# Spessard L Holland Elementary

leadership

analysis

students

Florida

mission

college and career

school improvement

ambitious

family and community involvement

striving

achievement

teaching

relationships

success

areas of focus

instruction

resources

needs assessment

strategic planning

collaboration

vision

learning

supportive environment

growth

# 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# Table of Contents

# Spessard L Holland Elementary

2342 EF GRIFFIN RD, Bartow, FL 33830

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

## Demographics

### Principal: Lacey Golden

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2009

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (50%)<br><br>2017-18: C (51%)<br><br>2016-17: B (56%)<br><br>2015-16: C (45%) |
| **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

# Spessard L Holland Elementary

## 2342 EF GRIFFIN RD, Bartow, FL 33830

### http://schools.polk-fl.net/slhe/

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | **2019-20 Title I School** | **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5 | Yes | 75% |

| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate**<br>(Reported as Non-white<br>on Survey 2) |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| K-12 General Education | No | 55% |

## 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.**

The mission of Spessard L. Holland Elementary is to provide high quality education for all students in an environment where students are eager to learn, willing to serve, and preparing to lead.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

The vision of Spessard L. Holland is that every student will achieve at his or her maximum potential in engaging learning environments in preparation for the next grade level.

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Butler, Melody | Principal | Principal - as defined by Polk County Public Schools job description.<br><br>All school leadership team roles and responsibilities include:<br><br>*Monitoring student progress with on going assessments and data analysis to adjust groups for students achievement and close achievement gaps.<br>*Mentor new teachers for growth and retention.<br>*Planning, leading, and supporting professional learning.<br>*Monitoring conditions for learning in classroom.<br>*Collaborating with grade level teams and vertical teams on standards based instruction.<br>*Ensuring quality core instruction to the depth of standards.<br>*Alignment of strategies and activities with appropriate target tasks alignment.<br>*Communication with stakeholders and community members.<br>*Monitoring the implementation of the SIP.<br>*Maintaining focus on student achievement.<br>*Making decisions based on needs with appropriate resources and budget alignment.<br>*Building relationships through communication, mentoring and the shared ownership of<br>student achievement.<br>*Using the adult coaching model to build capacity of teachers and monitor growth. |
| | Psychologist | Psychologist - as defined by Polk County Public Schools job description and listed above. |
| Rodgers, Erin | Dean | Dean - as defined by Polk County Public Schools job description and listed above. |
| Willis, Kacy | Instructional Coach | Math Instructional Coach - as defined by the Polk County Public Schools job description and listed above. |
| Hilgenberg, Craig | Instructional Coach | ELA Instructional Coach - as defined by the Polk County Public Schools and listed above. |
| Buchanan, Melanie | Teacher, ESE | ESE Facilitator - as defined by Polk County Public Schools and listed above. |
| Koon, Mary Ann | School Counselor | As defined by Polk County Pubic Schools job description and listed above. |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2009, Lacey Golden

**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.*

6

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

50

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (50%)<br><br>2017-18: C (51%)<br><br>2016-17: B (56%)<br><br>2015-16: C (45%) |
| **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, <u>click here</u>. | |

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

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

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of students enrolled | 113 | 119 | 110 | 113 | 133 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 689 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 11 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 20 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Course failure in ELA | 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 | | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| STAR Reading Level 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| STAR Math Level 1 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 14 | 13 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | |

**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 | 114 | 115 | 99 | 145 | 101 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 703 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 18 | 14 | 11 | 18 | 9 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 2 | 9 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 4 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 19 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

## 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 | 114 | 115 | 99 | 145 | 101 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 703 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 18 | 14 | 11 | 18 | 9 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 2 | 9 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 4 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 19 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

## 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 | 55% | 51% | 57% | 64% | 51% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 49% | 51% | 58% | 55% | 53% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 41% | 49% | 53% | 34% | 50% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 62% | 57% | 63% | 69% | 58% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 57% | 56% | 62% | 64% | 57% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 45% | 47% | 51% | 47% | 49% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 40% | 47% | 53% | 58% | 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 | 65% | 52% | 13% | 58% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 79% | 51% | 28% | 57% | 22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | -14% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 53% | 48% | 5% | 58% | -5% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 48% | -9% | 56% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | 14% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | -26% | | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 35% | 47% | -12% | 56% | -21% |
| | 2018 | 61% | 50% | 11% | 55% | 6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | -26% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | -4% | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 65% | 56% | 9% | 62% | 3% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|  | 2018 | 81% | 56% | 25% | 62% | 19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | -16% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 64% | 56% | 8% | 64% | 0% |
|  | 2018 | 53% | 57% | -4% | 62% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | 11% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | -17% | | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 44% | 51% | -7% | 60% | -16% |
|  | 2018 | 61% | 56% | 5% | 61% | 0% |
| Same Grade Comparison | -17% | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | -9% | | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 37% | 45% | -8% | 53% | -16% |
|  | 2018 | 59% | 51% | 8% | 55% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | -22% | | | | | |
| 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 | 23 | 34 | 39 | 32 | 53 | 46 | 15 | | | | |
| ELL | 13 | 43 | 58 | 42 | 50 | 55 | 18 | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | 28 | 46 | 49 | 63 | 39 | 19 | | | | |
| HSP | 51 | 54 | 41 | 59 | 50 | 58 | 21 | | | | |
| WHT | 63 | 54 | 38 | 68 | 58 | 43 | 56 | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 41 | 42 | 49 | 53 | 50 | 33 | | | | |
| 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 | 26 | 18 | 19 | 37 | 31 | 29 | 35 | | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 36 | | 71 | 64 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 54 | 40 | 24 | 46 | 35 | 24 | 40 | | | | |
| HSP | 54 | 46 | 60 | 68 | 43 | 38 | 64 | | | | |
| MUL | 64 | | | 55 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 63 | 50 | 41 | 72 | 48 | 39 | 63 | | | | |
| FRL | 55 | 52 | 44 | 59 | 45 | 41 | 58 | | | | |

| 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 | 28 | 16 | 17 | 30 | 45 | 42 | 21 | | | | |
| ELL | 42 | 43 | 50 | 48 | 67 | 60 | 20 | | | | |
| BLK | 51 | 49 | 40 | 57 | 51 | 46 | 39 | | | | |
| HSP | 61 | 50 | 38 | 61 | 66 | 53 | 42 | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | 60 | 23 | 76 | 65 | 44 | 71 | | | | |
| FRL | 58 | 55 | 37 | 57 | 55 | 47 | 38 | | | | |

## 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 | 53 |
| 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 | 76 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 425 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 35 |
| 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 | 44 |
| 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 | 40 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 52 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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 | 49 |
| 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 fifth grade ELA data showed the lowest performing proficiency with a 4% decrease from their fourth grade year (39% to 35%). After review of the data, a trend with this particular cohort was identified for students that were in a more restrictive learning environment, (i.e. resource and self-contained classrooms) scoring lower in terms of proficiency from those in the core instruction classroom.

**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 of FSA proficiency was the same grade cohort going from 3rd grade to the 4th grade in ELA. This cohort went from a 79% proficiency rate to 53%. Contributing factors to this decline were as follows: the added calculation of the writing component factored into the reading ability of the student, one first year teacher that ultimately contributes to half of the grade level data, and a lack of rigor used with too much of a reliance on the text instead of standards-driven instruction.

**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 5th grade ELA showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average with the school average being 21% lower than the state. After review of the data, a trend with this particular cohort was identified for students that were in a more restrictive learning environment (i.e. resource and self-contained classrooms) scoring lower in terms of proficiency. Contributing factors to this trend include: two first-year teachers added to the grade level, two other long-term maternity leaves with substitutes filling those voids, and an unusually high number of students identified with disabilities in that particular cohort of students.

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

The same grade comparison in 4th grade showed an improvement in both ELA and Math with an increase of 14% and 11% respectively. Although this was an improvement from a same grade perspective, the school recognizes that the cohort was a major contributing factor to the increases in ELA and Math.

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

One potential area of concern is the number of level 1 students in ELA and Math with the need to close the knowledge and achievement gap by moving the students towards proficiency and/or moving them towards achievement with learning gains. The two ESSA groups, were our students with disabilities and black student population.

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

1. ELA Proficiency Grades 3-5
2. Science Proficiency Grade 5
3. Students with disabilities

4. Black student population
5. Achieving learning gains in math and ELA Grades 3 -5

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| | |
|---|---|
| **#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | By focusing on instructional practices with differentiation the school plans to achieve an increase in each of the overall proficiency in both ELA and Math. Remediation and acceleration-based differentiation using the trend data with will improve student achievement for those maintaining and regressing as indicated. Differentiation of instruction will close the knowledge and achievement gaps in addition to enriching the higher performing students with maintaining achievement and/or learning gains taking place with the students. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Focusing on differentiation of instruction will allow a 5% gain in both ELA and Math learning gains as measured by the spring 2021 FSA. Continuing to differentiate instruction will allow for an overall proficiency gain in both math and ELA by 5% as measured by the spring 2021 FSA. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Melody Butler (melody.butler@polk-fl.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Differentiation of instruction is an evidence-based effective teaching strategy that provides students tools to be successful with mastery of content specific to their individual needs. Differentiation will ensure what is learned, and how it it learned based on the needs of the student demonstrated by data. Using data analysis, grouping students accordingly and differentiation the skills, concepts, and content taught will be implemented. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The rationale for selecting differentiation is because it will result in optimal learning and rigor for all students ensuring engaging learning environment where students apply their knowledge, question, and problem solve with mastery of the standards closing the knowledge and achievement gap with learning gains resulting in student achievement. |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Reading Wonders/Math assessment used and printed for progress monitoring.
2. Grade level and Individual Feedback of Classroom Visits with PD by coaches and others based on the needs of the teachers.
3.Weekly participation and after hour Collaborative Planning with the ELA, Math Coach, and others.
4. Continuation of best practices with the LSI Model and PD as needed.
5. Teachers will plan lessons using resources such as: Lexile readers, Reading A to Z,
periodicals (Scholastic News, Social Studies Weekly, Super Science, AR books) and hands on math materials).
6. Grade level teams will plan for enhanced learning experiences outside of the classroom with field trips that align with the given grade level standards in Science, Mathematics, and ELA.
7. Weekly collaborative planning facilitated by academic coaches for both
ELA and Mathematics using the adult learning model, coaching cycle, and PD.
8. The use of technology to support the learning.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Melody Butler (melody.butler@polk-fl.net) |

| | |
|---|---|
| **#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | In order to increase overall student achievement, an intentional plan will be used to monitor and provide feedback regarding standards-driven lesson plans, including small group plans based on data with differentiation. Small group instruction will take place with teachers working closely to locate knowledge and achievement gaps in reading and/or math with tailored lessons focused on specific learning targets with small groups of students. Frequent assessments, monitoring and adjustments with feedback will take place due to being critical to student achievement and learning gains. The plans will be monitored to ensure meaningful learning based on gaps in knowledge, concepts, and skills with inclusion of the core instruction for all students using small groups. Data shows a trend of maintaining or regressing in achievement. Small group instruction show will learning forward with gains. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Focusing on small group instruction will allow a 5% gain in both ELA and Math learning gains as measured by the spring 2021 FSA. Continuing to small instruction will allow for an overall proficiency gain in both math and ELA by 5% as measured by the spring 2021 FSA. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Melody Butler (melody.butler@polk-fl.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | *Target-Task Alignment for small groups<br>*Student Teaming with groups<br>*Success Criteria<br>*Student-Centered Classrooms<br>*Collaborative Planning with small group plans<br>*High Performing Professional Learning Communities<br>*Tiered Supports for Teachers<br>*Feedback via Journey, emails, checklist, and notes<br>*Monitoring Conditions for Learning with small groups<br>*Coaching for Implementation<br>*Continue 3-Act tasks, 5E model, and use of manipulatives in all classrooms<br>*Reading interventionist will target specific populations of students in the lowest quartile and the identified ESSA subgroups with Black students at 40% and Students with Disabilities at 35% using MTSS based interventions as outlined in the Power Hour resource materials. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The rationale for selecting the strategies above will result in successful conditions and the amount of rigor for optimal learning for all students with small group fidelity. These strategies will ensure engaging, student-led learning environments, where students are equipped to apply their knowledge, question new content, and demonstrate their mastery of each standard based on the specific needs of the students based on data monitoring, adjusting groups and instruction. |
| **Action Steps to Implement** | |

1. Instructional Leadership Walks with feedback of grade teams and individual teachers.
2. Active participation in Collaborative Planning.
3. Continuation of the LSI School Maturity Model
4. Lesson planning using resources such as: math books, manipulatives, technology, and materials as needed.
5. Plan for enhanced learning experiences outside of the classroom by attending field trips that align with the grade level standards in Mathematics and ELA.
6. Parent, Family Engagement events sharing resources at evening or on Saturday to assist with student

achievement, discipline strategies, attendance, Math and ELA.

7. School to home communication using a variety of tools such as: school newsletter, Tuesday folders, student agendas, technology, Saturday and/or after school extended learning with teacher paid to facilitate.

8. Tutoring offered for targeted at-risk students in both ELA and Mathematics.

9. Reading interventionist working directly with retained third grade students as well as the identified ESSA subgroups.

**Person Responsible**   Melody Butler (melody.butler@polk-fl.net)

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**By following the MTSS process with fidelity for attendance, academics, and behavior, a positive impact towards**
**student achievement will be evident. With the students with disabilities subgroup, a significant reduction in the number of students served in a more restrictive environment will take place (i.e. resource and self-contained classrooms). Additionally, the inclusion based teachers are now in a model of looping up with their case**
**load for the children they served the previous year to further enrich relationships, knowledge of these students' academic performances, and their needed accommodations**
**to be successful in the classroom. The reading interventionist will will work one-on-one and will small groups on specific needs based on the STAR Data benchmark testing given three times a year. The guidance counselor will monitor attendance and hold meetings to ensure the goal of being in school is a priority with families. The dean and school psychologist will meet with the teachers, students, and parents to ensure students being in classroom with the core instruction is a priority, with other means of management for students using PBIS and Conscious Discipline and other strategies for individual students based on needs.**

# 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.

Spessard L. Holland works at building positive relationships with families using the following methods:

1. Daily communication in student agendas and student Tuesday folders.

2. Back to School and Parent Orientation Nights
3. Classdojo School Story, school's Facebook page, and other social media sources are used to communicate important events.
4. Parent/Teacher Conferences
5. Volunteer orientation, training, and implementation program
6. Chorus, Gator News Network, Tivitz, A-Team, Art club, Uke Club, and Red Ribbon Run with parent participation
7. Family Literacy, FSA, and Curriculum Nights
8. The school website highlights the mission, vision, and school events.
9. Participation in community event such as parades, singing at locations in the community, and participation in speech, writing and art contest.
10. MLK banquet attendance
11. Blooming Arts Participation
12. Tag Art Participation
13. Hosting a spring art showing with an invitation to community members.
14. Hosting concerts and inviting the community.
15. Hosting school tours for new parents who move into the community.
16. Hold a Kindergarten Roundup Night to acclimate the new parents and children coming in the fall.
17. Joining the Bartow Chamber of Commerce yearly and participating in events sponsored by them.
18. Using local businesses for events held on campus building positive relationships with them.
19. Continues partnership with a hybrid model for field studies students at Polk State on campus at Spessard L. Holland Elementary two days a week.
20. Continued partnership with Southeastern University and Florida Southern College with internships on campus with with teachers.
21. Continued partnership with mental health providers, Peace River Center in Bartow, the school physiologist, and school social worker.
22. Continued participation in the Great American Teach In with volunteers, parents, local fire department, police agencies, and community members sharing about their business or occupation.
23. Continued partnership with Bartow High School and Teacher Academy in the school with the students to coming two days a week to work in classrooms with the students and teachers.
24. Continued partnership with United Way and Reading Pals.

### 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: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction | $0.00 |
| | | **Total:** | **$0.00** |