

Polk County Public Schools

# Frank E. Brigham Academy



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>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

# Frank E. Brigham Academy

601 AVENUE C SE, Winter Haven, FL 33880

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Lynn Boland**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2010

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (63%)
<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>	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](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>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

## Frank E. Brigham Academy

601 AVENUE C SE, Winter Haven, FL 33880

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

### 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	No	60%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

The mission of Brigham Academy is to ensure rigorous, relevant learning experiences that result in high achievement for all students. Students will excel in all areas of academic learning by utilizing cooperative teaching strategies, and a project-based learning approach, while focusing on high expectations and critical thinking skills.

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

It is our vision at Brigham Academy to develop each child to his or her fullest potential through both academic and personal achievement. We stress individual responsibility and citizenship, to develop tomorrow's leaders in an ever-changing global society through the promotion of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM).

### 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
Boland, Lynn	Principal	Provides leadership for and management of programs and processes related to instruction, school operations, personnel management, business management, student support services, student activities and community involvement.
May, Lori	Assistant Principal	Assists the school principal by providing leadership for and management of programs and processes related to instruction, school operations, personnel management, business management, student support services, student activities and community involvement.
Harper, Scott	Instructional Technology	Coordinates the maintenance, operation and management of existing instructional and non-instructional school microcomputer networks. Assists with the planning, design and installation of future network expansions as growth demands. Performs all functions and procedures necessary to install and maintain school network hardware and software. Configures local workstations as needed.
Negley, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	This position exists to ensure that all students learn the basic and essential skills at each grade level.
Bailey, Ashley	Other	TRST - Plans and implements a program of instruction that adheres to the district's philosophy, goals and objectives as outlined in the adopted courses of study
Parrish, Renee	Instructional Coach	The School-based Coach is responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. This position will also be responsible for coaching teachers about: data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools.
Almaraz, Maria	School Counselor	The School Counselor aligns with the district's mission to support the academic achievement of all students, insuring equity and access to all. The counselor implements federal, state and local mandates; facilitates the successful transition and progression of students throughout the system; develops and maintains a written plan for effective delivery of the school counseling program, communicating the goals to educational



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		stakeholders. Direct services address guidance curriculum, individual student planning, preventive and responsive services. The counselor works with students individually and in groups and provides consultation to teachers and other school personnel regarding students and makes referrals as appropriate.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2010, Lynn Boland

**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.*

3

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

45

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students

<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (63%)
<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>	N/A
* 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	88	99	82	87	86	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	530
Attendance below 90 percent	5	5	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on December 2019 STAR Reading Assessment	0	0	0	1	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on December 2019 STAR Math	0	0	1	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

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	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 6/3/2020

**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	104	84	87	86	87	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	535
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	2	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	2	3	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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

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

**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	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	104	84	87	86	87	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	535
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	2	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	2	3	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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

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

**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	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	78%	51%	57%	75%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	51%	58%	60%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	49%	53%	42%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	85%	57%	63%	82%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	79%	56%	62%	75%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	47%	51%	67%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	70%	47%	53%	79%	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	81%	52%	29%	58%	23%
	2018	83%	51%	32%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	48%	35%	58%	25%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	66%	48%	18%	56%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	70%	47%	23%	56%	14%
	2018	71%	50%	21%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	92%	56%	36%	62%	30%
	2018	77%	56%	21%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	56%	27%	64%	19%
	2018	70%	57%	13%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	81%	51%	30%	60%	21%
	2018	88%	56%	32%	61%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	70%	45%	25%	53%	17%
	2018	76%	51%	25%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
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	33			64							
BLK	59	55	40	75	63	43	55				
HSP	79	67	50	79	75	45	63				
MUL	75			92							
WHT	88	64	67	92	85	93	82				
FRL	63	61	48	73	71	56	46				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	40			30							
ELL	36			43							
ASN	90			90							
BLK	51	46	44	66	73	69	53				
HSP	79	59		73	67	60	76				
WHT	79	48	28	85	67	63	82				
FRL	67	49	44	70	67	65	61				
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
ASN	79	60		86	90						
BLK	57	59	53	73	62	60	62				
HSP	78	50		85	73		75				
WHT	82	63	44	85	79	62	88				
FRL	64	53	37	73	72	65	68				

### 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	69
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
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	65
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	84
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	82
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	60
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.**

Our lowest performance was in ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. Although we have made improvement, this was our lowest area last year too.

**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 was Science. Some possible factors that contributed to this decline was unfamiliar curriculum with minimal professional development and a misconception of achievement level descriptions.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

The only area we scored below the state average was in ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. A factor that may have contributed to this gap is an inconsistent system of monitoring students ranking in the bottom 25.

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

The data component reflecting the most improvement was ELA Learning Gains. Actions that contributed to this growth was the implementation of Reader's Workshop and increasing time students engage in independent reading.

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

The greatest area of concern is the increase of retentions in kindergarten.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
2. Improving Data Chats
3. Kindergarten Retention
4. 5th Grade Science

## Part III: Planning for Improvement



**Areas of Focus:****#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our Area of Focus is providing additional small group instruction to students scoring in the lowest 25th percentile of ELA. One reason we decided to focus on ELA's lowest 25th percentile is because because our 2019 FSA data reflected performance below the state average. Also, we recognize that strong literacy skills are necessary in order to be successful in all subject areas.

**Measurable Outcome:** On the Spring 2021 FSA ELA Assessment, 53% of students identified within ELA's lowest 25th percentile will make learning gains.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Lori May (lori.may@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The leadership team will partner with 4th and 5th grade teachers to develop a researched-based action plan for each student within the bottom 25th percentile of English Language Arts. In addition, we will implement a system to monitor student performance on a monthly basis.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The rationale driving this strategy is the need for individualized instruction and reinforcement of approaches to learning. As a team we will review student data (evidence of learning) to accurately identify and remediate areas of weakness while also building upon student's thinking skills. Resources: FSA Data and reports, STAR Data and reports, Power Hour resources, student surveys, Making the PYP Happen, The Reading Strategy Book and Action Plan template.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Identify students that scored within lowest 25th percentile in ELA.
2. Analyze testing data and student input to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses.
3. Refer to texts such as "The Reading Strategy Book" and "Making PYP Happen" as tools to develop an action plan.
4. Work with students to implement, monitor and reflect on the action plan.
5. Revise as needed

**Person Responsible** Lori May (lori.may@polk-fl.net)

**#2. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Our second Area of Focus is to improve the leadership team's management of accountability systems by targeting specific STAR, Istation and Freckle instructional reports and monitoring the data monthly. This will impact student learning because the leadership team can better support the teachers, assist in designing an action plan and have a heightened awareness of strengths and weaknesses. This was identified as a critical need because our leadership team invested more time in discussing data rather than generating an action plan to improve data.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	On the Spring 2021 FSA Assessments, the percent of students who score at proficiency (level 3 or above) in ELA will increase to 81%. The percent of students who score at proficiency (level 3 or above) in Math will increase to 88%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Lynn Boland (lynn.boland@polk-fl.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The strategy being implemented is to analyze and discuss performance data prior to Data Chats with grade levels. This will be done by reviewing relevant STAR / AR reports, performance on ISIP and skill growth activities within Istation, and standards-based outcomes within Freckle.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	In the book Leverage Leadership 2.0, it states, "Instructional leaders look at the student work in advance so that they can identify the patterns, pick out the key questions where they can focus and have a preliminary idea of the analysis and action plan." If the leadership team takes time to deeply analyze data before data chats, we will be a better support system to the teacher and can assist to create an action plan.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Each member of the leadership team will be assigned a data source to monitor.
2. Members of the leadership team will capture monthly data to share during the leadership team meeting scheduled before monthly grade level data chats.
3. During the leadership meeting, the team will review the data, identify gaps within subgroups, and discuss other relevant findings.
4. The leadership team will work collaboratively to generate questions for data chats, secure resources and draft an action plan based on the data reviewed.
4. Leadership team will host data chats and work collaboratively with teachers to make data-driven decisions.
5. Follow up with the teacher and continue to monitor student data.

**Person Responsible** Lynn Boland (lynn.boland@polk-fl.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Kindergarten Retention - We will provide additional literacy support for the grade level. Our instructional coach will attend grade level planning sessions and model lessons for teachers.**

**5th Grade Science - Students will be exposed to more science topics and texts during the read block.**

## 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 build a positive school culture and environment by staying connected to our community and involving stakeholders in school-based decisions. This is done through hosting regular parent meetings such as SAC Meetings, Grade Level Nights and International Baccalaureate sessions. During meetings, we review surveys, discuss student needs and plan for school improvement. As a result of our ongoing dialogue and transparency, we have built strong family and community partnerships.

In addition to gathering insight to improve our school, we recognize our volunteers and business partners by acknowledging their contributions on the school marquee, in monthly newsletters, our school website and yearbook. We host an annual breakfast for our volunteers and organize a holiday luncheon for our SAC members. Also, we organize on-campus community events such as The Great American Teach-in, Book Character Parade, a Night in Winter Wonderland, and Veteran's Day events to honor our veterans and their families. We believe that showing appreciation and recognition for our volunteers and stakeholders makes for a positive reciprocal relationship.

Not only do we invite community members and stakeholders on campus, we branch out beyond the perimeters of our school to stay involved in the community. We set up booths and plan youth activities at Polk County's School Showcase and Winter Haven Chamber Community Fest. Our Bear Choir performs the National Anthem at Lakeland Magic basketball games, students volunteer at the local soup kitchen, students organize can food drives, submit artwork and letters to local retirement homes.

### 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: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00