Cleveland Court Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cleveland Court Elementary School

328 EDGEWOOD DR E, Lakeland, FL 33803

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

Demographics

Principal: Emily Fite   Start Date for this Principal: 5/24/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2020-21 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: A (62%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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

Cleveland Court Elementary School

328 EDGEWOOD DR E, Lakeland, FL 33803

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	82%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	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.

Every CCE student will be prepared academically and socially through rigorous learning experiences to become successful lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

CCE, in partnership with family and community, will provide a safe and supportive learning environment where students strive for excellence in all they do.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
RUTENBAR, CHERYL	Principal	The administration sets clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships). They share past and current data from many different sources with team members. As a team they discuss barriers and instructional strategies to decrease gaps and increase proficiency. They seek input from teacher leaders in all areas of school improvement. School leaders, in turn, provide teachers on their grade level information to help them understand barriers, determine the effectiveness of instructional strategies, and next steps needed to move the students forward. School Leaders suggest professional develop needs for the staff. The literacy coach facilitates collaborative planning and provides coaching to the teachers. The guidance counselor provides teachers with social/emotional data and strategies for Tier 1, 2, and 3 students.
Kranek, Lee	Assistant Principal	The administration sets clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships). They share past and current data from many different sources with team members. As a team they discuss barriers and instructional strategies to decrease gaps and increase proficiency. They seek input from teacher leaders in all areas of school improvement. School leaders, in turn, provide teachers on their grade level information to help them understand barriers, determine the effectiveness of instructional strategies, and next steps needed to move the students forward. School Leaders suggest professional develop needs for the staff. The literacy coach facilitates collaborative planning and provides coaching to the teachers. The guidance counselor provides teachers with social/emotional data and strategies for Tier 1, 2, and 3 students.
Stephens, Emily	Reading Coach	Reading Coach SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring Modeling and Mentoring Teachers
Gainer, Linda	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor Oversee the MTSS process Counsels Students

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ortiz, Suggey	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Cruz, Barbara	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Byrd, Theresa	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Watson, Laura	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Alia, Sebrina	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Collier, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Monge, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Nolin, Lisa	Teacher, ESE	Inclusion Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Ibarra, Rose	Other	LEA Oversee the referral process Resource for ESE teachers Assist with SIP

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 5/24/2016, Emily Fite

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.*

2

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

358

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	58	66	63	65	71	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369
Attendance below 90 percent	0	16	11	19	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	6	3	8	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	6	16	18	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	6	2	12	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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

Friday 7/30/2021

2020-21 - 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	61	70	78	55	64	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	390
Attendance below 90 percent	4	7	10	8	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	5	4	10	5	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	1	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Dec. STAR 2019 ELA Level 1s	0	0	0	6	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Dec. STAR 2019 Math Level 1s	0	0	0	1	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	3	8	5	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	3	2	9	4	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	61	70	78	55	64	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	390
Attendance below 90 percent	4	7	10	8	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	5	4	10	5	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	1	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Dec. STAR 2019 ELA Level 1s	0	0	0	6	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Dec. STAR 2019 Math Level 1s	0	0	0	1	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	3	8	5	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	3	2	9	4	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				67%	51%	57%	63%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	51%	58%	48%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	49%	53%	32%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				80%	57%	63%	78%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				71%	56%	62%	68%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	47%	51%	53%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				52%	47%	53%	71%	53%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021						
	2019	72%	52%	20%	58%	14%	
Cohort Comparison							
04	2021						
	2019	65%	48%	17%	58%	7%	
Cohort Comparison		-72%					
05	2021						
	2019	56%	47%	9%	56%	0%	
Cohort Comparison		-65%					

				MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2021						
	2019	79%	56%	23%	62%	17%	
Cohort Comparison							
04	2021						
	2019	79%	56%	23%	64%	15%	
Cohort Comparison		-79%					
05	2021						
	2019	63%	51%	12%	60%	3%	
Cohort Comparison		-79%					

				SCIENCE			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2021						
	2019	47%	45%	2%	53%	-6%	
Cohort Comparison							

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Inzata
STAR Math 1st Grade

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70%	84%	79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	61%	76%	73%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	50%	67%
	English Language Learners	100%		100%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	77%	80%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	96%	91%	79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	88%	78%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	76%	75%	67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	76%	69%	65%
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69%	64%	64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	59%	53%	51%
	Students With Disabilities	18%	9%	
	English Language Learners	67%	57%	43%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61%	68%	59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46%	56%	44%
	Students With Disabilities		13%	13%
	English Language Learners	43%	57%	29%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	80%	67%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	83%	64%	62%
	Students With Disabilities	40%	17%	29%
	English Language Learners	50%		
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	67%	82%	80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56%	73%	73%
	Students With Disabilities	17%	43%	38%
	English Language Learners	33%	100%	25%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	67%	67%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46%	52%	42%
	Students With Disabilities		13%	
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70%	75%	71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	52%	48%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	13%	25%
	English Language Learners	20%		33%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	72%	78%	84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56%	63%	77%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	38%	63%
	English Language Learners	78%	81%	86%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	28			34			40				
ELL	38			46							
BLK	47	42		41	27		17				
HSP	63			74							
WHT	82	67		89	76		92				
FRL	58	33		62	50		50				
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	43	50	50	48	60	77					
ELL	35	67		53	67						
BLK	50	56	40	65	62		33				
HSP	52	62	50	66	57	60	43				

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
WHT	83	70		90	80		67				
FRL	57	59	40	79	70	67	42				
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	39	50	31	60	70	64	54				
ELL	15	40		69	70						
BLK	39	36	33	58	59	63	50				
HSP	51	37		76	62		64				
WHT	78	58		86	71	55	84				
FRL	49	41	28	67	60	50	63				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	401
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	69
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	81
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Our data shows that the rate of proficiency in students with disabilities and those who are economically disadvantaged drops in ELA and Math as students move from the primary grade levels to the intermediate grade levels.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Students in the lowest 25% are not making enough gains in ELA and Math to move them to proficiency within the year. Students in the lowest 25% need to make more than a year's worth of growth. The lowest 25% includes many students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Factors-School closure during final quarter of 19-20 school year; lack of resources in the home and community due to shutdowns; in the 20-21 school year, multiple students and staff quarantined throughout the school year; changes in modes of learning (sometimes multiple times); ESE teachers split time between campus students and eSchool students; teaming strategies were abandoned due to possibility of Covid exposure, and #1 students in the lowest quartile read significantly less than those who are proficient.

Actions-Adding an LEA, which will allow more time for School Counselor to work with students needing emotional/behavioral support-which will allow students with emotional/behavior issues to stay in class; additional ESE teacher-more concentrated time per student, time to preview lessons before they are presented to the whole class; Relatively young ELA teachers have gained another year of experience and have a better understanding of the reading process; monthly data chats with teachers-action will be required during the meeting-communicating with parents and/or changing students AR book levels. Adopting morning reading buddies for those in the primary grades. All reading teachers are now reading endorsed.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

4th grade ELA

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Smaller class size.
Partner teachers with same expectations for students; holding students accountable for their learning and behavior.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Increased frequency of communication with parents regarding student progress-letting parents know that their child read for only X number of minutes the previous week at home.

Re-assigning paraprofessionals each week to work with students based on need, instead of the same students each day. If teacher A has more students struggling than teacher B, the para will spend more time in teacher A's room. Having paraprofessionals provide guided reading assistance using grade level materials with students who are not reading at home. Having paraprofessionals preview content with struggling students during small group. Small group instruction and teaming will help in accelerating learning.

Additional ESE teacher to work with students with disabilities-this ensures that ESE students will receive more individual attention. ESE teachers will be asked to preview lessons with students. As ESE teachers will have fewer students assigned to them-they will be better able to hold their students accountable.

Verifying that students, especially ESE and B25 are reading during AR time, as shown in the diagnostic AR report that is run each week.

Have 4th and 5th grade students read to select kindergarten and 1st grade students before school.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development on accelerated learning vs. remediation will be provided for teachers. Once a month during faculty meeting, teachers will analyze reading data, make adjustments to instructional plans, communicate progress to parents, and change AR reading levels as appropriate with guidance from administration and Literacy Coach. (We found that some students' AR reading levels did not increase throughout the year.)

Literacy Coach and administration will provide professional development on the new BEST standards, as well as effective instructional strategies.

PD will be based on observation by administration and literacy coach. It could be Closed Reading, Guided Reading, SIPPS, HOT Questions, Teaming, Classroom Management and/or Writing. LFS, LSI, and BEST materials will be used for resources as needed. Teachers will receive feedback based on their individual need.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

The additional ESE teacher will ensure that ESE students will be able to receive more individual attention, rather than just small group attention. With fewer grade levels to focus on, the ESE teachers will become knowledgeable about the grade level standards and will have time to preview new information with the ESE students. This will ensure that during whole group instruction the student with disabilities is not hearing the information for the first time.

The amount of time that paras will be assigned to classrooms will be dependent on student data/need within each classroom. Their schedules will change based on student need. They will be provided with previewing materials. Paraprofessionals work with non-ESE students.

Our guidance counselor will be able to provide more support for students with behavioral and emotional needs, with the addition of an LEA this year. Looking at our lowest 25%, this will hopefully, reduce or eliminate behaviors that are keeping students from learning and paying attention in the classroom.

Holding students accountable for the amount of reading they do in a week, should increase student proficiency.

Tutoring will be offered.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After analyzing our data, we know that 66% of all students are meeting proficiency in ELA 52% of economically disadvantaged students are meeting proficiency in ELA 17% of students with disabilities are meeting proficiency in ELA
Measurable Outcome:	62% of economically disadvantage will make learning gains in ELA 50% of students with disabilities will make learning gains in ELA
Monitoring:	Weekly--AR book levels, comprehension percentage, and points earned; reading comprehension assessments Quarterly--STAR Reading proficiency
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lee Kranek (lee.kranek@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Monitoring AR diagnostic reports, which allow teachers to track students' independent reading level weekly to determine whether they are successfully reading and testing on or above grade level. Teachers will adjust the ZPD of each student every 2-3 weeks in order to increase the students' reading levels throughout the school year. Students will read and take AR tests weekly, with the goal that every student will earn a minimum of 50 points, at 85% accuracy, on grade level or higher by the FSA ELA test date. Once a month during faculty meeting, administrators and literacy coach will meet with teachers to ensure students are on track for success. Monitoring STAR data, which will be used to compare students' current levels to those they achieved on FSA ELA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The strong correlation between STAR assessment scores, AR points/accuracy/book level, and FSA have been documented at CCE for 4 consecutive years. Students who earn 50 or more points at 85% accuracy, on or above grade level are more likely to be proficient and/or make learning gains on FSA ELA. The use of AR diagnostic and STAR reports will allow teachers the ability to make weekly and/or quarterly adjustments to individual student's learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. AR Diagnostic and STAR Reports analyzed by classroom and ESE teachers.
2. Classroom observations and teacher implementation of the standards by administration.
3. Analysis of student products, formative and summative assessment data, .
4. Weekly collaborative planning with Literacy Coach.
5. Literacy Coach will meet with each grade level for a Collaborative Planning Day once per year. Substitutes will cover classrooms during planning days. Teachers will meet during summer months to review school data and plan appropriately for the coming school year.
6. Title I Paras will work daily with small groups of students in K-5th grades in the areas of ELA to support instruction of standards.
7. Library books will be purchased to ensure enough reading materials at all reading levels.
8. After school tutoring will be offered for students.
9. Teachers will communicate via phone calls, texting, agendas, Tuesday Folders, and Family Night meetings to inform them of their child's academic and behavioral status.

Person Responsible	Lee Kranek (lee.kranek@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2021, 73% of all students were proficient in the area of math, according to FSA data. 60% of students showed learning gains, but only 41% of the lowest 25% showed learning gains in math. 33% of incoming 4th graders are not proficient in math 34% of incoming 4th graders are not proficient in math 14% of incoming 5th graders are not proficient in math By bringing all students up to proficiency, we will be able to increase proficiency for all subgroups and in the lowest 25% in the area of math.
Measurable Outcome:	62% of economically disadvantage will make learning gains in math 50% of students with disabilities will make learning gains in math
Monitoring:	Unit/module assessments STAR Math assessments
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lee Kranek (lee.kranek@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Monitoring STAR assessment data, which will be used to compare students' current levels to those they achieved on FSA math in 3rd and 4th grades 2020-2021. Monitoring math module data so that teachers will have the ability to provide individual student scaffolding support as needed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The strong correlation between STAR assessment data between FSA has been researched and documented. The STAR reports will allow teachers to the ability to make quarterly adjustments to individual student learning. The math module results will allow the teachers the ability to provide scaffolding as needed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. STAR Reports analyzed by administration and classroom and ESE teachers.
2. Classroom observations and teacher implementation of the standards by administration.
3. Analysis of student products, formative and summative assessment data.
4. Each grade level will meet for a Collaborative Planning Day once per year. Substitutes will cover classrooms during planning days.
5. Title I Paras will work daily with small groups of students in K-5th grades in the areas of math to support instruction of standards.
6. Teachers will use Reflex to support mathematical fluency.
7. After school tutoring will be offered for students.
8. Teachers will make parent phone calls to inform them of their child's academic and behavioral status.

Person Responsible	Lee Kranek (lee.kranek@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Incident Ranking Details show that CCE had 2 violent incidents (a student threatened another student with bodily harm and that same student hit another student) in 2019-2020 and 1 property incident (a student stole an iPhone from another student).
Suspension Information shows that we had a total of 30 students earn out of school suspensions in 2019, with 14 of those having multiple incidents.
CCE has been allocated an LEA for the 2021-2022 school year. This will allow the guidance counselor to be proactive with students exhibiting inappropriate behaviors. She will have time to work with individual and small groups of students to teach them coping skills and give them strategies that will allow them to remain in the classroom. We plan to begin the MTSS process for behavior more quickly than in the past for students who are not being successful in the classroom. We will provide additional support to teachers who struggle with classroom management.

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.

CCE implements a school-wide PBiS plan and behavior framework (CHAMPS). Teachers provide lessons on classroom and common area behavior expectations, including bus expectations. Behavior expectations are modeled, taught, and practiced in all common areas of the school and monitored by all staff members on campus.
Teachers provide Sanford Harmony community building lessons, team building activities embedded within academics, and monthly character building lessons in each classroom. Administrators review expectations daily during the morning announcements.
Our PTO members provide grants for the teachers, pay for field trips and transportation, purchased equipment for recess and provide gifts to show appreciation to the school staff throughout the school year
SAC Committee includes staff members, parents, and community members which meet quarterly to discuss the areas of strengths and needs of our school, analyze student data, and make financial decisions that would best meet the needs of our students.
The Great American Teach In is a day we dedicate to our students to learn about careers and hobbies by welcoming in a variety of community business owners to share their expertise.
Business Partners invest in our school as sponsors to provide resources such as iPad carts, library books, and on-line learning subscriptions to further learning.

Volunteers dedicate their time to assist in classrooms, work with small group of students and read with students individually.

The Title I Annual Parent Meeting and Open House is held at the beginning of the school year to discuss school expectations, Title I funding, Title I, Compact and Parent Family Engagement Plan.

Family nights are held throughout the year to discuss curriculum, FSA state testing, classroom and school expectations.

All stakeholder groups are asked for feedback and suggestions on how to improve the whole school experience at CCE. This includes parents (family nights, PTO meetings, SAC meetings), community members (SAC meetings), volunteers (volunteer orientation), social worker (school visits), universities (field studies and internship programs), and students (PBiS surveys) and staff (family nights, conference nights, PBiS days).

Communication is on-going with all stakeholders through: newsletters, agendas, Tuesday Folders, Remind messages, conference nights, calendar dates, and emails.

Teachers serve as facilitators to various clubs, such as Kindness Club, Garden Club, Chorus, and Art Club.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Teachers provide lessons and model behavior expectations, Sanford Harmony community building lessons, team building activities, and monthly character building lessons in each classroom.

Administrators review expectations daily during the morning announcements, communicate often with staff and parents, have an open door policy, are visible daily to staff, students, and parents.

PTO provide grants for the teachers, pay for field trips and transportation, purchased equipment for recess and provide gifts to show appreciation to the school staff throughout the school year

SAC Committee meets quarterly to discuss the areas of strengths and needs of our school, analyze student data, and make financial decisions that would best meet the needs of our students.

Business Partners invest in our school as sponsors to provide resources such as iPad carts, library books, and on-line learning subscriptions to further learning, and volunteer to share their expertise with students.

Volunteers dedicate their time to assist in classrooms, work with small group of students and read with students individually.

Teachers serve as facilitators to various clubs, such as Kindness Club, Garden Club, Chorus, and Art Club.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$126,503.54
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	100-Salaries	0081 - Cleveland Court Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$57,124.59
			Notes: Literacy Coach			
	5100	100-Salaries	0081 - Cleveland Court Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$53,168.34
			Notes: Title I Para-educators			
	5900	100-Salaries	0081 - Cleveland Court Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$5,553.55
			Notes: Extended Learning			

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6300	100-Salaries	0081 - Cleveland Court Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$4,319.23
		Notes: Summer Planning				
	6150	510-Supplies	0081 - Cleveland Court Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$2,436.43
		Notes: Family Engagement--Agendas, Tuesday Folders, and Family Night supplies				
	6300	140-Substitute Teachers	0081 - Cleveland Court Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$2,502.40
		Notes: Substitutes during collaborative planning day				
	6200	612-Library Books for Existing Libraries	0081 - Cleveland Court Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$1,399.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$3,295.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0081 - Cleveland Court Elem. School	Title, I Part A		$3,295.00
		Notes: Subscription to Reflex Math				
					Total:	**$129,798.54**