

Polk County Public Schools

Polk City 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Polk City Elementary School

125 BOUGAINVILLEA AVE S, Polk City, FL 33868

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

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Erb Hancock

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

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* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: B (54%) 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Polk City Elementary School

125 BOUGAINVILLEA AVE S, Polk City, FL 33868

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

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	30%

School Grades History

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

Polk City Elementary will demonstrate high expectations by collaborating and communicating with the community, parents, staff and students to foster a safe, respectful and diverse learning environment that provides differentiated opportunities for all to think critically and participate in student centered, rigorous, standards based, high quality instruction.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Polk City Elementary School students will be independent thinkers and problem solvers who work cooperatively to meet high expectations in order to become lifelong learners.

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
Erb-hancock, Jennifer	Principal	To provide the vision and leadership necessary to develop and administer educational programs that optimize the human and material resources available. These programs will ensure implementation of learning processes for all students leading to enhanced student achievement within the context or providing a safe and successful school for students, staff, parents and community in support of enhanced student learning.
Miller, Jessica	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. The coach is also 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.
Menetre, Ashley	Assistant Principal	Assists the school principal in providing the vision and leadership necessary to develop and administer educational programs that optimize the human and material resources available. These programs will ensure implementation of learning processes for all students leading to enhanced student achievement within the context of providing a safe and successful school for students, staff, parents and community in support of enhanced student learning.
Bostelaar, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	The reading interventionist will analyze data, plan and deliver instruction to support students who are not proficient in their respective grade. The job role includes data analysis, interpretation, and usage; research based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement planning and support.
Raysin, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	The LEA will coordinate MTSS and ESE processes. LEA will work closely with teachers who serve ESE students. She will analyze data, plan and deliver instruction to support ESE students who are not proficient in their respective grade, as well as supporting the IEP goals. The job role includes data analysis, interpretation, and usage; research based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement planning and support.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2012, Jennifer Erb Hancock

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

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* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: B (54%) 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	110	79	101	106	73	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	555
Attendance below 90 percent	25	13	7	14	11	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	3	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	5	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	4	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	6	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	10	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Dec. 2019 Star Reading Level 1	0	1	2	27	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Dec. 2019 Star Math Level 1	0	8	15	15	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	5	3	8	22	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	3	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/9/2020

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	109	85	101	104	70	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	552
Attendance below 90 percent	9	25	10	17	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	39	30	51	52	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	254
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	15	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	3	1	1	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	109	85	101	104	70	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	552
Attendance below 90 percent	9	25	10	17	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	39	30	51	52	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	254
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	15	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	3	1	1	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	52%	51%	57%	50%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	51%	58%	59%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	49%	53%	60%	50%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	53%	57%	63%	57%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	56%	62%	57%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	47%	51%	50%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	47%	53%	44%	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	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
	2018	47%	51%	-4%	57%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	48%	-5%	58%	-15%
	2018	48%	48%	0%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	39%	47%	-8%	56%	-17%
	2018	38%	50%	-12%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	56%	-4%	62%	-10%
	2018	53%	56%	-3%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	56%	-2%	64%	-10%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	42%	51%	-9%	60%	-18%
	2018	42%	56%	-14%	61%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	38%	45%	-7%	53%	-15%
	2018	44%	51%	-7%	55%	-11%
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	26	25	27	41	52	70					
ELL	52	57		32	60						
HSP	53	55		43	42		37				
WHT	52	44	48	56	55	52	54				
FRL	46	46	44	41	44	42	30				
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	32	44	42	36	50	50					
ELL	31	70		44	64						
BLK	40			60							
HSP	50	42		49	50	30					
WHT	48	48	44	55	45	13	54				
FRL	41	43	33	47	40	22	44				
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	11	53	64	18	47	43					
ELL	36			57							
HSP	56	61		66	56						
WHT	50	60	60	57	58	50	47				
FRL	42	55	62	49	57	59	32				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46

Hispanic Students	
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	52
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	42
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.

According to 2019 FSA data, proficiency and learning gains in ELA are low overall while students with disabilities showed the lowest performance. Third grade shows less growth and more students struggling to make gains and reach proficiency as compared to fourth and fifth grade according to December 2019 STAR. These data components are low due to lack of progress monitoring of targeted interventions, lack of rigorous tier 1 instruction, and student engagement.

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

ELA proficiency and learning gains for SWD showed the greatest decline. The factors that contributed to the decline of scores include lack of intentional targeted instruction, progress monitoring, and instructional adjustments made based on progress monitoring.

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.

ELA learning gains has the greatest gap when compared to the state (12 points). In addition, math proficiency levels show a significant gap when compared to the state (10 points). The gap in learning gains in ELA was due to inconsistent small group instruction and lack of targeted interventions and effective progress monitoring. The proficiency in math was lack of release and use of strategies specifically aligned to standards.

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

Learning gains for the bottom quartile in math showed the most improvement with a 23 point increase. Teachers utilized review within the math block and provided small group instruction, in order to meet the needs of students who were lacking current skills and foundational math skill. December 2019 STAR data shows that this would not be maintained.

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

Based on early warning system data attendance for all grade levels is a major concern. Additionally, the number of students scoring on the cusp of proficiency on district and state assessments is a concern and an area of opportunity to raise proficiency.

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

1. Increase learning gains in ELA and Mathematics for all subgroups.
2. Increase overall ELA and math proficiency.
3. Close achievement gaps in ELA between SWD and the general population.
4. Increase 5th grade science proficiency.
5. Decrease the number of students with less than 90% attendance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Teachers will use data to diagnose student deficiencies, intentionally plan targeted intervention lessons, consistently deliver targeted intervention lessons, monitor student progress and adjust instruction based on response to intervention. Student data shows students are not proficient with tier 1 instruction and will require tier 2 and tier 3 interventions to close the achievement gap.

Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA overall learning gains from 46 to 51, while increasing the lowest quartile from 48-53. Increase learning gains for SWD from 25-50.
Increase Math overall learning gains from 53-58, while increasing the lowest quartile from 50-55. Increase learning gains for SWD from 41 to 46.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use guided reading strategies and targeted interventions to address specific weaknesses in ELA and Math. Teachers will monitor data and adjust interventions consistently.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research supports that guided reading and small group instruction increases proficiency and closes the achievement gap by scaffolding instruction and differentiating tasks to meet the student at their current instructional level. Monitoring student response to intervention, and making instructional adjustments has an effect size of 1.29.

Action Steps to Implement

Academic coaches will provide professional development on the MTSS process and monthly monitoring and support PLCs.

Literacy coach will provide quarterly guided reading professional development.

Math coach will provide professional development in math small group instruction.

Professional development will be provided either during the school day (subs required) or after school (special activity log required).

Person Responsible: Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will administer progress monitoring and diagnostic assessments.
Teachers will analyze data to plan for and form/adjust groups.
Teachers will monitor student progress and adjust instruction regularly.
Teachers will conference with parents to keep them informed.
Teachers will use research based materials.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

The leadership team will monitor small group instruction, data and plans.
The leadership team will provide feedback and coaching.

Person Responsible: Ashley Menetre (ashley.menetre@polk-fl.net)

The reading interventionist will analyze data and utilize guided reading and small group instruction to support teachers and students with the MTSS process.
The paraprofessionals will utilize small group instruction to support students within the MTSS process.

Person Responsible: Sarah Bostelaar (sarah.bostelaar@polk-fl.net)

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

Strengthen tier 1 instruction to increase student achievement in literacy, mathematics, and science.

Measurable Outcome: ELA proficiency will increase from 52-57, math proficiency will increase from 53-58 and science proficiency will increase from 47-52.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will implement student use of learning targets, success criteria, and teaming to impact rigorous instruction and increase student engagement. Tasks and lessons will planned according to the appropriate text complexity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research supports that student use of learning targets, success criteria, and student discourse increases proficiency and closes the achievement gap by increasing student engagement and rigorous standards based instruction. Classroom discourse has an effect size of 0.82.

Action Steps to Implement

Academic coaches will provide professional development on learning targets, success criteria and academic teaming.

Academic coaches will provide professional development on the use of standards tracker.

Academic coaches will provide professional development on PLCs.

Academic coaches will support teachers in planning lessons and tasks that meet the appropriate text complexity.

Person Responsible Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

Utilize PLC processes to collaboratively plan, develop common formative assessments, analyze assessment data, and act on assessment results.

Utilize PLC processes to reflect on teaching practices through peer/self observations.

Person Responsible Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

Coaches will engage in coaching cycles with individual teachers on learning targets, success criteria and academic teaming.

Coaches will engage in coaching cycles with teams/PLC leads on PLC processes.

Person Responsible Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

Using trend tracker the leadership team will monitor and provide feedback/coaching on the use of learning targets, success criteria and academic teaming.

Person Responsible Ashley Menetre (ashley.menetre@polk-fl.net)

Inclusion teachers will support classroom teachers and SWD during tier 1 instruction.

LEA will support inclusion teachers by coaching and identify areas of need for professional development.

Person Responsible Jessica Raysin (jessica.raysin@polk-fl.net)

Utilize ELP to increase student proficiency and close the achievement gap in ELA, math, and science.

Person Responsible Ashley Menetre (ashley.menetre@polk-fl.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Effectively implement PBIS to increase positive student behavior and improve attendance rates. Students who are present daily and authentically engaged will exhibit less disruptive behaviors.

Measurable Outcome: We will have less than 100 ODRs and decrease the number of students with less than 90% attendance from 88 to 50.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ashley Menetre (ashley.menetre@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Social skills lessons and Sanford Harmony lessons will be taught daily in all classrooms. All staff will use strategies learned through PBIS training. The tier 2 PBIS team will target specific groups of students to address targeted needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Due to the high percentage of low SES students, it is necessary to teach social skills and implement PBIS strategies to increase student autonomy.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will reach out to families after two consecutive absences.

Teachers will use Class Dojo or phone calls to communicate classroom behavior concerns with families consistently.

Teachers will utilize PBIS liaison to assist in creating Tier 2 behavior plans and interventions.

Teachers will utilize RTiB and school tracking forms to collect data on specific students and behaviors.

Teachers will utilize provided social skills lessons.

Person Responsible Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

PBIS Team will provide professional development on PBIS strategies and tracking forms.

Tier 2 PBIS Team will provide professional development on Tier 2 behavior interventions and necessary documentation.

PBIS grade level liaison will support new or struggling teachers with implementation of the school wide PBIS program.

Person Responsible Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

PBIS team will analyzed data to monitor implementation and determine needs for additional professional development.

PBIS Team will create an Attendance Task Force to address the attendance out come.

Person Responsible Jessica Raysin (jessica.raysin@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 school leadership team will support teachers, students and parents according to the action steps outlined for each area of 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.

At Polk City Elementary School, we address building a positive school culture and environment in many ways through ensuring all stakeholders are involved. First and foremost, we involve our families in the education of their students through engaging and purposeful family events that leave them with ways to assist their child in their education outside of the school's walls. We also engage a School Advisory Council toward guiding the school in continuous improvement. Lastly, our partnerships with various businesses and community members provide opportunities for our staff and students' growth.

For new teachers we have the Campus Induction Program, T.I.P.S. which provides information on specific campus orientation, curriculum, resources, and district initiatives. Academic coaches then provide mentoring supports to newly hired staff, then they are assigned a teacher that becomes their Engagement Ambassador. There is also a School Social Committee that plans regular events to build and sustain staff relationships.

The leadership team will recognize and celebrate individual attempts at trying new instructional strategies, team improvements, and teachers that are excelling at a new strategy using a method of their choice determined by a survey.

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: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00

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