

Polk County Public Schools

Auburndale Central Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Auburndale Central Elementary School

320 LEMON ST, Auburndale, FL 33823

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

Demographics

Principal: Octavia May

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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 (41%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: F (28%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Auburndale Central Elementary School

320 LEMON ST, Auburndale, FL 33823

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">70%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

Our mission is for every learner to reach academic excellence by becoming creative problem solvers and change makers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a nurturing environment committed to achieving academic excellence through the use of high yield strategies in preparation for college or career.

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
May, Octavia	Principal	The principal is the Instructional Leader and School Manager that provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making; models the problem solving process and supervises the development of a strong infrastructure ensuring student achievement.
Lott, Sandria	School Counselor	School Based Leadership Team member who assist with decision making for school-wide success. MTSS coordinator who collaborates with stakeholders in identifying students academic, personal and social developmental needs.
Stoquert, Sara	Assistant Principal	School Based Leadership Team member who assist with decision making for school-wide success. Lead the teachers and staff and set goals to ensure students meet their learning objectives and targets. Assists with the day to day operations of the school.
Sheppard, Trimeishia	Instructional Coach	School Based Leadership Team member who assist with decision making for school-wide success. Leads ELA professional development/professional learning communities and model instructional strategies for teachers. Collaborates with teachers to support lesson planning and implementation of aligned instructional standards and monitors intervention and enrichment groups.
Butler, Todd	Other	School Based Leadership Team member who assist with decision making for school-wide success. Assist with tracking ELA data and focus on remediation of LEVEL 1 and 2 students to meet learning gains and proficiency.
Thomas, Renard	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Representative
Gonzalez, Nikki	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Representative
Jarquin, Claudia	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Representative
Parnell, Ashley	Instructional Coach	School Based Leadership Team member who assist with decision making for school-wide success. Leads Math professional development/professional learning communities and model instructional strategies for teachers. Collaborates with teachers to support lesson planning and implementation of aligned instructional standards and monitors intervention and enrichment groups.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Octavia May

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

27

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 (41%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: F (28%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A

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	61	66	50	70	63	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	374
Attendance below 90 percent	5	19	6	18	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	3	4	5	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	10	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
December STAR ELA Level 1	0	0	0	22	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
December STAR ELA Level 3-5	0	0	0	24	28	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
December STAR Math Level 1	0	0	0	12	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
December STAR Math Level 3-5	0	0	0	40	37	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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	5	4	27	12	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/15/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	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	0	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	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	62	43	54	79	63	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	368
Attendance below 90 percent	5	24	9	11	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	5	5	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	3	5	17	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	19	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	3	8	18	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	1	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	35%	51%	57%	32%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	51%	58%	51%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	49%	53%	46%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	39%	57%	63%	38%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	40%	56%	62%	39%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	21%	47%	51%	37%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	47%	53%	24%	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	35%	52%	-17%	58%	-23%
	2018	34%	51%	-17%	57%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	32%	48%	-16%	58%	-26%
	2018	39%	48%	-9%	56%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	38%	47%	-9%	56%	-18%
	2018	29%	50%	-21%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	43%	56%	-13%	62%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	34%	56%	-22%	62%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	56%	-21%	64%	-29%
	2018	32%	57%	-25%	62%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	34%	51%	-17%	60%	-26%
	2018	44%	56%	-12%	61%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	45%	-4%	53%	-12%
	2018	40%	51%	-11%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
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	16	50	46	28	29	17	10				
ELL	31	46		35	51		38				
BLK	32	57		38	52	40	40				
HSP	35	39		41	45		56				
WHT	38	49	53	39	33	8	35				
FRL	34	47	64	36	45	24	44				

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	17	21	21	3	17	25					
ELL	32	48		32	45	42	10				
BLK	16	18		16	23		20				
HSP	36	58	67	44	51	50	41				
WHT	42	45	60	39	47	18	64				
FRL	37	50	55	37	47	38	43				

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	12	47		16	35	33					
ELL	21	44		40	36						
BLK	16	50		12	21						
HSP	33	51		48	35		33				
WHT	39	50	58	39	48	33	22				
FRL	31	49	47	37	41	42	18				

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	42
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	338
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
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	43
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	
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	36
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance is the 25th percentile in math. The contributing factor was a lack of rigorous and intentional remediation for that subgroup. Trend data shows a continuous decline in this component. The data shows 37% (2017), 33% (2018) and 21% (2019).

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 the math lowest 25th percentile at a 12% decline. The factors which contributed to this decline are limited problem solving strategies and extended learning opportunities.

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

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average was math lowest 25th percentile. The factors contributing to this gap was student participation in remediation during after and before school tutoring. No noted trends as the 2017/2018 data percentages remained at 14% gap.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was a 7% gain in the ELA lowest 25th percentile component. The school incorporated incentives for accelerated reading and an after school book club where students were able to read books, answer stem questions related to a standard and take quizzes on the books they read.

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

The current areas of concern are the number of retention's and student absences/tardies.

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

1. Core instruction
2. Professional Learning Communities
3. Math Lowest 25th percentile
4. MTSS
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on results from the 2019 winter STAR report, our students were at 54% proficiency in math and 41% proficiency in ELA. Relevant and engaging learning experiences were inconsistent in meeting expectations based on student learning data and classroom observations.

Measurable Outcome: Auburndale Central Elementary will increase the overall school grade by 7% from 41% to 48% as evident on the 2020-2021 FSA Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers, paras, interventionist, and instructional coaches will provide additional classroom support, tutoring, and small groups for remediation and enrichment. Deliver professional development focused on understanding grade-level standards and analyzing student data to influence decision-making and drive instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 2019-20 Winter STAR data indicates the need for additional curriculum and instructional support.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional coaches will provide weekly opportunities for teachers to discuss instructional strategies focused on aligning core standards and analyzing student data.

Person Responsible Sara Stoquert (sara.stoquert@polk-fl.net)

Instructional coaches, interventionist and teachers will provide students with before and after school tutoring to close achievement gaps in Math and ELA.

Person Responsible Sara Stoquert (sara.stoquert@polk-fl.net)

Paras, teachers, instructional coaches, and interventionists will provide targeted support for students during the instructional blocks based on data analysis. Administration will assist as needed.

Person Responsible Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)

Instructional coaches will use ink to print data collection forms. Teachers will meet weekly with instructional coaches to discuss and analyze student data.

Person Responsible Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 3-year aggregate VAM, current ESSA data, classroom instructional observations and progress monitoring tools, there is a need to provide instructional support to teachers. This area is a critical need of focus to ensure teachers are provided professional learning opportunities in all content areas that increases student engagement and maximize effective instruction.

Measurable Outcome: By Spring 2021, Auburndale Central Elementary will increase the number of effective teachers from 50% to 75%. As a result targets for ELA, Math and Science will be met and ESSA subgroup index will increase by 1 to 3%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Instructional coaches will provide weekly professional learning communities on effective high yield instructional strategies, including technology integration. Professional communities will also include analysis of student data (MTSS), while monitoring intentional implementation of instructional strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 3-year VAM aggregate and ESSA data indicates low student achievement. Instructional coaches will provide support to teachers through professional learning communities to address remediation and enrichment in all content areas, in order to bridge student academic learning gaps. All stakeholders will have the opportunity to contribute through multiple pathways.

Action Steps to Implement

School based leadership team will review SIP goals, monitor assessment data and adjust goals as needed.

Person Responsible Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)

Administrators will conduct frequent walk-through observations and provide timely feedback for opportunities to improve instructional practice.

Person Responsible Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)

Provide stakeholders with curriculum nights for ELA, math and science.

Person Responsible Ashley Parnell (ashley.parnell@polk-fl.net)

Ensure that teachers have access to resources/technology that will allow them to engage students in meaningful instruction.

Person Responsible Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)

Grade Level teams will collaborate weekly in PLC's that focus on student engagement and effective instruction.

Person Responsible Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School leadership team will meet with teachers consistently to review MTSS data and classroom observations to adjust instructional practices and interventions as needed.

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.

Auburndale Central welcomes parents as advocates for their children and invites them to act as full partners in making school decisions that affect their families. Our school collaborates with parents to ensure that children have a supported learning environment at school and at home and ensure daily student attendance. Technology is integrated into daily instructional tasks to ensure students are prepared for virtual learning. Auburndale Central ensures that all parents have regular access to clear, concise and easily readable printed information about academic updates and current events by providing curriculum nights and programs. We also accommodate work schedules, languages and cultural differences.

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	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00