Polk County Public Schools

Bartow Elementary Academy

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bartow Elementary Academy

590 WILSON AVE S, Bartow, FL 33830

http://www.bartowacademy.com/

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Van Hook

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (73%) 2015-16: A (71%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bartow Elementary Academy

590 WILSON AVE S, Bartow, FL 33830

http://www.bartowacademy.com/

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 KG-5	No	51%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	46%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Bartow Elementary Academy is a family partnership inspiring today's learners to become tomorrow's leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bartow Elementary Academy is a family partnership dedicated to inspiring and preparing learners to become productive global citizens. Our desire is for everyone to use life skills, technology, and innovative experiences to build tomorrow’s leaders.

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
Nelson, Tracy	Principal	The Leadership Team serves as the school's climate committee, ensuring that a positive learning climate fosters learning gains and student achievement in a diverse setting. The committee works together to share the school vision and mission. The committee also analyzes the Successful Schools Survey completed by parents and students. The committee makes recommendations to the School Advisory Council as necessary, informing both of concerns, issues, and possible strategies to address the various areas. The committee serves as a liaison to gather input from other staff members. The Leadership Team participates in writing, monitoring, and evaluating the School Improvement Plan. This includes assisting with the areas of focus, rationale, intended outcomes, action steps, and evaluation for all curriculum areas. It also analyzes data, conducts needs assessments, and provides input for areas of need for staff development. Furthermore, we work to provide appropriate professional learning activities based on the instructional needs of each grade level team. Dr. Tracy Nelson is the Instructional Leader of the school. She holds a dual doctorate in Organizational Leadership with a focus in Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University. Dr. Nelson believes in the importance of building positive relationships with staff, students, parents and community members. She has facilitated several training opportunities including MTSS, The Reading Block, Differentiated Instruction, Working with Difficult Children, Data Analysis and Positive Behavior Intervention Supports, LSI, Data Chats and Parent/Teacher Conferences. Dr. Nelson believes in shared decision making and using parent and staff surveys to help develop a plan of action for the coming school year. Mrs. Wallace is our guidance counselor and brings a great deal of knowledge to BEA. She is compassionate, understanding and truly listens when one speaks. Mrs. Wallace easily builds positive working relationships with all school stakeholders. She conducts several groups such as grief counseling, peer mediation, bullying, social skills and works individually with students in need. She is scheduled to meet monthly with administration and our instructional staff to ensure MTSS is well documented and make changes as necessary. She also locates resources for teachers to use during MTSS based on student need and explains and assists in the monitoring process. Additionally, she observes classrooms to ensure Harmony lessons are implemented with fidelity. Mrs. Jones is our assistant principal. She has a positive attitude and comes to us with a masters and Specialist degree in Educational Leadership. She has facilitated numerous training opportunities for staff including small group instruction, engaging difficult students, differentiated instruction, data analysis, Positive Behavior and CHAMPS to name a few. Mrs. Jones meets with staff to build their instructional knowledge base and share best practices to ensure overall academic improvement for each child we serve. Mrs. Wolfe has been a highly effective teacher at our school for several years and has served as an instructional coach for the past two year. She brings a wealth of best practices and content knowledge to the table. She thinks outside the box to assist teachers in pushing their children academically and helps set goals for students and our instructional staff. She has modeled in classrooms,

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		assisted in lesson planning, participated in collaborative planning sessions, and analyzes and tracks data for the school. In addition, she assist teachers with making decisions about instruction based on their individual data. This year Mrs. Wolfe will continue to mentor teachers, attends coaches meetings and teach reading endorsement classes. She will also be one of our fourth grade ELA teachers. Mrs. Katsoulis has been in the Polk County School system for many years. Mrs. Katsoulis has had years of experience as a teacher within our district. For the last several years she has been a technology manager and taught our students the ins and outs of our morning production show. In addition, she works closely with our instructional and administrative staff to ensure our technology is updated and working properly for our progress monitoring and testing that occurs in our computer lab and individual classrooms. Mrs. Katsoulis is extremely professional, pays a great deal to detail and is proactive in getting her job completed. Steven Benfield has been at BEA for the past several years as our inclusion teacher. He has worked to build positive working relationships with staff, students and parents. He continually provides a variety of strategies to address the needs of ever child. He is detailed oriented when documenting the implementation of accommodations provided to each child based on his/her individual education plan (IEP). We have seen a reduction in our gap between our special education and regular education students with his drive and determination. Our students love working with Mr. Benfield and making him proud. He is a great motivator for all students! Lori Crowley has been a highly effective gifted teacher for us the past three years. She has a proven track record for engaging students in meaningful rigorous activities. She eagerly builds relationships with our students and gets them to think outside the box. Her expertise is on project based learning that creates self-directed teams that explore a variety of work: from science projects to kindness project that involve the entire school. The tasks she assigns encourages these students to be open minded, think about the "what ifs" and "what could be" and our students take it from there.
Wolfe, Shari	Instructional Coach	
Benfield, Steven	Teacher, ESE	
Crowley, Lori	Teacher, ESE	
Jones, Nikki	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/10/2020, Sarah Van Hook

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (73%) 2015-16: A (71%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	6	3	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Dec. 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	2	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Dec. 2019 STAR Mathematics Level 1	0	1	0	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/11/2020

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA or Math	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	

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	

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	90	72	72	73	90	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	486
Attendance below 90 percent	3	5	1	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	77%	51%	57%	81%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	51%	58%	65%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	49%	53%	59%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	83%	57%	63%	85%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	61%	56%	62%	67%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	47%	51%	70%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	78%	47%	53%	84%	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	83%	52%	31%	58%	25%
	2018	92%	51%	41%	57%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	48%	29%	58%	19%
	2018	81%	48%	33%	56%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
05	2019	73%	47%	26%	56%	17%
	2018	84%	50%	34%	55%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	87%	56%	31%	62%	25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	90%	56%	34%	62%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	56%	24%	64%	16%
	2018	91%	57%	34%	62%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	83%	51%	32%	60%	23%
	2018	75%	56%	19%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	78%	45%	33%	53%	25%
	2018	79%	51%	28%	55%	24%
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	45			67							
BLK	61	39	43	74	65	62	50				
HSP	72	41	18	80	56		73				
WHT	84	46	29	86	61	38	86				
FRL	66	36	19	77	48	43	70				

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
BLK	74	52	50	63	48	43	63				
HSP	76	69	62	88	66	82	73				
WHT	90	70	59	90	55	68	85				
FRL	77	62	57	75	48	55	71				

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
BLK	77	67	64	74	77	79	57				
HSP	75	70		94	83		92				

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
WHT	83	63	50	86	59	57	87				
FRL	68	58	63	80	73	75	82				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	56
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
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	61
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	51
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 performed the lowest was 5th grade ELA. Based on the data, we documented 70% proficiency. This percent is a nine percent decrease over the previous school year. This year, fifth grade performed better than fourth grade for the first time in more than five years.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is our fourth grade ELA scores. We fell four percentage points from 81% to 77%. This is the second year our fourth grade team documented a decline in proficiency numbers.

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 largest gap when compared to the state average was in the area of ELA learning gains of our lowest 25%. The state documented 53% and our school documented 31%.

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 our 5th grade Math proficiency levels. Our percentage went from 75% to 83%, which is eight percent increase. The eight percent increase is the highest we have seen in the last five years. The teacher introduced more manipulatives an use of interactive notebooks.

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

There are a couple of concerns we have regarding our Early Warning System data:
1. course failure
2. subgroup data

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

1. Improve core instruction in every classroom
2. Build capacity in grades three through five
3. Increase learning gains for Black, Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities
4. Positively address the needs of our lowest 25/30% of students
5. Continue to develop self-directed teams to enhance student mastery on content outcomes

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our learning gains percentages, if teachers improve the core instruction (Tier 1) including small groups with differentiated instruction, then students will be authentically engaged in challenging work that would develop their levels of cognitive complexity and mastery of skills. This would enhance our overall performance that supports the PCSB District Strategic Plan: Goal 1-District Grade and Goal 2-Graduation Rate.
Measurable Outcome:	We expect to see higher complexity activities being worked on by self-directed teams in all classrooms. Providing students with opportunities to collaborate, discuss, set goals, choose materials and organize the process, would lead to greater independence and higher levels of achievement. The ultimate outcome would be to move overall proficiency in ELA from 77% to 82%; learning gains from 45% to 50%; and our lowest 25% from 31% to 40%. We would like to move our science proficiency from 78% to 82%. Finally, we would like to move our overall proficiency in math from 83% to 88%; learning gains from 61% to 65%; and our lowest 25% from 52% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Nelson (tracy.nelson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to address this area of focus our School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) and instructional staff need to dig into learning targets and scales, understand the depth of standards ensuring the task is aligned to the standard, maintain pace with standards-based instruction and ensure success criteria are being mastered (Order 1 Change. We will utilize our SBLT to monitor information obtained from LSI training/Trend Tracker to enhance our overall core instruction and instructional outcomes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use the following to monitor the effectiveness of implementation in the are of focus: Administrative team will monitor implementation of core instruction and differentiated instruction, structured blocks with schedules posted by content area in each classroom, utilization of CHAMPS and positive classroom management (PBIS).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly collaborative planning session with administration
2. Common use of Marzano's Taxonomy
3. STAR, FRECKLE, iStation, Smarty Ants progress monitoring results
4. MTSS documentation and implementation
5. Quality assignments with rigor, grade recovery, interim and report cards

Person Responsible	Nikki Jones (nikki.jones@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our ESSA Report, African American and Economically Disadvantaged students are falling behind our school's overall Federal Index of 70%. Our Subgroup Federal Index for African Americans is 56% and 64% for our Economically Disadvantaged students.
Measurable Outcome:	We expect to increase proficiency with our African American subgroup from 56% to 60%; we will increase proficiency within our Economically Disadvantaged subgroup from 51% to 55%. Additionally, we will increase learning gains and lowest 25 percent learning gains for both subgroups by four percent. Each academic teacher will provide small group differentiated instruction during their ELA blocks. MTSS interventions will be implemented to ensure consistent progress of each student in the above subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Nelson (tracy.nelson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use the following to monitor the effectiveness of implementation in this area of focus: administration will conduct monthly data chats with students and teachers, review MTSS documentation during monthly grade level meetings, monitor small group differentiated instruction during classroom observations, daily walk-roughs and weekly lesson plans.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategies chosen will provide weekly progress reports to analyze data and make instructional decisions appropriate for each child's learning pathway. Adjustments in instruction and interventions will be made in a timely manner thus assuring that all students are moving forward.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data chats with students and teachers
2. MTSS monthly meetings to monitor students progress
3. Lesson plans and classroom walk-throughs/observations
4. STAR, FRECKLE, iStation
5. Weekly assessments in ELA, Math and Science

Person Responsible	Nikki Jones (nikki.jones@polk-fl.net)

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our proficiency levels, if teachers improve and/or maintain levels 3, 4, or 5 in grades 3-5 our overall school proficiency levels for those grade levels will continue to grow. This would enhance overall proficiency performance that supports the PCSB District Strategic Plan: Goal 1-District Grade.
Measurable Outcome:	We expect to see higher complexity activities by self-directed teams in all classrooms. Providing students with opportunities to collaborate, discuss, set goals, choose materials and organize the process, would lead to greater independence and higher levels of achievement. The ultimate outcome would be to increase our number of students performing proficiently and reduce the number of students still performing below the state mandated proficiency level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Nelson (tracy.nelson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to address this area of focus, the SBLT and instructional staff will focus on teaching to the depth of the standard and beyond. Weekly lesson plans will document standards. We will help teachers' development and implement meta-cognitive skills and differentiated instruction to ensure all students are moving forward, address gender differences by subject area, subgroup and grade level (gap analysis), providing additional time/support before, during and after school and assigning project-based activities/tasks to engage students in work of higher complexity levels while working in self-directed teams.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on proficiency levels, if teachers improve and/or maintain levels 3, 4, or 5 in grades 3-5, our overall school proficiency levels for those grade levels will continue to grow. This would enhance our overall performance that supports the PCSB District Strategic Plan: Goal 1-District Grade.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. Teach to the depth of each standard
2. Authentic student engagement (compliance vs. true engagement)
3. Differentiated tasks/assessments
4. Higher complexity levels for all tasks with documentation
5. Monitor progress of all subgroups

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.

Kindergarten Big Step Day is help in May. During this time, parents and students rotate to a variety of activities to help familiarize them with the school and kindergarten expectations. Each student is observed completing various skill activities. Within the first 30 days of school, kindergartners are given the Florida Kindergarten Readiness Test (FLKRS). This tool is used to measure a student's readiness for school.

Fifth graders attend a transition meeting that is hosted by the guidance counselor from the feeder middle school (Union Academy). They receive information on middle school requirements, programs offered, and are afforded a question/answer session with middle school students. Elective schedules are sent home at the end of each session.

Boy and Girl Scouts will visit to discuss transitioning into middle school. In addition, Stephen Scheloske, Principal of Union Academy is our partner in preparing our students for what if facing them as middle school students.

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: Differentiation	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00