

Polk County Public Schools

Sandhill Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	27

Sandhill Elementary School

1801 TYNER RD, Haines City, FL 33844

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/sandhill>

Demographics

Principal: Kathy Conely

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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)	100%
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: C (43%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (42%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	27

Sandhill Elementary School

1801 TYNER RD, Haines City, FL 33844

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/sandhill>

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	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

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

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.

Sandhill Elementary - a family of teachers and students learning in an encouraging environment where high expectations result in productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sandhill Elementary staff will create a safe community of collaborative learners where students persevere through a productive struggle to meet learning targets while engaging in rigorous tasks.

CRANES believe that

Caring about the learning environment is important so we can grow as a community of learners.

Respect of self and others is important.

ALL students can be leaders in a positive way.

Nurturing staff and families lead to successful students.

Every student can and will learn in an encouraging environment.

Safety is important for success.

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
Conely, Kathy	Principal	Facilitates the weekly Leadership Team meetings. Weekly Leadership Team meetings involve reviewing formative data and making decisions to adjust and support instruction. Assigns responsibilities after discussion.
Renesca, Lindsay	Assistant Principal	Takes notes during the weekly Leadership Team meetings. Weekly Leadership Team meetings involve reviewing formative data and making decisions to adjust and support instruction.
Glasgow, Jennifer	Reading Coach	Weekly Leadership Team meetings involve reviewing formative data and making decisions to adjust and support instruction. Coaches Teachers as needed as a result of data discussions using the coaching cycle.
Glasgow, Jeff	Instructional Technology	Weekly Leadership Team meetings involve reviewing formative data and making decisions to adjust and support instruction. Provides instructional technology support based on data discussions.
Singleton, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	Weekly Leadership Team meetings involve reviewing formative data and making decisions to adjust and support instruction. Provides instructional support based on data discussions.
Chapman, Sally	Teacher, K-12	Weekly Leadership Team meetings involve reviewing formative data and making decisions to adjust and support instruction. Provides instructional support based on data discussions.
Pelletier, Matthew	Math Coach	Weekly Leadership Team meetings involve reviewing formative data and making decisions to adjust and support instruction. Coaches Teachers as needed as a result of data discussions using the coaching cycle.
Lewis, Sarah	School Counselor	Weekly Leadership Team meetings involve reviewing formative data and making decisions to adjust and support instruction. Provides guidance support based on data discussions.
Santos, Antonio	Dean	Weekly Leadership Team meetings involve reviewing formative data and making decisions to adjust and support instruction. Provides PBIS support based on data discussions.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Kathy Conely

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

0

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

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

834

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

9

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

9

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	0	147	153	150	161	192	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	803
Attendance below 90 percent	0	50	41	47	59	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	274
One or more suspensions	0	6	10	9	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
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	38	77	50	66	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	315

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	23	34	27	39	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213

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	0	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/15/2021

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	143	155	155	172	186	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	979
Attendance below 90 percent	33	28	29	33	26	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	178
One or more suspensions	4	3	3	2	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	20	19	37	32	35	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
Course failure in Math	22	12	25	27	27	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	26	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	27	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Dec 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	27	72	106	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	314
Dec 2019 STAR Math Level 1	0	0	60	73	125	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	337

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	4	3	5	5	20	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	7	6	10	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	143	155	155	172	186	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	979
Attendance below 90 percent	33	28	29	33	26	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	178
One or more suspensions	4	3	3	2	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	20	19	37	32	35	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
Course failure in Math	22	12	25	27	27	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	26	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	27	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Dec 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	27	72	106	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	314
Dec 2019 STAR Math Level 1	0	0	60	73	125	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	337

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	4	3	5	5	20	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	7	6	10	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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				42%	51%	57%	44%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				44%	51%	58%	46%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	49%	53%	47%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				45%	57%	63%	51%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				40%	56%	62%	47%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	47%	51%	46%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				36%	47%	53%	45%	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	52%	52%	0%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	30%	48%	-18%	58%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	36%	47%	-11%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	53%	56%	-3%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	56%	-18%	64%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	34%	51%	-17%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	34%	45%	-11%	53%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA: Grades K, 1, 2 uses STAR Early Literacy. Once students score at a scale score of 852 and have a mastery of 100 high frequency words, they move onto the STAR assessment. Students in grades 3-5 take the STAR assessment.

Math: students in grades 1-5 take the STAR assessment.

Science: students in grades 4 and 5 take a district benchmark assessment, testing the state science benchmarks that are taught up to that specific testing time.

Scores are reported as the percent of students proficient.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49	59	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	57	53
	Students With Disabilities	36	15	45
	English Language Learners	27	50	42
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	58	65	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	59	48
	Students With Disabilities	33	45	38
	English Language Learners	45	67	36
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33	47	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	47	50
	Students With Disabilities	11	11	14
	English Language Learners	20	24	31
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	48	45	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	44	33
	Students With Disabilities	11	11	10
	English Language Learners	32	36	31

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52	47	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	45	41
	Students With Disabilities	10	14	4
	English Language Learners	20	30	24
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	56	53	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	55	51	24
	Students With Disabilities	25	40	13
	English Language Learners	44	42	36
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37	41	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	39	32
	Students With Disabilities	17	13	12
	English Language Learners	23	31	21
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	40	49	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	46	37
	Students With Disabilities	20	20	17
	English Language Learners	35	42	36

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	41	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	39	38
	Students With Disabilities	8	6	8
	English Language Learners	32	29	27
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35	32	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	32	30
	Students With Disabilities	15	12	6
	English Language Learners	27	26	20
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41	32	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	32	33
	Students With Disabilities	12	10	10
	English Language Learners	39	36	51

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	14	8	9	14	13	10	8				
ELL	30	29	20	17	11	26	16				
BLK	33	26		16	9		19				
HSP	39	30	19	17	11	21	23				
WHT	49	24		46	25		38				
FRL	38	27	16	19	12	21	19				
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	9	40	45	21	47	50	5				
ELL	28	34	52	35	43	50	13				
BLK	38	56	56	38	29	50	42				
HSP	41	41	50	43	42	46	32				

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
MUL	45			45							
WHT	45	45	45	54	41	43	41				
FRL	39	41	44	43	42	43	31				
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	13	27	32	27	47	45	33				
ELL	28	45	52	36	45	52	16				
BLK	43	49	53	58	62	50	50				
HSP	41	48	53	42	40	44	33				
WHT	47	40	29	60	49	53	57				
FRL	42	46	43	49	44	45	41				

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	27
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	216
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	12
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	25
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	21
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	26
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	36
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	24
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Students with disabilities, ELL students and Economically Disadvantaged students went down in all core content areas, except for 2nd grade ELA and 5th grade Science. In 2nd grade, all subgroups improved from fall to winter to spring and in Science all subgroups improved from winter to spring.

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

Students with disabilities demonstrates the greatest need for improvement. Scores show as low as 4% proficient (grade 3) to 45% proficient (grade 1). In the tested grades (grades 3, 4, 5), students with disabilities have the lowest number of students proficient and are making the least amount of progress. In some cases, they are decreasing in scores.

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

Core instruction, Quarantines, E-learning (parents telling students the answers, absences), Teachers on survival are some of the contributing factors to the decrease in scores during the 2020-2021 school year. Students with disabilities are the subgroup that had the most absences during the 2020-2021 school year due to parents keeping students home and/or not having the students participate online. During the 2021-2022 school year, all students will be returning to campus. Direct instruction will be targeting skill deficits to make sure students are successful.

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

1st grade students made progress in ELA going from 49% proficient to 58% proficient. 2nd grade ELA made the most improvement going from 33% proficient to 53% proficient. This score is from Early Literacy. 2nd grade students who took the STAR assessment ended the year with 63% proficient. ELL students in grade 5 made great progress in Science going from 39% proficient to 51% proficient.

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

The three things that were implemented to account for this improvement are: 1. Consistent instruction in these grade levels 2. e-learning students returning to campus during the months of January and February and 3. utilizing Leveled Literacy Intervention to target the students in the bottom 25%.

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

Consistent direct instruction needs to occur in all classrooms since many of the students did not receive this while at home last school year. Even though they received the online instruction, there were many distractions in the home and parents often enabled the students, doing the work and taking the assessments for the students.

Data driven instruction with timely interventions will be key to making sure targeted gaps are filled for each student.

Teachers will be observed and provided with feedback for improvement more often than done in previous years. This will be done using the "say it, see it, do it" model.

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 will be provided on the following topics: BEST Standards, Power Hour, MTSS, Small group instruction, Effective Instructional strategies, AR, Assessment, MTSS, LLI, "Say it, See it, Do it" model using Get Better Faster videos and one on one observation, coaching and feedback. These will be done during weekly PLCs and through individual coaching sessions.

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

The following strategies will continue in years to come to sustain progress: Observation and feedback with coaching sessions, analyzing student learning, Power Hour, New Teacher PD (monthly), continued focus on data driven instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus	Core Instruction in all subject areas - Teachers will plan and implement effective standards based instruction in all subject areas.
Description	Rationale: Rationale: Some barriers from last year are now gone. We need to refocus on the basics.
Rationale:	We have 27 teachers who are within their first three years of teaching. New standards are being implemented in K-2. Many students are behind because of lack of instruction due to being at home or excessive absences due Covid.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>ELA - % of students scoring level 3 and above 2019 = 42%</p> <p>ELA - % of students scoring level 3 and above 2021 = 39%</p> <p>ELA - goal for % of students scoring level 3 and above 2022 = 45%</p> <p>Math - % of students scoring level 3 and above 2019 = 45%</p> <p>Math - % of students scoring level 3 and above 2021 = 22%</p> <p>Math - goal for % of students scoring level 3 and above 2022 = 45%</p>
Monitoring:	Each teacher will be observed weekly by a member of the leadership team. After the observation, the teacher will receive coaching using the "say it, see it, do it" model. In addition, formative assessment data will be reviewed bi-weekly by the teacher. Instruction will be adjusted accordingly. Teachers will also analyze student learning as a part of their regular planning routine.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathy Conely (kathy.conely@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Knowledge and understanding of the standards and instructional strategies for teaching the standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We will have new state standards for K-2. Professional Development needs to occur and discussions need to happen centering around the standards. Teachers need instructional strategies that will help them meet the needs of all students.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Development will be held on a variety of topics including BEST standards, Power Hour, MTSS, small group instruction, Effective Instructional Strategies, AR, Assessment, Data Driven Instruction, etc.

Person Responsible Kathy Conely (kathy.conely@polk-fl.net)

Data Driven Instruction will include analyzing common assessments and planning for differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Jennifer Glasgow (jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net)

Curriculum Planning and Professional Development - Teachers will be provided three full day planning times with a substitute covering their classroom in order to plan curriculum. This time will be used to analyze data, review the standards and plan instruction to meet the needs of students.

Person Responsible Jennifer Glasgow (jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net)

Analyze Student Learning - Teachers will utilize the New Teacher Center rubric during planning to analyze student learning related to the standards. This ASL tool is based on a rubric where teachers will classify student work as Exceeding, Meeting, Approaching or Far Below the standards. Then, teachers will discuss next steps for instruction for each of the groups of students.

Person Responsible Jennifer Glasgow (jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net)

Say it, See it, Do it – all teachers will be observed weekly by a member of the leadership team and will be provided feedback using the “say it, see it, do it” framework.

Person Responsible Kathy Conely (kathy.conely@polk-fl.net)

Paraprofessionals will be trained in instructional strategies to support core instruction.

Person Responsible Antonio Santos (antonio.santos@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus	Targeted instruction in all subject areas - teachers will analyze data to determine student needs and differentiate instruction based on those targeted needs.
Description and Rationale:	Rationale: Some barriers from last year are now gone. Once we have focused on the basics, strengthening core instruction, we will need to fill in the gaps. Many students are behind because of lack of instruction due to being at home or excessive absences due Covid.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>ELA - % of lowest 25% making learning gains 2019 = 50%</p> <p>ELA - % of lowest 25% making learning gains 2021 = 21%</p> <p>ELA - goal for % of lowest 25% making learning gains 2022 = 50%</p> <p>Math - % of lowest 25% making learning gains 2019 = 45%</p> <p>Math - % of lowest 25% making learning gains 2021 = 21%</p> <p>Math - goal for % of lowest 25% making learning gains 2022 = 45%</p>
Monitoring:	Each teacher will be observed weekly by a member of the leadership team. After the observation, the teacher will receive coaching using the "say it, see it, do it" model. In addition, formative assessment data will be reviewed bi-weekly by the teacher. Instruction will be adjusted accordingly. Teachers will also analyze student learning as a part of their regular planning routine.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sarah Lewis (sarah.lewis@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated Instruction - utilizing data to determine the specific needs of students and using targeted instructional strategies with the students on the identified specific skill deficits.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data shows that students are lacking in many areas, especially students in our subgroups. This may be due to student absences due to Covid. It may be due to students receiving instruction at home and being enabled by parents. These students will need to be identified, then specific skill deficits will need to be identified. Once identified, specific instructional strategies will need to be used to fill in the gaps for these students.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Development will be held on a variety of topics including LLI, Power Hour, MTSS, Intervention strategies for ELL and ESE students.

Person Responsible Kathy Conely (kathy.conely@polk-fl.net)

Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) - Identified students will receive intensive reading instruction for 30 minutes daily from two Reading Interventionist Teachers and two Reading Interventionist paraprofessionals. This instruction will be provided on the student's instructional reading level. Formative assessments will be given once per week to determine student progress. Adjustments to curriculum will be made accordingly.

Person Responsible Sally Chapman (sally.chapman01@polk-fl.net)

Power Hour - One hour each day will be used for targeted skill instruction. Students will be homogeneously grouped according to data analysis. Students will receive direct instruction in small from the teacher for at least 30 minutes every other day targeting the needed skills. When not working with the

teacher, students will be engaged in activities that reinforce learned skills. Teachers will use content area text such as Math Reads and Scholastic News.

Person Responsible Jennifer Glasgow (jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net)

Extended Learning - Students in grades 3, 4 and 5 will be provided the opportunity for extended learning after school in the area of Reading based on the students' individual needs. Extended learning will be offered according to targeted students in reading and math during the time that students are waiting for buses in the afternoons.

Person Responsible Tiffany Singleton (tiffany.singleton@polk-fl.net)

MTSS - Specific procedures will be outlined for each teacher including use of assessments, data tracking and interventions. Professional development will be provided both individually and whole group.

Person Responsible Sarah Lewis (sarah.lewis@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	Sandhill Elementary is a school that is in the bottom 300. Our ELA test scores have decreased over the past few years. We need to make a targeted effort toward effective instructional strategies and differentiated instruction in ELA based on data.
Description and Rationale:	<p>ELA - % of students scoring level 3 and above 2019 = 42%</p> <p>ELA - % of students scoring level 3 and above 2021 = 39%</p> <p>ELA - goal for % of students scoring level 3 and above 2022 = 45%</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>ELA - % of students making learning gains 2019 = 44%</p> <p>ELA - % of students making learning gains 2021 = 28%</p> <p>ELA - goal for % students making learning gains 2022 = 50%</p>
Monitoring:	<p>ELA - % of lowest 25% making learning gains 2019 = 50%</p> <p>ELA - % of lowest 25% making learning gains 2021 = 21%</p> <p>ELA - goal for % of lowest 25% making learning gains 2022 = 50%</p> <p>Student progress in ELA will be monitored using Acadience Reading. This includes Oral Reading Fluency for grades 2-5, MAZE for grades 3-5, Nonsense word Fluency, Phoneme segmentation and for grades 1 and 2 and First sound fluency for Kindergarten. These assessments will be given by the teacher every two weeks.</p> <p>Summative assessments will include STAR being given in September, February and April.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Glasgow (jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data Driven Instruction - Assessing students using Acadience Reading and Running Records, then utilizing the data to determine specific needs of students and using targeted instructional strategies in the area of ELA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers need to know where they are going (BEST Standards for K-2 and Florida Standards for 3-5) and where they are starting (assessments) before they can begin teaching. Acadience Reading (formerly DIBELS) will provide information for teachers to determine a starting point for teachers on targeted skills. Teachers who are using Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) will also be giving running records to students to determine student progress. These assessments will provide information on skills for teachers to target for instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Acadience Reading – Teachers will use Acadience Reading to assess students every other week to determine student needs in the area of Reading. Student progress will be graphed.

Person Responsible Sarah Lewis (sarah.lewis@polk-fl.net)

Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) – Students in grades Kindergarten, First and Second grade will receive small group instruction using the LLI curriculum. This instruction will be provided on the student's instructional reading level. Formative assessments (Running Records) will be given once per week to determine student progress. Adjustments to curriculum will be made accordingly.

Identified students in grades 3, 4, 5 will receive intensive reading instruction for 30 minutes daily from two Reading Interventionist Teachers and two Reading Interventionist para professionals using LLI.

Person Responsible Sally Chapman (sally.chapman01@polk-fl.net)

Power Hour - One hour each day will be used for targeted skill instruction. Students will be homogeneously grouped according to data analysis. Students will receive direct instruction in small from the teacher for at least 30 minutes every other day targeting the needed skills. When not working with the teacher, students will be engaged in activities that reinforce learned skills.

Person Responsible Jennifer Glasgow (jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net)

BEST Standards Professional Learning – All teachers will be engaged in professional learning centered around the BEST standards – making sure assessments are an accurate measure of the benchmarks.

Person Responsible Jennifer Glasgow (jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net)

Writing in every subject – Writing will be a part of every teachers' lesson plan for every subject. Teachers will utilize the New Teacher Center rubric during planning to analyze student learning using the students' writing related to the standards. The ASL tool is based on a rubric where teachers will classify student work as Exceeding, Meeting, Approaching or Far Below the standards. Then, teachers will discuss next steps for instruction for each of the groups of students.

Person Responsible Jennifer Glasgow (jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net)

Instructional Strategies – Professional Learning will be held to ensure that all teachers utilize effective instructional strategies such as: Teaching strategies using Teach Like a Champion, FCRR Reading instructional strategies, Florida Inclusion Network, Guided Reading, The Science of Reading, etc.

Person Responsible Kathy Conely (kathy.conely@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Sandhill Elementary reported 0.8 violent incidents per 100 students during the 2019-2020 school year. This is lower than the statewide elementary school rate of 1/0 incidents per 100 students. However, Sandhill Elementary School's student suspension rate is higher than the state average with 6.1 suspensions per 100 students vs. 3.9 suspensions per 100 students for the state. Even though the number of violent incidents are lower than the state average, we are rated at "high" on the scale. The number of property incidents and drug/public order incidents at Sandhill are rated as very low.

Sandhill Elementary is a PBIS school. We have implemented PBIS and CHAMPS schoolwide. Sandhill is a model PBIS school for the 2020-2021 school year. During the 2021-2022 school year, we will continue to implement a consistent schoolwide behavior plan, emphasizing a positive school culture. Students and staff follow the schoolwide expectations of Courteous, Responsible, Attentive, Noble and Exemplary. The staff teaches the students these Crane Expectations during the first month of the school year. The students practice them throughout the year. Students are rewarded daily on their Crane cards and recognized monthly through our Crane of the Month program. Students participate in monthly reward activities. The PBIS committee meets monthly to review data and make adjustments to the plan. Data is shared with the staff monthly by the Dean of students, along with positive staff reinforcement and reminders. Individual Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions are put into place for students who are not successful following the Crane Expectations. Data for these students is reviewed monthly and the plan is adjusted according to student need.

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.

Staff - We will build a positive school culture with staff by implementing a variety of strategies during the 2021-2022 school year including staff recognition, birthday celebrations, new teacher support and mentoring, staff events, PTO monthly recognitions, Individual teacher and para continuous feedback and conversations and a general positive atmosphere.

Parents - We will create a family friendly and welcoming environment in the school through the following strategies including revamping the front office to make it more inviting, communicating with families more

often on the school website, agenda planners, communication folders, school messenger and class dojo, and use positive family friendly language in all communications.

Family events - We will have the following events during the school year: Open House, Reading Bingo Night, Math Carnival, Science Night, FSA Night, Multi-Cultural Night, Student Led Conference Night, Family Movie Night. We will communicate with families on a regular basis to ensure that they are knowledgeable of school activities. Families will also be involved in One School, One Book family engagement activity to pull the school community together as learners.

Community - We will engage community stakeholders in our school through School Advisory Council, PTO and other events at the school. We will invite them to school events and recognize them on our school website and marquee.

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

Staff - we will need the Leadership Team to continuously review data, keep a pulse on the culture and adjust activities throughout the year. PTO will also play a vital role in providing financial support for celebrations and recognitions.

Parents and family events - the PTO will assist in planning some of the family events. We will also need the teachers to communicate with families on a consistent basis including academics, what's happening in the classroom, positive phone calls and phone calls asking for assistance.

Community - the Haines City Chamber of Commerce will play a key role in communicating school needs. The School Advisory Council will assist in decision making and communication with the community. Our school website will be key in disseminating information to all stakeholders.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00