%                       | 56%   | -20%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 38%    | 50%      | -12%                       | 55%   | -17%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 53%    | 56%      | -3%                        | 62%   | -9%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 48%    | 56%      | -8%                        | 62%   | -14%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 38%    | 56%      | -18%                       | 64%   | -26%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 47%    | 57%      | -10%                       | 62%   | -15%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -9%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -10%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 34%    | 51%      | -17%                       | 60%   | -26%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 52%    | 56%      | -4%                        | 61%   | -9%                     |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -18%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -13%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 34%    | 45%      | -11%                       | 53%   | -19%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 43%    | 51%      | -8%                        | 55%   | -12%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -9%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 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                                       | 9        | 40     | 45          | 21        | 47      | 50           | 5        |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 28       | 34     | 52          | 35        | 43      | 50           | 13       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 38       | 56     | 56          | 38        | 29      | 50           | 42       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 41       | 41     | 50          | 43        | 42      | 46           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 45       |        |             | 45        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 45       | 45     | 45          | 54        | 41      | 43           | 41       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 39       | 41     | 44          | 43        | 42      | 43           | 31       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 13       | 27     | 32          | 27        | 47      | 45           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 28       | 45     | 52          | 36        | 45      | 52           | 16       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 43       | 49     | 53          | 58        | 62      | 50           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 41       | 48     | 53          | 42        | 40      | 44           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 47       | 40     | 29          | 60        | 49      | 53           | 57       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 42       | 46     | 43          | 49        | 44      | 45           | 41       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 15       | 32     | 35          | 20        | 24      | 17           | 14       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 25       | 42     | 56          | 38        | 46      | 34           | 8        |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 40       | 47     | 45          | 51        | 49      | 29           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 38       | 45     | 52          | 49        | 44      | 32           | 17       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 70       |        |             | 60        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 50       | 44     | 21          | 59        | 42      | 25           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 37       | 40     | 42          | 45        | 38      | 24           | 26       |         |           |                   |                     |

**ESSA Data**

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

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 46   |
| 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 | 63   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 365  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>  |      |
| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>   |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 31   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 1    |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>  |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 40   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 0    |
| <b>Native American Students</b>   |      |
| 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    |
| <b>Asian Students</b>   |      |
| 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    |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>  |      |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                 | 44   |
| 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  | 45  |
| 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   | 45  |
| 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   | 45  |
| 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                                | 43  |
| 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.**

ELL and ESE students show the lowest performance data, along with students in 4th and 5th grade. Contributing factors include: 1. A turnover in teachers in 4th grade during the 2018-2019 school year. 2. A lack of consistency with support for Students with Disabilities has been present. 3. For ELL students, a mindset has been present with teachers regarding who is responsible for teaching the students (the classroom teacher or the ELL support teacher).

The other data that shows the lowest performance is Math. Math FSA scores dropped from Spring 2018 to Spring 2019 in both 4th grade and 5th grade by 26 percentage points in each grade level. Contributing factors include: 1. A turnover in teachers in 4th grade during the 2018-2019 school year.

2. A lack of consistency of Math instruction in these classrooms because of teacher turnover. 3. Lack of Math Coach support in Math instructional strategies.

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

Students moving from 4th grade to 5th grade dropped 13 percentage points in the area of math. This is due to students lacking the foundations of math from the previous year in 4th grade due to a turnover of teachers in 4th grade during the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 school year. In addition, a focus was not placed on the ELL students and Students with Disabilities. Another area of decline is in the area of Science. The school decreased 19 percentage points in the area of Science. This is due to 5th grade teachers trying to focus on math and not focusing on science. When they did focus on Science, they were making up for a few years of lost science content due to previous years' lack of instruction.

**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.**

4th grade ELA scores have the greatest gap compared to the state average. The school shows that 30% of 4th grade students scored a level 3 and above in ELA compared to the state with 58%. Once again, this is due to a turnover in teachers in this grade level. 4th and 5th grade Math is a close second with a 26% gap between the school's scores and the state average.

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

According to December STAR data, scores have improved in both Reading and Math for all students, especially students identified as the lowest 25%. In addition, Staff Attendance has improved and is higher than the district average with 28% of the staff present more than 98% of the time. We have incorporated Power Hour into the Master Schedule where we have one hour a day that is dedicated to reading instruction that is specific to the the students' levels and learning needs. Students are homogeneously grouped and receive targeted instruction during this time. We have incorporated Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) for students who need intensive reading instruction. These students are identified according to data and work with a teacher on the student's instructional level.

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

Two areas of concern are: 1. student attendance - 25% of students are in attendance < 90% of the school year. 2. Discipline referrals - student discipline referrals have increased over the past three school years.

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

1. ELA subgroups (Students with disabilities, ELL students)
2. Writing across the curriculum
3. Science instruction (including vocabulary)
4. Student discipline
5. Student attendance

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | During the 2019-2020 school year, we have placed an emphasis on Reading and Writing instruction. We have incorporated Power Hour and LLI (Leveled Literacy Instruction). By implementing these two strategies with fidelity, we have seen gains with our students in the area of Reading based on STAR scores. We are continuously looking at data, adjusting groups and meeting the needs of students. According to the latest data (FSA data 2019), we must target our lowest 25% of students and make sure they are making progress. The best way to do this is through targeted interventions. In addition, a writing component needs to be added to hold teachers and students accountable for the learning that is taking place.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | <p>ELA - % of students scoring level 3 and above 2019 = 42</p> <p>ELA - % of students scoring level 3 and above 2021 = 47 (goal)</p> <p>ELA - % of learning gains 2019 = 44</p> <p>ELA - % of learning gains 2021 = 49</p> <p>ELA - % of learning gains, bottom 25% 2019 = 50</p> <p>ELA - % of learning gains, bottom 25% 2021 = 55</p>   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Kathy Conely (kathy.conely@polk-fl.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Differentiated Instruction - utilizing data to determine the specific needs of students and using targeted instructional strategies with the students on the identified specific skill deficits.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | <p>Differentiated instruction addresses the differing needs of the varied learners in the classroom. It identifies and meets the needs of each individual learner based on assessments. It provides multiple ways for the students to approach the content. It is student centered. It can be a blend of whole class, small group or individualized instruction.</p> <p>When looking at our data, the Leadership Team determined that our students are diverse. We need all of the above to meet the needs of our diverse population. Using Power Hour, LLI, continuously analyzing data and incorporating writing will provide the basis for us to do what is best for each of our students. Thus, we will meet the needs of all subgroups and raise student achievement.</p> |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Power Hour - One hour each day will be used for targeted skill instruction. Students will be homogeneously grouped according to data analysis. Students will receive direct instruction in small from the teacher for at least 30 minutes every other day targeting the needed skills. When not working with the teacher, students will be engaged in activities that reinforce learned skills. Instruction for Power Hour will be monitored and coached by the Literacy Coach.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Glasgow (jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net)

Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) - Identified students will receive intensive reading instruction for 30 minutes daily from two Reading Interventionist Teachers and two Reading Interventionist para professionals. This instruction will be provided on the student's instructional reading level. Formative assessments will be given once per week to determine student progress. Adjustments to curriculum will be made accordingly.

**Person Responsible** Sally Chapman (sally.chapman01@polk-fl.net)

Analyze Student Learning - Teachers will utilize the New Teacher Center rubric during planning to analyze student learning related to the standards. This ASL tool is based on a rubric where teachers will classify student work as Exceeding, Meeting, Approaching or Far Below the standards. Then, discuss next steps for instruction for each of the groups of students. The Literacy Coach will facilitate these discussions.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Glasgow (jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net)

Writing in every subject - writing will be used to summarize learning in every subject. Teachers will use a rubric to assess the writing. Writing will be displayed in the classroom for accountability. The Literacy Coach will monitor and coach instruction in writing.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Glasgow (jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net)

Curriculum Planning and Professional Development - Teachers will be provided three 1/2 day planning times with a substitute covering their classroom in order to plan curriculum. This time will be used to analyze data, review the standards and plan instruction to meet the needs of students. Professional Development will be centered on strategies for differentiated instruction and utilizing materials to meet the needs of individual students. In addition, teachers will be provided professional learning in distance learning strategies and will be paid for their time. Professional Development will be provided by the Literacy Coach.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Glasgow (jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net)

Extended Learning - Students in grades 3, 4 and 5 will be provided the opportunity for extended learning after school in the area of Reading based on the students' individual needs. Extended learning will be offered according to Reading level during the time that students are waiting for buses in the afternoons.

**Person Responsible** Lindsay Renesca (lindsay.renesca@polk-fl.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Based on the Spring 2019 FSA scores, our Math scores decreased from 2018 to 2019. This is due to a variety of factors. Two main factors are: a turnover in classroom teachers in grades 4 and 5 and not having a Math Coach from 2018-2020. Because of these things, we have adjusted the classroom teachers in these grade levels and now have stable, well-qualified teachers in 4th and 5th grade classrooms. We have hired a Math Coach to work with Teachers and a Math Interventionist to work with students. We have also departmentalized 4th and 5th grade classrooms so the Math Teachers will be able to focus specifically on the Math standards. Now that these things are in place, we will be able to focus on the specific Math strategies that will be put into place.                       |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Math - % of students scoring level 3 and above 2019 = 45<br>Math - % of students scoring level 3 and above 2021 = 50 (goal)<br>Math - % of learning gains 2019 = 40<br>Math - % of learning gains 2021 = 45 (goal)<br>Math - % of learning gains, bottom 25% 2019 = 45<br>Math - % of learning gains, bottom 25% 2021 = 50 (goal)   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Kathy Conely (kathy.conely@polk-fl.net)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Knowledge and understanding of the standards and instructional strategies for teaching the standards - Professional Development needs to occur and discussions need to happen centering around the standards. Teachers need instructional strategies that will help them meet the needs of all students.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Even though the Florida Standards have been in place for a number of years, the teachers do not teach to the depth of the standard. They either use the math book or teach what they think the standard means. Emphasis has been placed so much on ELA over the past few years that conversations about Math standards have been set aside and assumptions have been made. According to data, Math scores have decreased over the past few years. Based on classroom walk throughs, teachers are not teaching to the depth of the standard and are not utilizing research based instructional strategies to teach math. With the BEST standards coming in the next few years, these instructional strategies will still be valid because they will be research based teaching strategies that will be shared. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Professional Development will occur on the topics of Math instructional strategies based on the needs of the teachers. Some topics that were discussed by the Leadership Team based on data and observations are: breaking apart the standards, data analysis, small group instruction / interventions, using manipulatives, Math fluency. Professional Development will be provided by the Math Coach.

**Person Responsible** Matthew Pelletier (matthew.pelletier@polk-fl.net)

Power Hour ... using "Math Reads", Scholastic News and Science passages. Teachers will use content area text during Power Hour. This will help the students to connect Math with the real world. It will also allow the teacher to work with students on their instructional level in both Reading and Math. The Math Coach and Literacy Coach will work together to provide materials to the teachers.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Glasgow (jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net)

Analyze Student Learning - Teachers will utilize the New Teacher Center rubric during planning to analyze student learning related to the standards. This ASL tool is based on a rubric where teachers will classify

student work as Exceeding, Meeting, Approaching or Far Below the standards. Then, discuss next steps for instruction for each of the groups of students. The Math Coach will facilitate the conversations based on the Math standards using the ASL tool.

**Person Responsible** Matthew Pelletier (matthew.pelletier@polk-fl.net)

Writing to explain in Math - writing will be used to summarize learning in every subject. Teachers will use a rubric to assess the writing. Writing will be displayed in the classroom for accountability. The Literacy and the Math Coach will work collaboratively to monitor utilization of writing in Math.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Glasgow (jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net)

Curriculum Planning and Professional Development - Teachers will be provided three 1/2 day planning times with a substitute covering their classroom in order to plan curriculum. This time will be used to analyze data, review the standards and plan instruction to meet the needs of students. Professional Development will be centered on breaking apart the standards, data analysis, small group instruction / interventions, using manipulatives, Math fluency. In addition, teachers will be provided professional learning in distance learning strategies and will be paid for their time. Curriculum Planning will be facilitated by the Math Coach.

**Person Responsible** Matthew Pelletier (matthew.pelletier@polk-fl.net)

Extended Learning - Students in grades 3, 4 and 5 will be provided the opportunity for extended learning after school in the area of Math based on the students' individual needs. Extended learning will be offered according to Math strands and Math fluency during the time that students are waiting for buses in the afternoons.

**Person Responsible** Lindsay Renesca (lindsay.renesca@polk-fl.net)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**The two areas that haven't been addressed in the areas of focus are student discipline and student attendance.**

**Student discipline will be addressed through the following:**

**Improvement of staff school culture.**

**Fidelity of PBIS (Tier 1, 2 and 3).**

**Utilization of CHAMPs.**

**Student attendance will be addressed through the following:**

**Improvement of staff school culture**

**Attendance competition and recognition between classes at each grade level**

**Sign in front of school with thermometer showing average daily attendance**

**PBIS strategies (Tier 1, 2, and 3) including meetings with parents and students to discuss reward systems.**

## 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.

**Staff** - We will build a positive school culture with staff by implementing a variety of strategies during the 2020-2021 school year including staff recognition, birthday celebrations, new teacher support and mentoring, staff events, food and a general positive atmosphere.

**Parents** - We will create a family friendly and welcoming environment in the school through the following strategies including revamping the front office to make it more inviting, creating a children's reading area in the front office, communicating with families more often on the school website, agenda planners, communication folders, school messenger and class dojo, and use positive family friendly language in all communications.

**Family events** - We will have the following events during the school year: Open House, Reading Bingo Night, Math Carnival, Science Night, FSA Night, Student Led Conference Night (x2), Family Movie Night

**Community** - We will engage community stakeholders in our school through School Advisory Council, PTO and other events at the school. We will invite them to school events and recognize them on our school website and marquee.

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

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

## **Part V: Budget**

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

|               |        |  |               |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA  | \$0.00        |
| 2             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |  | <b>\$0.00</b> |