Polk County Public Schools

Spessard L Holland Elementary

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 (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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (56%) 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 (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	75%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white 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. All school leadership team roles and responsibilities include: *Monitoring student progress with on going assessments and data analysis to adjust groups for students achievement and close achievement gaps. *Mentor new teachers for growth and retention. *Planning, leading, and supporting professional learning. *Monitoring conditions for learning in classroom. *Collaborating with grade level teams and vertical teams on standards based instruction. *Ensuring quality core instruction to the depth of standards. *Alignment of strategies and activities with appropriate target tasks alignment. *Communication with stakeholders and community members. *Monitoring the implementation of the SIP. *Maintaining focus on student achievement. *Making decisions based on needs with appropriate resources and budget alignment. *Building relationships through communication, mentoring and the shared ownership of student achievement. *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 (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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (56%) 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](#).	

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	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	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	4	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	

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 *Student Teaming with groups *Success Criteria *Student-Centered Classrooms *Collaborative Planning with small group plans *High Performing Professional Learning Communities *Tiered Supports for Teachers *Feedback via Journey, emails, checklist, and notes *Monitoring Conditions for Learning with small groups *Coaching for Implementation *Continue 3-Act tasks, 5E model, and use of manipulatives in all classrooms *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**