Chain Of Lakes Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Chain Of Lakes Elementary School

7001 STATE HIGHWAY 653, Winter Haven, FL 33884

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

Demographics

Principal: Suzie Nelson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (71%)
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

Chain Of Lakes Elementary School

7001 STATE HIGHWAY 653, Winter Haven, FL 33884

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

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 PK-5	Yes	74%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We believe each child is unique and has potential. We believe it is our responsibility to instill in each child the ability to think critically, work cooperatively, pursue knowledge, respect others and make responsible healthy choices.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Chain of Lakes Elementary is a family partnership committed to excellence. We expect everyone to cooperatively acquire the skills and knowledge necessary to become successful lifelong learners and productive citizens with respect for themselves, others and the world around them.

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
Nelson, Suzie	Principal	Chief Instructional Leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with staff about data and instructional planning.
Linn, Heather	Assistant Principal	Collaborates with staff about data and instructional planning in the content area of Math.
Klupp, Stephen	Assistant Principal	Collaborates with staff about data and instructional planning in the content area of ELA and Science.
Thomas, Brittany	Teacher, ESE	Coordinates with ESE teachers, administration, students, and families to ensure students receive instruction based upon their up-to-date individualized education plans.
Drehmer, Melissa	ELL Compliance Specialist	Coordinates with teachers, administration, families, and students to ensure English Language Learners receive needed ESOL support.
Nottage, Lavieria	School Counselor	Coordinates with administration, teachers, students, and families to provide support to students needing interventions and/or 504 plans.
Wilson, Kristi	Math Coach	Induction Coordinator. Coaches teachers in the content area of math. Collaborates with teachers about math data and instruction.
Victor, Bruce	Dean	Promotes CHAMP and PBIS implementation. Collaborates with administration, staff, families, and students to support students needing behavior interventions.
Garcia, Ramon	Instructional Technology	Provides staff with technology support. Coordinates with district staff to repair and maintain technology devices.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Suzie Nelson

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.*
6

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.*
11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

84

Total number of students enrolled at the school

909

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

17

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

24

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	133	156	167	158	144	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	910
Attendance below 90 percent	19	28	27	21	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	3	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	29	15	54	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

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	13	16	13	20	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

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	3	6	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/23/2021

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	167	176	156	154	162	182	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	997
Attendance below 90 percent	20	12	10	29	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	4	0	4	2	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Dec. 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	1	5	17	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Dec. 2019 STAR Mathematics Level 1	0	4	13	5	19	19	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	1	6	12	18	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	6	5	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	167	176	156	154	162	182	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	997
Attendance below 90 percent	20	12	10	29	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	4	0	4	2	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Dec. 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	1	5	17	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Dec. 2019 STAR Mathematics Level 1	0	4	13	5	19	19	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	1	6	12	18	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	6	5	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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				68%	51%	57%	67%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				69%	51%	58%	64%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65%	49%	53%	54%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				75%	57%	63%	75%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				74%	56%	62%	67%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	47%	51%	47%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				50%	47%	53%	68%	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	68%	48%	20%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2021					
	2019	59%	47%	12%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	76%	56%	20%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	56%	15%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	74%	51%	23%	60%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

First Grade uses Star Early Literacy and Star Math for progress monitoring in Fall, Winter, and Spring.
Second Grade uses Star Early Literacy and Star Math for progress monitoring in Fall, Winter, and Spring.
Third Grade uses Star Reading and Star Math for progress monitoring in Fall, Winter, and Spring.
Fourth Grade uses Star Reading and Star Math for progress monitoring in Fall, Winter, and Spring.

Fifth Grade uses Star Reading, Star Math, and the district quarterly science assessment for progress monitoring in Fall, Winter, and Spring.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	66%	76%	77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53%	68%	67%
	Students With Disabilities	23%	36%	38%
	English Language Learners	33%	43%	38%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	86%	88%	68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	81%	84%	60%
	Students With Disabilities	78%	79%	36%
	English Language Learners	57%	71%	43%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55%	70%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48%	61%	74%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	25%	24%
	English Language Learners	33%	44%	38%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70%	72%	59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	61%	66%	46%
	Students With Disabilities	40%	35%	27%
	English Language Learners	56%	44%	60%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	67%	72%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	63%	62%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	38%	19%	14%
	English Language Learners	50%	65%	60%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	71%	81%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	76%	71%	61%
	Students With Disabilities	47%	50%	36%
	English Language Learners	65%	89%	70%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55%	61%	51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49%	52%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	25%	18%
	English Language Learners	50%	56%	44%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	57%	63%	53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44%	55%	49%
	Students With Disabilities	26%	39%	29%
	English Language Learners	63%	60%	47%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59%	64%	60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	52%	54%	52%
	Students With Disabilities	4%	13%	12%
	English Language Learners	44%	56%	61%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63%	63%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62%	57%	52%
	Students With Disabilities	31%	24%	22%
	English Language Learners	67%	78%	78%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	71%	61%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	73%	50%	59%
	Students With Disabilities	32%	32%	38%
	English Language Learners	72%	63%	75%

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	20	41	43	32	44	47	22				
ELL	47	50		59	70		44				
ASN	75			96							
BLK	49	58		45	42		38				
HSP	47	47	43	53	53	38	34				
MUL	72			83							
WHT	70	68	38	73	55	29	66				
FRL	54	56	52	56	48	39	40				
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	32	55	55	49	66	59	27				
ELL	51	73	62	63	55	45	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
ASN	94	92		100	92						
BLK	67	67	58	66	67	58	39				
HSP	51	68	65	66	65	54	36				
MUL	73			87							
WHT	76	69	66	82	80	70	68				
FRL	62	68	65	71	74	65	46				
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	29	57	60	35	48	34	30				
ELL	55	69	54	65	61	46	46				
ASN	87			93							
BLK	64	59	57	61	54	31	39				
HSP	59	64	61	65	59	43	51				
MUL	53	45		67	55						
WHT	72	66	46	84	75	64	82				
FRL	59	57	58	69	61	45	59				

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	430
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	55
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	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
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	78
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	57
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	50
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?

EOY reading proficiency below BOY reading proficiency in grade 3-2 year trend
• Economically Disadvantaged students and Students with Disabilities EOY reading proficiency below BOY reading proficiency in grade 3-2 year trend
• EOY mathematics proficiency score below BOY proficiency score in grades K-1 and 4-5 below BOY mathematics proficiency-2020-2021
• Students with Disabilities math proficiency score below BOY mathematics proficiency score in grade 3-2 year trend
• More than 10% of our first and second-grade students remained in STAR Early Literacy-2 year trend
• Majority of Discipline referrals are categorized as Disruptive Behavior-2020-2021
• Inconsistent science proficiency PM scores and state scores (Scores below reading proficiency.)

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

• Hispanic students reading proficiency
• Black and Hispanic students mathematics proficiency
• Students with Disabilities reading and mathematics proficiency
• Economomically Disadvantaged students reading proficiency
• Science proficiency for all students *trend data when compared to reading proficiency
• Science-departmentalization tied to ELA information text standards
• Cross-curricular connections
• Writing to summarize learning

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

• Students lack foundational skills in ELA and math
• Student small group focus focused on building phonics skills and fluency
• Planning with teachers addressing K-2 B.E.S.T. standards
School Name: Chain of Lakes Elementary
Principal: Suzie Nelson
Date: July 16, 2021• Planning with teachers in grades 3-5 focused on student evidence of learning through
the analysis of student work samples
• Students with Disabilities-inconsistency in scheduling due to campus shifts between
eSchool and face to face instruction (20-21)

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

• ELL students demonstrated growth in ELA and mathematics

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

• Consistent implementation of ELL small groups focused on student needs

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

• Novel studies
• Open-ended, multi-entry questioning
• Write to respond to learning
• Plan for misconceptions

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.

• K-2 B.E.S.T. standard collaborative planning

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

• Assign leadership team members specific components to monitor, analyze and report
• Consistent agendas centered around the discussion of trends, observation, and data
• Continuous planning, revising, and editing of plans based on outcomes

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: Improving Instruction for K-2 Foundational Skills in Reading using the new B.E.S.T. Standards. -Training and coaching teachers on the foundations of reading. -Students leaving grade level, mastering grade-level foundations benchmarks. Rationale: • EOY reading proficiency below BOY reading proficiency in grade 3-2 year trend • Economically Disadvantaged students and Students with Disabilities EOY reading proficiency below BOY reading proficiency in grade 3-2 year trend • More than 10% of our first and second-grade students remained in STAR Early Literacy-2 year trend • Majority of Discipline referrals are categorized as Disruptive Behavior in 2020-2021
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to decrease the number of students in first and second grade scoring at an intervention level or lower from 20% to 16% in the winter screening period and from 15% to 12% in the spring screening period.
Monitoring:	During regularly scheduled collaborative planning and data chats teachers, academic coaches, and administrators will track students' progress with interventions and make adjustments as needed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephen Klupp (stephen.klupp@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will offer K-2 teachers time for ongoing collaborative planning and coaching focused on improving instruction foundational reading skills and the new B.E.S.T. standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will require support while adopting the new B.E.S.T. standards. Focusing on foundational skills will increase the number of our proficient readers entering our third-grade classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement

Use of Title I funds to provide teachers with planning days before units for learning and creating resources for lessons.

Person Responsible	Jackie Brock (jackie.brock@polk-fl.net)

The administrative team and academic coaches will collaborate with teachers to provide training, coaching, and lesson planning to increase the focus on reading foundations during both whole group and small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Stephen Klupp (stephen.klupp@polk-fl.net)

The administrative team and academic coaches will conduct data charts with teachers to identify students needing strategic interventions, monitor progress, and collaborate on improving the quality of interventions.

Person Responsible	Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Offer opportunities for families and staff to collaborate during evening events to learn about the new B.E.S.T. standards and share strategies families can use to encourage and support their students with independent reading.

Person Responsible	Jackie Brock (jackie.brock@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: K-5 Science Instruction Rationale: Our school has had inconsistent science proficiency with the district quarterly assessments and the Florida Science Assessment. Additionally, the science proficiency is much lower than our school's reading proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase our students' proficiency on the second quarterly district science assessment from 63% to 67% and increase our students' proficiency on the third quarterly district science assessment from 75% to 77%
Monitoring:	Using ongoing data tracking and spiral reviews, teacher-created quizzes, and tests, and the district's science quarterly assessments we will have teachers track students' individual mastery of the NGSSS.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephen Klupp (stephen.klupp@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will offer teachers time for ongoing collaborative planning and a collection of resources that will enable them to engage students with hands-on science lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing students with the opportunity to engage with complex science text and hands-on learning will increase their ability to process and apply the gained knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement

Academic coaches and administrators will meet with teachers during collaborative planning to ensure instruction is meeting the needs of the students and fully teaching the standards to mastery.

Person Responsible	Stephen Klupp (stephen.klupp@polk-fl.net)

Allocating someone to spearhead the science initiative to build an archive of resources and lessons for science.

Person Responsible	Stephen Klupp (stephen.klupp@polk-fl.net)

Use of Title I funds to provide teachers with planning days before units for learning and creating resources for lessons.

Person Responsible	Jackie Brock (jackie.brock@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	K-5 Mathematics Proficiency EOY mathematics proficiency score below BOY proficiency score in grades K-1 and 4-5 below BOY mathematics proficiency-2020-2021
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase the level of math proficiency on the spring Star Math assessment in 1st grade from 68% to 72%, 2nd grade from 59%-63%, 4th grade 53%-57%, and 5th grade from 62%- 66%.
Monitoring:	During regularly scheduled collaborative planning and data chats teachers, academic coaches, and administrators will track students' progress with mastery of the standards on classroom assessments and Star Math assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Linn (heather.linn1@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will offer teachers time for ongoing collaborative planning and coaching focused on improving instruction math and implementation of the new B.E.S.T. standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	After a year and a half of inconsistent instruction in math do Covid 19 many of our students demonstrated a loss of proficiency in math. In addition, teachers will need additional support in planning to implement a new set of standards and fill in the gaps of instruction students may have missed.

Action Steps to Implement

Use of Title I funds to provide teachers with planning days before units for learning and creating resources for lessons.

Person Responsible	Jackie Brock (jackie.brock@polk-fl.net)

The administrative team and academic coaches will collaborate with teachers to provide training, coaching, and lesson planning to improve math instruction and increase a focus on math fact fluency.

Person Responsible	Heather Linn (heather.linn1@polk-fl.net)

Offer opportunities for families and staff to collaborate during evening events to learn about the new B.E.S.T. standards and share strategies families can use to improve math fact fluency at each grade level.

Person Responsible	Jackie Brock (jackie.brock@polk-fl.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our 4th grade ELA proficiency of 49% is underperforming the State's R.A.I.S.E. minimum goal of 50%. We plan to improve instruction in our fourth-grade ELA blocks by targeting students for interventions, conducting ongoing evaluation of intervention plans, and recording student mastery with individual standards.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase the number of students in fourth grade scoring at a level of proficient or higher from 49% to 54% on 2022 ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	During regularly scheduled collaborative planning and data chats, teachers, academic coaches, and administrators will analyze student work samples and track students' progress with standards using weekly assessments and Star Reading data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will implement the R.A.C.E writing format for analytical writing and open-ended question stems. When addressing essay prompts in both opinion and expository essays, we will train students to use the T.R.E.E planning format. During PLCs we will work with teachers to calibrate evaluating student work samples and identifying exemplar texts. We will have multi-tiered levels of support for students receiving Tier 2 and 3 MTSS interventions. Students will receive interventions using Wiley Blevins phonics kits and/ or i-Ready Reading.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	After a year and a half of inconsistent instruction in ELA do to Covid-19, many of our 4th graders demonstrated a loss of proficiency in ELA. In addition, teachers will need additional support in planning to implement a new curriculum with transitioning standards and to fill in the gaps of instruction students may have missed.

Action Steps to Implement

The administration will reach out to a district Writing Curriculum Specialist to set a day to provide our new team of fourth-grade teachers with training on providing instruction for dissecting a writing prompt, planning for essay writing, the process of essay writing, and evaluating student essays using state-provided rubrics.

Person Responsible	Stephen Klupp (stephen.klupp@polk-fl.net)

The administrative team and academic coaches will collaborate with teachers to provide training, coaching, and lesson planning to improve ELA instruction in reading comprehension, creating stem questions and planning to implement the new expectations of writing using both the R.A.C.E and T.R.E.E formats.

Person Responsible	Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Teachers and the Leadership team will meet and analyze data to target students to receive MTSS services. We will offer interventions in fluency, phonics, and comprehension.

Person Responsible	Lavieria Nottage (lavieria.nottage@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.

Our school's discipline data has a much lower rate than most other schools across the state. Our incident rate per one hundred students is .2, our ISS rate is 1.2 and our OSS rate is 2.2. Based on the data our two greatest areas of concern would be in-school suspension and out-of-school suspensions. The majority of our discipline referrals are categorized as disruptive behavior. One area of focus to combat this is by improving the quality of engaging lessons and improving targeted interventions for both academics and behaviors. We will work on celebrating students of the month during lunchtime and encourage teachers to reward students with PBIS points using specific praise. Students on behavior intervention plans will have a mentor that they will meet with using the check-in and out method.

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.

Chain of Lakes Elementary addresses building positive school culture and environment involving all stakeholders by building relationships with school families and community members in an ongoing, welcoming environment. This is a constant, flexible process with multiple avenues including, monthly grade chair meetings, weekly grade-level meetings, family involvement activities. We participate actively in community and college events and support our community colleges by hosting interns, promoting summer activities on campuses, and hosting a summer showcase.

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

Our school has many community stakeholders ranging from students, parents, teachers, retired educators, community members. These various stakeholders fill the ranks of our school's PTO, volunteers, staff, and School Advisory Council. We actively seek input on Chain of Lakes Elementary's mission, protocols, and input on school plans for decision-making through our stakeholder meetings, surveys, family involvement surveys after each family activity, and a comprehensive SAC committee that includes a sampling of all stakeholders. Our PTO helps to promote our school spirit by hosting family and school events throughout the year. Our volunteers support instruction and contribute to the improved morale of our staff. Our families attend school events and provide us with valuable feedback. Our staff is dedicated, friendly, and

hardworking. Everyone on campus works diligently to make our campus a safe environment focused on providing students with a quality education.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: B.E.S.T. Standards	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**