Edgar L. Padgett Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Edgar L. Padgett Elementary

110 LEELON RD, Lakeland, FL 33809

http://www.polk-fl.net/padgett

Demographics

Principal: Joette Burse

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2013

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 (53%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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

Edgar L. Padgett Elementary

110 LEELON RD, Lakeland, FL 33809

http://www.polk-fl.net/padgett

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	97%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Padgett Elementary is a diverse learning community, strongly committed to preparing all students to become problem solvers and lifelong learners through the use of rigorous and relevant learning and in a collaborative effort with teachers, staff, families, and community volunteers to increase student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Padgett Elementary is committed to providing a quality education to all students. The teachers, staff, families, and community volunteers strive to build life long learners. Padgett Elementary is continuously working on producing technologically proficient students who will make positive contributions to society. We believe all students can learn.

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
Kirby, Antionette	Principal	School's instructional leader. Lead all instructional practices. Monitor the effectiveness of programs.
Burse, Joette	Assistant Principal	Provides support to the instructional leader. Monitors the effectiveness of PBIS.
Burdick, Davina	Instructional Coach	Provides reading support and coaching to classroom teachers. Assists with the implementations of programs.
Griffin, Keli	Instructional Coach	Provides math support and coaching to classroom teachers. Assists with the implementations of programs.
Coughlin, Patrick	School Counselor	Provides guidance for the school's positive culture and environment. Provides support for MTSS guidance.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/2/2013, Joette Burse

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

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
41

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 (53%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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	90	104	86	75	93	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	12	17	15	9	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	2	5	7	5	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	2	5	4	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	4	5	4	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	17	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
December 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	20	5	16	15	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
December 2019 STAR Math Level 1	0	11	10	6	8	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	6	8	14	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	95	96	81	70	95	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	527
Attendance below 90 percent	37	13	14	26	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	8	5	7	18	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	9	1	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	0	0	5	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	6	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	95	96	81	70	95	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	527
Attendance below 90 percent	37	13	14	26	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	8	5	7	18	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	9	1	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	0	0	5	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	6	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	54%	51%	57%	46%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	51%	58%	52%	53%	57%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	49%	53%	49%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	57%	57%	63%	62%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	56%	62%	73%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	47%	51%	64%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	47%	53%	51%	46%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
	2018	53%	51%	2%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	48%	12%	58%	2%
	2018	45%	48%	-3%	56%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	41%	47%	-6%	56%	-15%
	2018	45%	50%	-5%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	50%	56%	-6%	62%	-12%
	2018	61%	56%	5%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	56%	20%	64%	12%
	2018	65%	57%	8%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
05	2019	40%	51%	-11%	60%	-20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	79%	56%	23%	61%	18%
Same Grade Comparison	-39%					
Cohort Comparison	-25%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	40%	45%	-5%	53%	-13%
	2018	55%	51%	4%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison	-15%					
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	34	40	46	35	26	18	14				
ELL	49	54		57	67	64					
BLK	40	42	40	46	53	40	20				
HSP	57	69	70	57	60	45	38				
MUL	70			60							
WHT	61	57	60	64	58		53				
FRL	41	49	52	50	59	44	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	24	37	41	46	44	35	38				
ELL	40	59		57	65	45	36				
BLK	29	31	29	54	56	47	29				
HSP	54	61		72	71	50	55				
MUL	75			83							
WHT	61	57	58	86	81	69	76				
FRL	48	52	38	72	72	57	56				
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	30	35	24	59	57	9				
ELL	29	37	30	50	63						
BLK	32	43	33	39	64	61	17				
HSP	44	46	40	70	70	60	61				
WHT	55	57	73	70	79	69	66				

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
FRL	42	51	46	57	73	65	40				

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	54
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	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	430
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
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	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	65
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	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

When examining data by subgroups, SWD performed the lowest in ELA, Math, and Science.A contributing factor is a lack of foundational skills and exposure to grade level content. This is a trend across the years.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was economically disadvantaged students in math. This decline is partially due to a lack of spiral review and student autonomy.

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.

Fifth grade math had the greatest gap compared to the state. The decline was due to a lack or spiral review and student autonomy.

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

Fourth grade math showed the greatest improvement. A focus was placed in spiral review, student autonomy, and tutoring.

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

A major area of concern when examining EWS data is student attendance.

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

1. Data driven instruction while utilizing embedded spiral review.
2. Exposure to grade level curriculum for SWD.
3 .Learning gains in Math with a focus on spiral review.
4. Learning gains in Reading while focusing on core instruction.
5. Multiple exposure to curriculum for economically disadvantaged students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional practices are elements of effective teaching methods that come together to achieve student success. Our specific focus is instructional practices in connection with standards aligned instruction. Data indicates that as a school, Padgett struggles with proficiency and learning gains which can indicate a problem with core instruction. Core needs to be aligned to the standards.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on 2018-2019 baseline data, proficiency and learning gains will be increased by 5 percentage points in reading, math, and science.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Antionette Kirby (antionette.kirby@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	As a school, Padgett will implement Marzano's Essentials for Achieving Rigor with a focus on student autonomy, complexity levels, target task alignment, learning targets, and success criteria.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Marzano is a district initiative with a proven track record of increasing student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Reintroduce Marzano's Elements of Rigor including student autonomy and complexity levels.
Job embedded professional development addressing standards and complexity levels of standards provided by the Title I funded coaches during PLCs and Title I funded collaborative planning.
LSI Conference implementation.
Standards review, target task alignment and success criteria implementation.
Classroom libraries, supplies, and scholastic news to support reading in the classroom.

Person Responsible	Antionette Kirby (antionette.kirby@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA data indicates that students with disabilities and Black/African American students perform below the 41% threshold. Data indicates that as a school. we need to provide students with disabilities increased access to grade level curriculum. Additionally, our ESSA subgroups need constant exposure to spiral review.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase proficiency in reading to 40% (SWD), 50% (EDD) and 45% (BLK). Increase proficiency in math to 40% (SWD), 55% (EDD) and 56% (BLK). Increase proficiency in science to 30 % (SWD), 40%(EDD) and 30% (BLK).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Antionette Kirby (antionette.kirby@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Padgett will utilize data to drive instruction and flexible guided math, reading, and science groups and in addition to spiral review.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data will be the basis to determine with students need remediation and enrichment. Teacher will use current and trend data to inform instructional decisions. Data will also be used to determined extended learning groups.

Action Steps to Implement

Inclusion and self-contained teachers planning with general classroom teachers.
Job embedded professional development flexible grouping using data to inform decisions.
Family engagement events to provide resources for improved proficiency: A Grand Morning of Reading, Festival of Nations, Grade Level Tastings, Real Men Read, and A Night of Reading,
Extended Learning and in-class support provided by teachers and Title I funded paraprofessionals.

Person Responsible	Antionette Kirby (antionette.kirby@polk-fl.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to Padgett Elementary School's 2019-20 Discipline Data, the majority of discipline issues were in the area of disruptive behavior in the classroom. The classroom includes P.E. The data shows that 38 children had two or more discipline referrals. The majority of students with referrals were males. The grade level with the most referrals was fourth grade. According to the ESSA report card, the population of Padgett Elementary consists of 25.8% African American, 29.7% Hispanic, 38.1% White, 3.6% Multi-Racial, and 2.7% Asian. The discipline data shows a negative dis-proportionality with 45% of African Americans receiving discipline referrals last year. When students are in the office due to behavior, they are missing important classroom instruction. This has a direct impact on student achievement. In addition, when students disrupt in the classroom, they are negatively impacting the learning of the other students in the classroom.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the number of students with two or more referrals by 5 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school will continue to implement PBIS and CHAMPS. Teachers will teach and model PBIS and CHAMPS social skills, procedures, and expectations. Students will be rewarded for their appropriate behaviors.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	School-wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports is a systems approach to establishing the social culture and behavioral supports needed for all children in a school to achieve both social and academic success. The goal of PBIS is to create a positive school climate in which students learn and grow. PBIS represents a change in thinking about behavior and discipline. Instead of allowing poor behavior to escalate into disciplinary measures, the focus is on teaching and promoting positive behaviors. By building on these positive behaviors, escalations in discipline are reduced. CHAMPS, developed by Safe and Civil Schools, is a research-based set of guidelines that follows PBIS' framework for multi-tiered behavior support that help outline and communicate expectations and procedures for students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review, implement, and monitor PBIS and CHAMPS with a focus on how to prevent disruptive behavior.
2. Review, implement, and monitor Sanford Harmony.
3. Implement Mentoring for Tier 2 Students with a focus on 5th grade males.
4. Implement Drumbeat with tier 3 students.
5. Implement Skillstreaming by guidance.
6. Mental health services for Tier 2 or 3 students at risk.
7. Implement an optional book study with staff- Even on Your Worst Day You Can Be A Student's Best Hope by Manny Scott.

Person Responsible	Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

An additional area of focus is multiple exposure to curriculum for economically disadvantaged students. This will be addressed through spiral review, remediation, and resources provided for home use.

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.

At Padgett Elementary, students, staff, families, and the community all work together to ensure a positive school culture. We focus on building relationships and communication with all stakeholders. Our school vision is shared with all stakeholders and all stakeholders work together to make our school vision a reality. At our school, we have common school-wide expectations of Respect, Effort, (Positive) Attitude, Cooperation, and Honesty. These expectations are valued and taught.

Students who follow school-wide expectations have opportunities to earn rewards and even have opportunities to visit the office for positive praise. Students are recognized on bulletin boards as students of the month. Students are encouraged to participate in after school clubs like chorus, drama and e team. A mentoring program is in place to support student needs. Students who show improvement in behavior are celebrated each grading period. Student ambassadors and safety patrols are selected to provide student leadership on campus. Student teaming, small group instruction, and student accountability lead to student engagement at Padgett Elementary. .

The Padgett leadership team supports staff on a regular basis. The reading coach and math coach provide modeling, coaching, and instructional plan guidance. The administrative team provides regular feedback to staff and coaches staff through the SAO process. Staff members are celebrated and recognized at different times throughout the school year. Staff members are recognized through staff of the month and staff drawings. Regular communication with staff occurs via PLC's, weekly newsletters, professional development sessions, and email. The leadership team, PBIS team, MTSS teams, Healthy Schools team, threat assessment teams, grade level teams, and ESE department meet regularly to support our school programs.

Padgett families are an essential part of the educational program at Padgett. Families are encouraged to participate at Padgett through orientation, back to school night, family involvement events, volunteering, student performances, special lunches, and SAC. Daily communication occurs between parents and teachers through use of the agenda. Face to face or phone conferences occur as needed. Some teachers communicate via online platforms such as DOJO, Microsoft Teams, and Zoom. The school-wide newsletter

is used to share important information with families every month. Parents are informed about what is happening at school by following the school Facebook page and checking the school website.

Padgett staff have built a strong relationship with community partners. Area churches often collaborate with the school staff and provide needed items to families. One church in particular hosts school-affiliated events on their site. Area businesses support our school through donations. Community members visit our campus and provide educational programs to students during Careers on Wheels and the Great American Teach In. Police and firefighters visit the campus and collaborate with our leadership team to ensure school safety. Padgett has a partnership with Lake Gibson High school where high school students in the Education Academy visit Padgett weekly to work with students and teachers in the classrooms.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction				$220,464.63
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400		1451 - Edgar L. Padgett Elementary	Title, I Part A		$11,000.00
			Notes: LSI June Conference			
	7300		1451 - Edgar L. Padgett Elementary	Title, I Part A		$2,000.00
			Notes: LSI Conference Administration			
	5000		1451 - Edgar L. Padgett Elementary	Title, I Part A		$12,011.06
			Notes: Scholastic News, Supplies, Classroom Library			
			1451 - Edgar L. Padgett Elementary	Title, I Part A		$190,883.97
			Notes: Full Time Personnel: Literacy Coach, Math Coach, 2 Classroom Instructional Paraprofessionals			
	6300		1451 - Edgar L. Padgett Elementary	Title, I Part A		$4,569.60
			Notes: Collaborative Planning			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$9,425.37
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5900		1451 - Edgar L. Padgett Elementary	Title, I Part A		$2,746.14
			Notes: Extended Learning			
	6150		1451 - Edgar L. Padgett Elementary	Title, I Part A		$6,679.23
			Notes: Family Involvement Events supplies and print materials			

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
		Total:	$229,890.00