

Polk County Public Schools

Eagle Lake 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	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Eagle Lake Elementary School

400 CRYSTAL BEACH RD, Eagle Lake, FL 33839

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

Demographics

Principal: Heather Linn

Start Date for this Principal: 6/8/2020

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 (47%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: D (39%)
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	20

Eagle Lake Elementary School

400 CRYSTAL BEACH RD, Eagle Lake, FL 33839

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

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	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We, at Eagle Lake Elementary, supported by family and community, are committed to teaching a meaningful curriculum in a safe, positive learning environment, where students will be respectful, productive, and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Eagle Lake Elementary School is to become a healthy community of learners that develops high performing students with an emphasis on collaboration, involving families, staff members, and school community.

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
Loutzenhiser, Connie	Principal	The leadership team will meet weekly. The roles/functions of the Leadership Team will include the collection and analysis of data, contribute to and review/revise the School Improvement Plan, plan professional development opportunities, and share overall happenings from each member of the team to continue monitoring for student achievement. Each member of the team will serve the staff in their designated area of assignments, for example, Administration and/or coaches will lead the staff during professional developments and/or PLCs.
Jimenez, Maria	School Counselor	Our School Counselor will facilitate and support teacher implementation of PS-Rtl/MTSS processes. Ms. Jimenez will counsel small group, and/or individual students regarding social emotional wellness and behavioral needs. She will also oversee the utilization and implementation of the Sanford Harmony (school-wide social emotional curriculum) at Eagle Lake Elementary.
Greenlee, Bobbie	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Greenlee will lead and support the implementation of the mathematics curriculum and data for Kindergarten through fifth grade in conjunction with collaborative planning and professional learning communities (PLCs). She will also provide instructional supports to teachers through the utilization of the coaching cycle.
Anderson, Cory	Other	Mr. Anderson will support the staff members and the school by managing the use/access of technology and its infrastructure. He will also monitor and update the school website and social media pages for Eagle Lake Elementary, thus providing additional methods for maintaining two-way communication with all stakeholders.
Hardesty, Bradley	Assistant Principal	Mr. Hardesty will lead and support the staff in promoting a safe and secure learning environment through the continuation of the PBIS/PS-Rtl behavior implementation plan. A specific focus on discipline and parent communication is the major responsibilities of the assistant principal. Mr. Hardesty will also oversee district progress monitoring and state assessment administration.
Murphy, Amy	Instructional Coach	Ms. Murphy will lead and support the implementation of the literacy curriculum and data for Kindergarten through fifth grade in conjunction with collaborative planning and professional learning communities (PLCs). She will also provide instructional supports to teachers through the utilization of the coaching cycle.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/8/2020, Heather Linn

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

29

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 (47%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: D (39%)
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	122	86	107	117	88	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	610
Attendance below 90 percent	35	17	22	24	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	3	2	2	5	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	11	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	18	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Dec. 2019 Star Reading Level 1	0	0	0	39	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Dec. 2019 Star Mathematics Level 1	0	0	0	27	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	2	2	6	29	19	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/22/2020

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	84	100	95	100	90	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	543
Attendance below 90 percent	13	21	20	14	19	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	4	5	15	4	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	14	10	21	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	22	27	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	1	6	6	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	6	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	84	100	95	100	90	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	543
Attendance below 90 percent	13	21	20	14	19	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	4	5	15	4	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	14	10	21	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	22	27	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	1	6	6	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	6	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	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	42%	51%	57%	51%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	51%	58%	57%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	49%	53%	53%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	50%	57%	63%	49%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	49%	56%	62%	46%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	47%	51%	38%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	46%	47%	53%	43%	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	43%	52%	-9%	58%	-15%
	2018	42%	51%	-9%	57%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	48%	-13%	58%	-23%
	2018	42%	48%	-6%	56%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	46%	47%	-1%	56%	-10%
	2018	48%	50%	-2%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	56%	-1%	62%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	60%	56%	4%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	56%	-17%	64%	-25%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
05	2019	50%	51%	-1%	60%	-10%
	2018	62%	56%	6%	61%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	45%	-2%	53%	-10%
	2018	55%	51%	4%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
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	7	25	20	22	36	33					
ELL	26	43		39	35		33				
BLK	27	37	73	35	46	54	23				
HSP	42	44	47	51	53	38	50				
WHT	49	54	55	58	47		55				
FRL	38	44	63	49	48	43	45				
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	14	39	46	29	53						
ELL	31			64							
BLK	33	57		41	48	45	42				
HSP	43	44	40	61	61		53				
WHT	54	53	50	70	76	57	67				
FRL	40	49	57	55	59	48	50				

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	13	18	10	36	44	36					
ELL	44	60		56	50						
BLK	41	66	64	31	45	46	16				
HSP	53	53	60	61	51		47				
WHT	53	55	43	51	45	44	56				
FRL	43	54	50	37	37	27	35				

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	50
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	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	398
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	42
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	49
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	53
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	50
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 was ELA achievement (proficiency). Our ELA proficiency for the 2018-2019 school year was 42 percent.

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 previous year was Mathematics Learning Gains. Our Mathematics Learning Gains slid from 65 percent in the 2017-2018 school year to 49 percent for the 2018-2019 school year. This was a decrease of 16 percent.

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 which had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was our ELA Achievement (Proficiency). The percentage of students performing at a proficient level on the 2018-2019 FSA ELA was 42 percent, however the state's overall proficiency was at 57 percent. This is a difference of 15 percent.

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

According to the 2018-2019 state assessment results, all components showed losses.

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

One area of potential concern includes attendance, specifically students whose attendance is under 90 percent. This area includes 132 students out of a total of 610 for Kindergarten through Fifth Grade which equates to 21.6 percent of our students. Another area of potential concern includes the number of students earning a level one on the Mathematics and ELA FSA for the 2018-2019 school year.

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

1. Core Instruction (Literacy and Mathematics)
2. Progress Monitoring, achievement and behaviors (Multi-tiered Systems of Support) intervention and acceleration
3. Learning supports Exceptional Student Education and English Language Learners
4. Attendance (Adhering to Polk Vision and ELE school vision, pending ICP for 2020-2021 school year)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

All students will receive grade-level, standards-based instruction to improve student achievement in core content areas. Students will be exposed to the intent and rigor of the grade level standard, while we build on their current level of learning, closing the gap in proficiency and increase the number of students making learning gains. In 2019-2020 on the December STAR Literacy, 56 percent of 3-5 students achieved a level one or two. The December administration of the STAR Mathematics assessment yielded an outcome of 49% of students earning a level one or two.

Prior year data from the 2018-2019 FSA ELA concluded that 42% of students in grades 3-5, achieved a level three, four, or five. Students taking the FSA Mathematics while earning a level three, four, or five was 50 percent.

Measurable Outcome:

As a result of standards-based instruction taught within core content areas, 47% of students will earn a level 3, 4, or 5 on the ELA Florida State Assessment, 55% of students will earn a level 3, 4, or 5 on the Mathematics . All ESSA subgroups will perform at a minimum of 41% overall. Student learning will be monitored through grade-level formative assessments and district progress monitoring tools.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Collaborative Planning
Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
Instructional Coaches to include for supports: Collaborative Planning, PLC's, Coaching Cycle, Modeling, etc.
Multi-tiered System of Support/Response to Intervention (MTSS/RtI-Progress Monitoring)
The use of Title I Paraprofessionals to assist teachers to support student learning.
Extended Learning opportunities will be available to students based on individual needs using I-Ready materials.
Agendas used to communicate with parents concerning recent data progress monitoring.
Students will continue the use of technology, at their levels, for support of instruction.
Resources for small group instruction will be used to support and enhance student learning.

Collaborative Planning allows teachers in similar grade levels and content areas a time to develop intentional instructional plans with peers and colleagues. This time also allows for in-depth conversations centered around the state standards, their cognitive complexity, and meaningful tasks/assessments aligned to them.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Professional Learning Communities provide a time for teachers to engage in data analysis of common assessments developed and administered to students, along with comparing student samples for alignment purposes.

Instructional Coaching is a method for supporting the development of strong instructional in the classroom through the coaching cycle, including followup.

MTSS/RtI provides teachers and staff with a strategic and intentional way to monitor and support student learning, while adjusting instruction. "The practice of providing high-quality instruction and intervention matched to student need, monitoring frequently to make decisions about changes in instruction or goals, and applying child response data to important educational decisions" (Batsche et al., 2005)

Action Steps to Implement

1. PLCs to include PD on depth of knowledge, target-task alignment, and data analysis of the most recent progress monitoring administration (STAR) unit/module assessments.
2. Set goals for classrooms/individual student to support continuous data chats (administration and teachers).
3. Weekly conversations during common planning pertaining to target, task, and taxonomy alignment.
4. Conduct regular MTSS data analysis sessions with guidance counselor and school psychologist along with teachers, staff members, and administration.
5. Purchase of AR books for students to continue increasing fluency and comprehension skills.

Person Responsible Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**Area of Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

In the 2019-2020 school year the number of office discipline referrals decreased to 154 down from 341 in the 2018-2019 school year. The number of days of out-of-school suspensions administered to students, were reduced from 290 in the 2018-2019 school year to 104 in the 2019-2020 school year. Although the number of office discipline referrals and out-of-school suspensions continue to decline, we must continue to strengthen our classroom management and behavioral supports. In addition, we need to continue to develop our integration of social emotional learning through resources, such as Drumbeat and Sanford Harmony resulting in stronger relationships with peers and adults.

Measurable Outcome:

Decrease the number of office discipline referrals by 20 percent.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)
STOIC:CHAMPS
Sanford Harmony (Social Emotional Skills Development Program)
Drumbeat

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) assists in addressing behaviors that precede or lead to suspensions and/or expulsions through the establishing of a positive social and academic culture. This structure provides a systems approach that addresses a continuum of student needs within tiered interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

STOIC:CHAMPS provides strategies to engage students in being mindful and productive through structured, guided, observable, and supported classroom management.

Sanford Harmony (Social Emotional Skills Development Program) supports the development of pro-social skills through devised lessons, morning meetings, role play, and relationship development.

Drumbeat engages students in group drumming sessions which allows students to expel negative feelings and develop connections with peers through rhythm and song.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Revise school-wide PBIS plan with PBIS team to share with stakeholders.
2. Continue monthly meetings with PBIS team.
3. Establish dedicated time for daily implementation of Sanford Harmony.
4. Revisit PBIS, through professional development, with staff at the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year.
5. Establish and maintain timeline for implementation of tiered interventions (MTSS): Drumbeat, Mentors, Check-in and Checkout, Sanford Harmony, small group sessions, one-on-one sessions, and administrative supports.
6. Provide staff and stakeholders with school-wide data.

Person Responsible

Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team will meet routinely, to discuss current data and prioritize interventions based on needs. This will include student performance data and attendance (Unify, Performance Matters, Renaissance, and FOCUS).

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.

Eagle Lake Elementary recruits parents and community members for school support/tasks, listens to other people's viewpoints, and encourages collaborative decision-making to build a solid foundation for all school/family/community partnerships. We will be targeting every parent by sending home Title 1 newsletters informing parents of events happening in school and how parents can support students at home. Our school marquee will be updated regularly to inform parents of upcoming Title 1 events and additional school related events. We will also inform parents through the use of flyers, grade-level newsletters, and notes in student agendas/Wednesday folders. Social media, including Facebook and our school website, will also be a focal point for maintaining communication and transparency. We will work diligently to inform parents and families of student performance and methods of supports for students in Kindergarten through fifth grade. Our leadership team will share important information regarding our school's programs, procedures, curriculum expectations, and use of technology at home to assist parents and families help their child(ren) succeed. We will also offer family workshops in literacy, mathematics, science (Mad Science Nights), and test-taking skills.

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: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00