Frostproof Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Frostproof Elementary School

118 3RD ST W, Frostproof, FL 33843

fes.polk-fl.net

Demographics

Principal: J. Dart Meyers

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-2
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Frostproof Elementary School

118 3RD ST W, Frostproof, FL 33843

fes.polk-fl.net

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-2	Yes	%

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

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission at Frostproof Elementary is to provide all students with learning experiences that result in high student achievement by demonstrating mastery of their grade level standards.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision at Frostproof Elementary is for all students to acquire the necessary academic and social skills to graduate with a high school diploma allowing them to be college and career ready.

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
Meyers, Dart	Principal	Oversees all operations of the school instructionally and operationally.
Chapman, Tina	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal in overseeing the instructional and operational areas of the the school.
Wrye, Debbie	Instructional Media	Oversees all aspects of the media center.
Fugate, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Oversees the instructional pieces of ELA and Math
Thornton, Felecia	School Counselor	Oversees guidance lessons, counselor duties, MTSS, ESE, 504
Armijo, Martha	Teacher, K-12	1st grade level leader
Mullis, Candiss	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of kindergarten
Kelson, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of 2nd grade
Schmidt, Anarah	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of kindergaren

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 8/1/2012, J. Dart Meyers

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-2
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	134	126	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	387
Attendance below 90 percent	31	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	18	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
STAR Early Lit Proficiency Mid Year	34	62	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
STAR ELA Proficiency Mid Year	3	37	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
STAR Math Proficiency Mid Year	0	103	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193

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	14	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/2/2020

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	135	118	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	376
Attendance below 90 percent	10	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	135	118	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	376
Attendance below 90 percent	10	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	51%	57%	0%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	51%	58%	0%	53%	57%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	53%	0%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	0%	57%	63%	0%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	56%	62%	0%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	47%	51%	0%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	47%	53%	0%	46%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	K	1	2	
	(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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State 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											
ELL											
HSP											
FRL											
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

	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

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	68
Total Components for the Federal Index	1
Percent Tested	

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	68
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	67
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.

Kindergarten ELA students showed to be the lowest preforming students indicated on the STAR Early Lit mid Year data. In December 2019 on the Star Early Lit data, 29% of our Kindergarten students were at or above proficiency level.

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

Kindergarten Star Early Lit data.

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.

In comparing our school data to the state our math proficiency was 78% and the state proficiency was 63%.This is contributed to our school wide focus on students writing/illustrating/modeling in math to explain and justify when solving math problems.

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

Second grade showed the most improvements with 56% proficiency on the STAR ELA Mid Year compared to April 2019 STAR ELA 44% proficiency. 2019-2020 focused heavily on small group instruction utilizing support staff and administration, fluency, high frequency words and foundational skills.

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

Attendance and number of students in kindergarten failing ELA course.

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

1. Focus on high need students (SWD, TIER ii and TIER iii students) in ELA through the MTSS process
2. In ELA, focus on foundational and comprehension skills.
3. In math, focus on fact fluency and writing/illustrating/ modeling to explain, justify and prove in solving math problems.
4. Decrease number of students failing in ELA.
5. Decrease the number of students below 90% attendance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA - Our STAR data indicates the need to continue increasing student reading proficiency including building on foundational and comprehension skills.
Measurable Outcome:	The overall proficiency on the STAR data for ELA mid year was 54% and the goal is to have 80% of our students proficienct on this assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Fugate (jennifer.fugate@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Mini lessons Small group instruction with an emphasis on foundational skills Collaborative Planning STAR Smarty Ants Accelerated Reader thinking maps/ graphic organizers modeling collaborative structures LSI strategies
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies provide intentional planning and instruction to support the specific reading and writing needs of the students.

Action Steps to Implement

Literacy Coach working with teachers by modeling strategies, conducting walkthroughs and providing feedback, and during collaborative planning. They will also work with groups of our struggling students focused on foundational skills.

Person Responsible   Tina Chapman (tina.chapman@polk-fl.net)

Utilize ipads in the classroom to provide additional practice on supplemental programs like Smarty Ants, Freckle, and other online resources.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Fugate (jennifer.fugate@polk-fl.net)

Family and Parent Engagement Activities to provide resources in the area of reading focused on foundational skills and comprehension for families to work on at home with their child(ren).

Person Responsible   Jennifer Fugate (jennifer.fugate@polk-fl.net)

Collaborative Planning to align tasks and activities to the standards and depth of knowledge levels. Incorporate strategies in writing like summarizing, quick writes, reseach, responding to prompts

Person Responsible   Jennifer Fugate (jennifer.fugate@polk-fl.net)

Extended Learning Program to provide additional learning time for our struggling students in the area of reading.

Person Responsible   Tina Chapman (tina.chapman@polk-fl.net)

Family Media nights and Parent Family Engagement staff to promote additional time reading with our students and parents after school.

Person Responsible   Debbie Wrye (debrah.wrye@polk-fl.net)

Classroom/Title 1 parent involvement para working with small groups using research based strategies

Person Responsible   Jennifer Fugate (jennifer.fugate@polk-fl.net)

Brain Pop to provide additional resources to help with reading comprehension

Person Responsible   Jennifer Fugate (jennifer.fugate@polk-fl.net)

Poster printer supplies to create materials for teachers to use in the classroom with their students.

Person Responsible   Debbie Wrye (debrah.wrye@polk-fl.net)

Library books to provide a variety of reading material to create interest and engage all learners.

Person Responsible   Debbie Wrye (debrah.wrye@polk-fl.net)

Additional classroom paras to help with small group instruction working with our struggling students to close the achievement gaps.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Fugate (jennifer.fugate@polk-fl.net)

Student agendas to communicate with parents regarding their child's progress in school.

Person Responsible   Tina Chapman (tina.chapman@polk-fl.net)

Media Specialist to promote reading through various programs, ensure we have a variety of library books to meet our students needs, and to work with some of our students with reading and writing.

Person Responsible   Dart Meyers (dart.meyers@polk-fl.net)

Collaborative planning days for teachers to plan lessons and tasks focused on the standards and depth of knowledge. Substitutes will be utilzied on these days.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Fugate (jennifer.fugate@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the area of Math, we will improve proficiency on our STAR assessment by having students use illustrations, modeling, or writing to explain and justify solving math problems. We will also have a focus on math fluency.
Measurable Outcome:	Proficiency level will be at 80% or higher as measured on the STAR Math assessment and/or Freckles assessment. 2019-2020 mid-year STAR data we were at 77% of our students were at the proficiency level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tina Chapman (tina.chapman@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction Mini lessons Freckle Math Star Math Assessment Fact Fluency practice thinking maps/ graphic organizers LSI strategies collaborative structures
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies provide students the opportunity to practice, monitor and reflect on the strategies and processes they use to solve problems.

Action Steps to Implement

Math Night to provide strategies and resources to parents to support learning at home with a focus on math fact fluency.

Person Responsible	Tina Chapman (tina.chapman@polk-fl.net)

Collaborative Planning with teachers on math standards, tasks, 5E, and writing/illustrating/modeling to explain/justify math word problems.

Person Responsible	Tina Chapman (tina.chapman@polk-fl.net)

Ipads to provide additional practice for students to use on Freckles learning paths and assessments.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Fugate (jennifer.fugate@polk-fl.net)

Poster printer supplies to create materials for teachers to use in the classroom with their students.

Person Responsible	Debbie Wrye (debrah.wrye@polk-fl.net)

Fact fluency incentive program to use with our students.

Person Responsible	Tina Chapman (tina.chapman@polk-fl.net)

Manipulatives to provide hands-on practice and exploration to solve math problems.

Person Responsible	Tina Chapman (tina.chapman@polk-fl.net)

Student agendas for teachers to communicate with parents regarding their child's academic progress.

Person Responsible	Tina Chapman (tina.chapman@polk-fl.net)

Classroom paras to work with students in small groups on math concepts and skills.

Person Responsible	Tina Chapman (tina.chapman@polk-fl.net)

Grade levels will incorporate math journals in the classroom with students

Person Responsible	Tina Chapman (tina.chapman@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	MTSS - Tier 2 and Tier 3 effective instructional/monitoring practices to support student academic progress. Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions target students that are not on grade-level reading skills and need to fill in gaps and catch the student up with grade level peers.
Measurable Outcome:	The proficiency on the mid-year STAR ELA was 54%. The proficiency on mid-year STAR Math assessment and/or Freckles assessment was 77%. This area will focus on having at least 80% of our students being at the proficiency level and/or making a learning gain in reading and/or math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tina Chapman (tina.chapman@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide remediation in specific, clearly defined academic skills based on assessments STAR LSI strategies Freckle Smarty Ants PBiS CHAMPS Intervention resources in Reading Wonders and Go Math Intervention resources in curriculum maps
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy focuses on student progress on specific interventions to help close the achievement gap of our struggling students in reading and math.

Action Steps to Implement

School Counselor and Literacy Coach working with teachers on Tier II and III paperwork and effective interventions to implement in the classroom with the students.

Person Responsible	Felecia Thornton (felecia.thornton@polk-fl.net)

Provide professional development for teachers and staff focused on effective strategies/implementation of MTSS Tier II and Tier III interventions in small groups and one on one within the classroom.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Fugate (jennifer.fugate@polk-fl.net)

Student agendas for communicating with parents regarding academics, attendance, and behavior.

Person Responsible	Tina Chapman (tina.chapman@polk-fl.net)

Provide professional development on effective strategies to incorporate into small groups and one onone to enhance the learning and skills of struggling learners in closing the achievement gap.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Fugate (jennifer.fugate@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance- We will continue to be monitored using PBiS strategies, daily/weekly monitoring, weekly student incentives and student agendas to communicate with parents. We will hold parent meetings to build positive relationships with families and provide additional support if needed. Our assigned school social worker will assist as well in helping monitor student attendance and work with our parents.

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.

We provide and build a positive culture by building positive relationships with our students, staff, parents, and community through a variey of avenues. For students, we utilize PBiS strategies promoting positive behaviors at school and on the bus. We also provide an awards program, learning field trips, Great American teach in, use CHAMPS, Top Dog ceremonies, and lessons on social/emotional learning. For staff, we use PBiS strategies that includes attendance, special 'gold tickets', and special events recognizing their efforts in working with our students and helping improve the school. With parents, we have orientation, Open House, Title I annual meeting, SAC meetings, PTO, volunteer program, Adopt-A-Class program, Family Turkey Day, Spring Picnic, Disabilities Awareness week, Awards program, Special Olympics, Family Media nights, and educate and engage families in their student learning through our various Parent and Family Engagement events throughout the year, parent/teacher conferences, and providing translation of school information for our non-English speaking families.

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
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00