Medulla Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Medulla Elementary School

850 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

http://schools.polk-fl.net/medulla

Demographics

Principal: Gale Macleod

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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: B (60%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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

Medulla Elementary School

850 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

http://schools.polk-fl.net/medulla

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	92%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

School Grades History

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

Medulla Elementary provides a safe, rigorous, academic environment. Each child will reach his/her fullest potential and become a respectful and productive citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As a part of the Medulla community, Medulla Elementary provides a safe, supportive environment that fosters curiosity, inquiry, and a life-long pursuit of knowledge.

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
MacLeod, Gale	Principal	The principal is an instructional leader and continuous learner who works collaboratively with others engaging in data driven dialogue to problem solve, make decisions, improve instructional practices and organizational structures to achieve shared goals and improve student learning.
Aranda, Ginnie	School Counselor	The School Counselor collaborates with colleagues in using research in order to select appropriate strategies to solve identified problems, make decisions, manage conflict, and promote meaningful change.
Hill, Cathy	Teacher, ESE	The Local Education Agency (LEA) Facilitator works effectively within systems, understands decision-making processes, and supports district and school priorities. The LEA also inspires and mobilizes colleagues to achieve goals and implementation plans.
Martin, Victoria	Instructional Coach	This Instructional Coach develops knowledge and understanding of how to identify and use multiple assessment tools aligned to standards. In addition, develops a climate of trust and reflection to engage colleagues in conversations about student learning data and ways to use data to improve instructional practices.
Spear, Tracey	Instructional Coach	This Instructional Coach builds trusting relationships by listening intentionally, taking an ethical and caring stance and developing cultural competency. The Coach also facilitates professional learning for teachers by using data and encouraging collegial inquiry.
Ricco, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach continues to increase her knowledge of content and pedagogy by being a reflective learner. The coach collaborates with colleagues in using research in order to select appropriate strategies to solve identified problems of practice in teaching and learning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Gale Macleod

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.*
1

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.*
9

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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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	87	72	90	90	112	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	557
Attendance below 90 percent	11	9	5	10	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	4	0	2	3	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	19	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 Dec. STAR Reading	0	0	3	17	34	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2019 Dec. STAR Math	0	23	30	28	41	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151

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	4	14	28	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/17/2020

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	87	80	97	98	119	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	587
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	16	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	87	80	97	98	119	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	587
Attendance below 90 percent	18	21	17	21	18	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	3	5	5	5	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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	16	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	24	13	20	30	41	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157

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	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	53%	51%	57%	53%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	51%	58%	47%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	49%	53%	31%	50%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	61%	57%	63%	63%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	56%	62%	68%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	47%	51%	57%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	47%	53%	42%	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	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
	2018	47%	51%	-4%	57%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	48%	12%	58%	2%
	2018	54%	48%	6%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
05	2019	47%	47%	0%	56%	-9%
	2018	39%	50%	-11%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	56%	-1%	62%	-7%
	2018	54%	56%	-2%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	56%	15%	64%	7%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
05	2019	56%	51%	5%	60%	-4%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	61%	-13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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	30	44	53	40	52	56	41				
ELL	41	52		61	69	50	40				
BLK	37	49	80	42	56	62	35				
HSP	53	57	68	63	66	45	55				
MUL	54	64		67	71						
WHT	62	59	50	67	77	83	62				
FRL	47	56	69	52	66	50	48				
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	21	37	35	28	42	45	34				
ELL	43	59	69	55	45		25				
BLK	33	38	33	41	49	38	35				
HSP	49	53	70	58	54	29	48				
MUL	61	44		57	44		60				
WHT	52	38	20	56	48	50	65				
FRL	44	42	40	52	47	37	49				
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	17	25	33	28	50	62	17				
ELL	30	41	35	48	59	56	10				
BLK	34	38	25	56	66		38				
HSP	50	45	36	61	66	57	33				
MUL	60	55		77							
WHT	67	53	30	67	68	50	56				

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
FRL	45	44	30	58	70	63	36				

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	60
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	478
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	53
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	52
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	59
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	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	66
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	56
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.

SWD - student behavior can compound the student challenges when students are attempting to grasp concepts.

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

ELL -lack language acquisition

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 indicated the greatest gap compared to the state average due to a lack of foundational skills in reading.

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

African American - ELA Lowest Quartile

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

ELL, Students w/Disabilities, and number of students with below 90% attendance

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

1. Close the gap of the lowest quartile in ELA and Math
2. Close the gap with students with disabilities in ELA and Math
3. Increase ELA proficiency and gains
4. Increase attendance
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Small group instruction is designed to group four to six students who share similar struggles with a standard/objective and provide them with intensive remediation/instruction. This will allow teachers to differentiate according to the needs of the students within the class. The subgroups that were identified through the data will allow us to differentiate the instruciton to close academic gaps within the classroom.
Measurable Outcome:	We will systemically implement small group instruction campus-wide. 85% of our classrooms will implement small group instruction to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of our subgroups and 56% of students will demonstrate proficiency levels in ELA state testing.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will implement best practices as framed by Marzano and packaged by Learning Science Institiute. We have experienced incremental improvement and sucess employing these strategies. This will allow us to employ these strategies with our small group instruction to improve instruction and student performance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction will allow the teacher to closely monitor student learning through formative assessments and provide opportunities for reteaching, interventions, and/or enrichment. Administration will conduct walkthroughs to monitor the fidelity of instruction and documentation of interventions provided.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide staff PD in regards to small group instruction and analyze data with teachers.

Person Responsible	Tracey Spear (tracey.spear@polk-fl.net)

Assist teachers in decision making and gathering materials needed.

Person Responsible	Tracey Spear (tracey.spear@polk-fl.net)

Provide instructional coaching support and feedback.

Person Responsible	Tracey Spear (tracey.spear@polk-fl.net)

Monitor the implementation of small groups and provide feedback.

Person Responsible	Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Continuous progress monitoring and adjusting instruction in small groups will also address our concerns with ELL and students with disabilities. Coaches and administration will walk classrooms daily with a targeted focus to monitor implementation and student growth. Attendance will be monitored biweekly during leadership meetings to identify students with high absences, trends, and problem solve.

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.

Medulla builds a positive school culture by collaborating with stakeholders through the School Advisory Committee as well as School Leadership Team Meetings throughout the year. Engagement and collaboration also takes place with Community partnerships.

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
		Total:	$0.00