

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Highlands Grove Elementary School

4510 LAKELAND HIGHLANDS RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

www.polk-fl.net/highlandsgrove

Demographics

Principal: Lyndsy Kulcher

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)	77%
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: B (59%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (70%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Inf	formation*
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

* 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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Polk - 1281 - Highlands Grove Elementary School - 2021-22 SIP

Highlands Grove Elementary School

4510 LAKELAND HIGHLANDS RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

www.polk-fl.net/highlandsgrove

School Demographics

School Type and Gr (per MSID F		2020-21 Title I School	Disadvant	Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)
Elementary S PK-5	chool	Yes		70%
Primary Servic (per MSID F		Charter School	(Reporte	Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)
K-12 General Ec	lucation	No		45%
School Grades Histo	ry			
Year Grade	2020-21	2019-20 B	2018-19 B	2017-18 A
School Board Approv	val			

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 Highlands Grove Elementary is to provide a high quality education for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Highlands Grove Elementary believes in providing students with a challenging and relevant curriculum aligned to the state standards where students have opportunities to work together to solve problems and take ownership over their own learning in a safe and inclusive environment. The vision of Highlands Grove Elementary is that all students reach their maximum potential through their engagement in a high quality education and building positive relationships with the staff and their peers.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Polk - 1281 - Highlands Grove Elementary School - 2021-22 SIP

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kulcher, Lyndsy	Principal	The role of a principal is to provide strategic direction for the school. Principals evaluate curriculum and instruction, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities. The principal sets clear expectations for instruction to all stakeholders through effective communication. The principal works with the leadership team to discuss barriers and instructional strategies to decrease gaps and increase proficiency. They will past and current data from many different sources with team members and set performance objectives for both students and staff based on that data. They seek input from teacher leaders in all areas of school improvement and use that feedback to better understand the barriers and determine the effectiveness of instructional strategies and professional development needed, and next steps needed to move the students forward. Additionally, administrators research and acquire new materials and resources to improve the experience of both students and teachers. It is the administrations' responsibility to ensure that school facilities remain safe for students and faculty.
mcluckey, alexander	Assistant Principal	The role of the Assistant Principal is to support the Principal with their plan for the strategic direction of the school. The Assistant Principal works with the Principal to ensure the mission and vision are clear to all stakeholders. The administration works with the leadership team to discuss barriers and instructional strategies to decrease gaps and increase proficiency. They will share past and current data from many different sources with team members and set performance objectives for both students and staff based on that data. Administration seeks input from teacher leaders in all areas of school improvement and use that feedback to better understand the barriers and determine the effectiveness of instructional strategies and professional development needed, and next steps needed to move the students forward. Additionally, administrators research and acquire new materials and resources to improve the experience of both students and teachers. It is the administrations' responsibility to ensure that school facilities remain safe for students and faculty.
Nance, Sharon	Math Coach	The role of an instructional coach is to work as a colleague with classroom teachers to support student learning in all content areas while carrying out the vision of administration. Instructional Coaches will focus on individual and group professional development that will expand and refine the understanding of research-based effective instruction. In order to fulfill these expectations, the Instructional Coach will provide personalized support that is based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers in support of the school improvement action plan. The Math Coach will be responsible for the following: Collaborative Planning Coaching Cycle Data Analysis Professional Development

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		SIP Planning Family Engagement
milcich, megan	Reading Coach	The role of an instructional coach is to work as a colleague with classroom teachers to support student learning in all content areas while carrying out the vision of administration. Instructional Coaches will focus on individual and group professional development that will expand and refine the understanding of research-based effective instruction. In order to fulfill these expectations, the Instructional Coach will provide personalized support that is based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers in support of the school improvement action plan. The Reading Coach will be responsible for the following: Collaborative Planning Coaching Cycle Data Analysis Professional Development SIP Planning Family Engagement
Sumner, Joshua	Other	Coordinates the referral, staffing, placement, and re-evaluation process for exceptional student education at the school level. Serves as a member of individual educational plan (IEP) meetings as the LEA representative. Provides the level and frequency of direct support to students and teachers based upon general educators' and students' need for assistance. Arranges for classroom and testing accommodations for students with disabilities. Assists in the development and adaptation of curriculum and testing materials to meet the needs of teachers and students. Models small group instruction to ESE students in general classes, as well as in a pullout setting. Serves as a resource to school personnel regarding ESE rules and regulations. Implements a program of study designed to meet individual needs of students with disabilities as outlined in the student's IEP. Provide support for ESE student achievement in the general education classroom through cooperative consultation and support facilitation. Provides small group and supplemental services beneficial to students with disabilities as an extension of regular classroom activities and modification for students on access points attending basic classes. Will assist with progress monitoring, data collection, analysis and necessary changes in the instructional program for students with disabilities based on assessed results.
Loya, Joanna	Instructional Media	Media Specialist is responsible for promoting, supporting and encouraging literacy; maintaining library collection and controlling audio visual equipment at school site; assisting students, staff and community in utilizing library resources; performing clerical functions related to collection, processing, circulation, maintenance, and inventory of library and curriculum materials.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		The Media Specialist uses STAR data to determine needs of the school and individual students.
Wilkerson, Jihan	School Counselor	The School Counselor aligns with the district's mission to support the academic achievement of all students, insuring equity and access to all. The counselor implements federal, state and local mandates; facilitates the successful transition and progression of students throughout the system; develops and maintains a written plan for effective delivery of the school counseling program, communicating the goals to educational stakeholders. Direct services address guidance curriculum, individual student planning, preventive and responsive services. The counselor works with students individually and in groups and provides consultation to teachers and other school personnel regarding students and makes referrals as appropriate.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Lyndsy Kulcher

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.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school 36

Total number of students enrolled at the school 713

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year. 5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year. 4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

Polk - 1281 - Highlands Grove Elementary School - 2021-22 SIP

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

In ellipseters	Grade Level												Total	
Indicator	Κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	111	130	114	127	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	603
Attendance below 90 percent	0	18	17	19	28	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	5	6	8	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
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	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	23	23	19	22	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117

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

Indicator					G	Grade	e Lo	eve	el					Total
indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	16	17	8	17	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator		Grade Level												
indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	10	11	2	7	17	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/20/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOLAI
Number of students enrolled	0	110	145	124	142	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	638
Attendance below 90 percent	0	14	19	16	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	10	7	6	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	11	12	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	1	7	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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

Indiantan	Grade Level													
Indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	6	4	11	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indiantor						Gra	de	Lev	vel					Total
Indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	4	5	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indiantar					Grad	de Le	vel							Total
Indicator	Κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	110	145	124	142	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	638
Attendance below 90 percent	13	14	19	16	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	10	7	6	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	11	12	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	1	7	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOLAI
Students with two or more indicators	3	6	4	11	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indiantan						Gra	de	Lev	vel					Total
Indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	4	5	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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 Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				63%	51%	57%	71%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	51%	58%	57%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	49%	53%	35%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				75%	57%	63%	83%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				67%	56%	62%	81%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	47%	51%	69%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				52%	47%	53%	76%	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	67%	52%	15%	58%	9%
Cohort Cor	mparison					
04	2021					
	2019	67%	48%	19%	58%	9%
Cohort Cor	nparison	-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	47%	5%	56%	-4%
Cohort Cor	nparison	-67%			· · ·	

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	74%	56%	18%	62%	12%
Cohort Co	mparison					
04	2021					
	2019	74%	56%	18%	64%	10%
Cohort Co	mparison	-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	51%	17%	60%	8%
Cohort Co	mparison	-74%			· · ·	

	SCIENCE													
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison								
05	2021													
	2019	51%	45%	6%	53%	-2%								
Cohort Corr	nparison													

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

STAR Early Lit and STAR Math - 1st and 2nd Grades STAR Reading and STAR Math - 3rd - 5th Grades District Science Quarterly - 5th Grade

		Grade 1		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79	83	80
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	72	78	80
	Students With Disabilities	64	55	64
	English Language Learners	86	57	71
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
		Grade 2		
	Number/% Proficiency	Grade 2 Fall	Winter	Spring
	Proficiency All Students		Winter 77	Spring 70
English Language Arts	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged	Fall		
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	Fall 75	77	70
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	Fall 75 63	77 71	70 52
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency	Fall 75 63 60 67 Fall	77 71 55 67 Winter	70 52 50 50 Spring
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students	Fall 75 63 60 67	77 71 55 67	70 52 50 50
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged	Fall 75 63 60 67 Fall	77 71 55 67 Winter	70 52 50 50 Spring
Arts	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically	Fall 75 63 60 67 Fall 85	77 71 55 67 Winter 81	70 52 50 50 Spring 79

		Grade 3		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	64	70	69
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	48	60	57
	Students With Disabilities	7	27	29
	English Language Learners	11	25	22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	74	81	71
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	64	62	56
	Students With Disabilities	43	47	36
	English Language Learners	33	44	25
		Grade 4		
	Number/% Proficiency	Grade 4 Fall	Winter	Spring
	Proficiency All Students		Winter 63	Spring 57
English Language Arts	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged	Fall		
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	Fall 63	63	57
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	Fall 63 48	63 53	57 44
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency	Fall 63 48 24 40 Fall	63 53 25 40 Winter	57 44 18 29 Spring
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students	Fall 63 48 24 40	63 53 25 40	57 44 18 29
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged	Fall 63 48 24 40 Fall	63 53 25 40 Winter	57 44 18 29 Spring
Arts	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically	Fall 63 48 24 40 Fall 72	63 53 25 40 Winter 75	57 44 18 29 Spring 61

		Grade 5		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53	53	54
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	33	33	45
7410	Students With Disabilities	15	30	19
	English Language Learners	33	11	11
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58	59	61
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	36	40	45
	Students With Disabilities	20	10	32
	English Language Learners	33	33	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58	50	71
Science	Economically Disadvantaged	51	35	61
	Students With Disabilities	29	22	33
	English Language Learners	59	52	76

Subgroup Data Review

		2021	SCHOO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	21	23	15	35	50	60	9				
ELL	38	29		44	47						
BLK	29	29		44	36	36	9				
HSP	51	42		57	60		37				
MUL	75			75							
WHT	72	54		81	70		65				
FRL	46	50	44	55	47	44	32				
		2019	SCHOO	OL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	38	40	33	62	63	14				
ELL	40	58	73	66	80		25				
BLK	45	51	44	55	63	57	21				

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
HSP	48	43	56	72	68	60	35				
MUL	36			45							
WHT	74	60	45	82	69	53	63				
FRL	47	50	46	60	56	52	29				
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	25	28	21	45	57	48					
ELL	37	37	25	73	79						
BLK	40	37	21	51	52	53	10				
HSP	63	60	47	77	81	69	57				
WHT	81	61	43	92	87	83	90				
FRL	60	51	36	76	74	66	67				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	26
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	390
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	91%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	30 YES
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% English Language Learners	YES

Polk - 1281 - Highlands Grove Elementary School - 2021-22 SIP

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	31			
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	46			
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	75			
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?				
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?				
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%				
White Students				
Federal Index - White Students	68			
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?				
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%				
Economically Disadvantaged Students				
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44			
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO			

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?

Data based on 2020-2021 STAR and District Quarterlies.

1. 4th grade science % proficient declines from Q1 to Q3 in all subgroups (SWD, ED, ELL)

2. Math Proficiency scores drop based on STAR in grades 1-3 in all subgroups (SWD, ED, ELL)

3. ELA Proficiency scores drop in grades 2 and 4 in all subgroups (SWD, ED, ELL). 3rd grade scores rose by at least 3 percentage points in all subgroups.

4. Early Star scores, % proficient dropped in grades K-2 in both Economically disadvantaged and ELL students.

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

1. ELA proficiency trend has declined over the past five years. In 2017 ELA proficiency for 3-5 was 71%. The last year for FSA 18-19 3-5 proficiency was 63%. STAR projected 20-21 proficiency to be 60% proficient for grades 3-5. This has impacted not only proficiency scores but also learning gains for ELA.

2. ELA Students with Disabilities scored an average of 22% proficient in grades 3-5 based on STAR Reading Scores.

3. STAR Math projected 3-5 proficiency to be 64% in 2020-2021. The 17-18 school year FSA Math proficiency was 83% proficient for grades 3-5.

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

1. A need for increased use of small group instruction with tailored activities for students based on their current level.

2. Administration needs to push for increased data analysis to determine student levels and incorporate acceleration activities for students who are already proficient.

3. Centers and small group activities need to be targeted and allow student autonomy to complete tasks.

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

1. 2020-2021 STAR Math showed improvement in 5th grades students proficiency levels in all subgroups but ELL which showed stagnant scores of 33% on every assessment.

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

- 1. Used data to purposely plan lessons during collaborative planning.
- 2. Teachers used learning targets and success criteria throughout instruction.
- 3. Small group instruction was thoroughly planned with students needs at the forefront.

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

- 1. An increased urgency to use data to drive centers and small group activities
- 2. Increased attention to acceleration activities for those that are already proficient.

3. Weekly collaborative planning with coach and administration ensuring rigorous standards and tasks are in place.

4. On-going review of grade level data and student work samples

5. PD/Support provided to teachers on providing targeted interventions based on data.

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.

1. Support/PD on BEST standards will be on-going.

2. Support/PD on use of district's core curriculum Florida Wonders will be on-going.

3. Support/PD with content knowledge and school wide instructional practices by admin and coach will be ongoing.

4. Support/PD will be provided on how to effectively interpret data for proficiency and learning gains for all subgroups in all grade levels will be on-going.

5. Support/PD will be provided by PBIS committee and admin to identify those students not responding to Tier 1 school wide support and appropriate Tier 2/3 supports will be on-going.

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

1. Administration and coaches will provide support to teachers both in and out of the classroom to ensure goals are met and the resources needed to meet those goals are available.

2. Request district coach support in reading for both classroom feedback and professional development needs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Highlands Grove ELA overall proficiency and learning gains have dropped over the past 5 years. In 16-17 ELA proficiency was 71%, STAR predicted ELA proficiency for the 20-21 school year would be 60% a drop of 11%. Similarly, ELA gains and bottom 25 dropped over the same period. Gains dropped from 67% in 16-17 to 54% in 18-19, during the same period bottom 25% dropped from 63% to 48%. STAR predicted 20-21 would see a drop in proficiency levels of both SWD's and ELL students with SWD's dropping 3% from the 17-18 year to 22% proficient and ELL students dropping 16%, earning 21% proficient.
Measurable Outcome:	Highlands Grove expects to increase student proficiency for the 21-22 school year by 3%. STAR predicted a 60% proficient level in 20-21 so our scores for the 21-22 school year should be 63% proficient. Also, we expect to increase learning gains by 3% from the 18-19 school year. This would mean our learning gains for ELA in 21-22 school year would be 57%.
Monitoring:	 STAR Assessments Administration will monitor teacher planning to guarantee lessons are planned with acceleration in mind. Student work will be discussed in planning
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	alexander mcluckey (alexander.mcluckey@polk-fl.net)
Evidence- based Strategy:	 Continued Data analysis of student levels and understanding Small group instruction (tailored to student needs) Teacher designed centers to reach students at their current levels Differentiated instruction
Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy:	Differentiated instruction based on student data is widely considered as the best way to improve student development and understanding. Teacher's must understand their student's level of knowledge and understanding for them to effectively plan lessons tailored to a students individual needs. 1. STAR data 2. Leveled Readers

Action Steps to Implement

Intentionally plan high quality lessons with a focus on target task alignment and student accountability with instructional coaches.

Person Responsible megan milcich (megan.milcich@polk-fl.net)

Monitor student data closely using STAR and weekly assessments to create purposeful small groups with a specific focus on acceleration for all students and remediation as needed with Tier 2 and Tier 3 students including ESSA subgroups (Black and Students with Disabilities) falling below 40%.

Person Responsible alexander mcluckey (alexander.mcluckey@polk-fl.net)

Administration will monitor the fidelity and effectiveness of the implemented curriculum in both whole group and small group instruction through regular classroom visits and will provide feedback detailing areas of growth, as well as identify trends of need for students and teachers.

Person Responsible Lyndsy Kulcher (lyndsy.kulcher@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Highlands Grove scored 1% lower than the state average on the FSA for the 18-19 school year with a 52% proficiency rating. The previous year, 17-18 Highlands Grove scored 75% proficiency, 23% higher than the last scores for Science proficiency. Since 15-16 Highlands Grove has alternated between proficiency scores in the 70's and in the 50's. These inconsistencies have placed science as a primary focus for school improvement. Our goal is to create consistency, while at the same time increasing Science scores and maintaining our levels in the 70's.
Measurable Outcome:	Highlands Grove science scores will mirror the scores of ELA. We expect our students to score 63% proficient for the 21-22 school year.
Monitoring:	 District Science Quarterly Data Teacher based assessments Classroom work
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	alexander mcluckey (alexander.mcluckey@polk-fl.net)
Evidence- based Strategy:	Teachers will utilize LSI strategies of Learning targets and success criteria. Also, classroom assignments will have rubrics attached to them to alert students of their expectations and allow them to critique their own work.
Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy:	LSI has been proven to be effective by educational studies. Learning targets and success criteria provide framework and roadmap for instruction. Learning targets off targeted directions for instructions while success criteria provides a measure for success.

Action Steps to Implement

Intentionally plan high quality lessons with a focus on target task alignment and student accountability with instructional coach.

Person Sharon Nance (sharon.nance@polk-fl.net) Responsible

Analyze district quarterlies to determine gaps in student understanding of essential standards. Small group instruction and centers will contain targeted tasks for individual student needs.

Person

alexander mcluckey (alexander.mcluckey@polk-fl.net) Responsible

Science instruction will be monitored by administration to guarantee that standards are being taught and ensure task and target alignment to the correct depth of the standard

Person

Lyndsy Kulcher (lyndsy.kulcher@polk-fl.net) Responsible

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

Highlands Grove only had one SESIR during the 19-20 school year. Based on suspension data we had 40 incidents that received suspensions which was down from the 18-19 school year which saw 63 incidents receive suspensions.

To prevent future discipline situations, Highlands Grove has implemented a PBS house system. The goal is to increase community and belongingness for our students. The 6 houses include all students and teachers on campus. They are discussed and displayed on the news show daily with the important traits of each house included in the district's "Keys to character." The goal is to limit student misbehavior because students represent a house on campus and they have pride in the symbolism their house represents. Student behavior is tracked through our PBS committee and students with repeated behaviors will be retaught the expectations by staff members in their particular house.

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.

Highlands Grove will be undertaking several initiatives in an effort to build a positive school culture and environment.

First, we will be implementing a House System. This system places each child and staff member into a House which will promote relationships being built across grade levels and create a sense of belonging within our large student body and staff. Each House embodies a character trait that has been specially chosen to align with the vision of our school and has diverse figure heads who exemplify that character trait. Through the use of earning points, the system encourages healthy competition between Houses and it shows students that as individuals they are part of the greater whole community at HGE. Using the House approach as our PBIS system will also provide us with tracking documentation and the necessary data to impact our students' behavior over the long term.

In addition, we will be teaching "Keys to Character" each month to reinforce the values and positive character traits of each House. The character traits will be taught and embedded in the news show, in reading class, and in the library and other specials areas. By focusing on one trait per month, it will allow us to have a common vocabulary and understanding of each of the values. Exemplifying any of the values will be an area in which students can earn points for their House, further solidifying the high expectations we have for our students' conduct and behavior.

One final way Highlands Grove will be working to build a positive school culture is through the use of the Harmony program. Harmony lessons will be taught school-wide on early dismissal days. Also, teachers will be strongly encouraged to include a daily Morning Meeting time, which builds a sense of community within the classroom, but also teaches students their roles in how to interact with one another and with their teacher. Teachers who need support in how to facilitate the morning meeting can have it modeled in their classroom so that they can be successful and the use of the time is worthwhile and has its intended outcome.

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

Our teachers and staff are critical in their role in promoting a positive culture and climate at the school. Our House system has been created by 12 of these stakeholders to implement this approach school wide and many other teachers have shown their support of this change to our PBIS system. Teachers will be provided the necessary training and support so that they feel competent and have an active role in training our students how to be successful parts of a greater community.

The students are the other stakeholders who will be most impacted by the new initiatives. Because the Houses are multi-grade level, the goal is that the older students become mentors for the younger students which will also promote the positive culture throughout our campus.

The next set of stakeholders are our families. Families will be able to see our Keys to Character on our social media and Class Dojo sites. Part of our initiative will be to send out monthly information so families can use our Keys to Character as discussion points in their homes and how parents/guardians can support and reinforce those values.

Our long-term goal for the House system and our Keys to Character is to build a generation of young people who embody the values and strong character traits that will eventually benefit all stakeholders in our community.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA		
2	2 III.A. Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science			
		Total:	\$0.00	