Southwest Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Southwest Elementary School

2650 SOUTHWEST AVE, Lakeland, FL 33803

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

Demographics

Principal: Julie Sloan

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2015

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (58%)
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

Southwest Elementary School

2650 SOUTHWEST AVE, Lakeland, FL 33803

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

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	58%

School Grades History

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

Southwest Elementary will nurture academic excellence and integrity by promoting a passion for learning in a safe environment while providing a high quality education for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Roping Success: Reaching Our Potential Everyday

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
sloan, julie	Principal	Monitor and facilitate common planning, observations with feedback. Analyze assignments and task alignment, monitor test and progress monitoring data. Data chats, Participate in MTSS meetings, PBS rewards, leadership team meetings and delegation, plan and provide professional development. Monitor, observe and provide feedback on small group instruction. Lead LSI team and school wide implementation.
Draper, Brady	Assistant Principal	Monitor and facilitate common planning, observations with feedback. Analyze assignments and task alignment, monitor test and progress monitoring data. Data chats, Participate in MTSS meetings, PBS rewards, leadership team meetings and delegation, plan and provide professional development. Monitor, observe and provide feedback on small group instruction. Lead LSI team and school wide implementation.
Lawton, Kyle	Instructional Technology	Implement electronic devices and instructional apps to reinforce learning. Member of leadership team, LSI team, and on check in/out committee of bottom 25th. Tutors bottom 25th% in Math for grades 4/5.
Beardsley, Tiffany	Reading Coach	facilitates common planning, assist with aligning tasks to the standards, provides examples and coaching. Mentors new teachers. Models lessons, provides observations with non evaluative feedback. Monitors test and progress monitoring data. Member of LSI team, leadership team. Provides and plans professional development, participates in MTSS meetings, data chats, and PBS meetings. Plans and coordinates parental involvement activities.
Pickrell, Tauni	Teacher, ESE	LEA, manages the IEP and 504 status for students. Provides assistance to ESE teachers, parents and students. Monitors IEP review dates and helps to select appropriate accommodations for students. Member of leadership team and PBS team. Participates in MTSS meetings and PBS meetings.
Runnels, Lindsey	Instructional Coach	Member of LSI team, PBS team, leadership team. Provides reading interventions in small groups based off of progress monitoring data and test data. Monitors students growth. Attends common planning and data chats. Models lessons and helps provide coaching cycles to teachers.
Leonard, Kelly	School Counselor	Facilitates schoolwide MTSS process, and coordinates new ESE referrals. Leads Mental health support team. Leads data chats and MTSS meetings. Conducts student observations for academic or behavioral needs. Member of leadership team and lead of PBS team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/24/2015, Julie Sloan

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

22

Total number of students enrolled at the school

412

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

2

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

4

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	20	64	62	65	90	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	373
Attendance below 90 percent	21	23	11	20	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	3	2	2	2	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	3	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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

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

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	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/24/2021

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	70	64	68	71	75	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	408
Attendance below 90 percent	10	5	11	13	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	5	5	9	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Dec 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	0	14	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Dec 2019 STAR Math Level1	0	0	0	6	12	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	1	7	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	70	64	68	71	75	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	408
Attendance below 90 percent	10	5	11	13	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	5	5	9	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Dec 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	0	14	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Dec 2019 STAR Math Level1	0	0	0	6	12	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	1	7	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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				51%	51%	57%	45%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				43%	51%	58%	44%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	49%	53%	32%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				66%	57%	63%	61%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				83%	56%	62%	74%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67%	47%	51%	57%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				61%	47%	53%	53%	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	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	47%	-9%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

				MATH		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	62%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	74%	56%	18%	64%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%	51%	10%	60%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

				SCIENCE		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	53%	45%	8%	53%	0%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

STAR Assessments
Inzata Data

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	75	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	68	64
	Students With Disabilities	33	50	80
	English Language Learners	0	25	50
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	75	79	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	74	79	63
	Students With Disabilities	60	67	60
	English Language Learners	33	50	50

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47	43	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	84	62
	Students With Disabilities	0	100	25
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48	45	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	36	47
	Students With Disabilities	14	20	10
	English Language Learners	0	20	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47	43	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	37	30
	Students With Disabilities	31	23	21
	English Language Learners	22	11	22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	55	58	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	55	43
	Students With Disabilities	45	31	36
	English Language Learners	44	50	11

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39	48	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	33	27
	Students With Disabilities	0	9	0
	English Language Learners	25	38	38
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	46	61	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	58	40
	Students With Disabilities	18	33	20
	English Language Learners	86	75	50

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39	47	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	37	28
	Students With Disabilities	7	6	13
	English Language Learners	30	40	50
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53	53	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	44	60
	Students With Disabilities	14	19	25
	English Language Learners	50	40	50
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58	55	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	59	44	55
	Students With Disabilities	65	59	66
	English Language Learners	33	25	33

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	23	28		26	53		20				
ELL	20	25		58	73						
BLK	13	6		23	69		23				
HSP	35	41		63	81		37				
WHT	48	54		60	54		56				
FRL	27	31	44	50	68	77	29				
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	36	36	55	42	74		38				
ELL	50	37		67	70	50					
BLK	30	30		48	77		43				
HSP	48	38		72	82	50	73				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
WHT	65	53	46	73	89	75	68				
FRL	41	38	39	56	78	65	57				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	17	31	27	30	50	30					
ELL	40	50		53	75						
BLK	29	34	50	50	63		50				
HSP	41	41		48	77	50	46				
WHT	60	55		76	77	60	59				
FRL	43	43	33	58	72	57	55				

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	384
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	27
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	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	
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	54
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	45
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?

Number of students scoring below proficiency in ELA is lower than previous school year based off of current FSA ELA results as well as STAR scores from the spring. School wide trends continue to show a low percentage of students scoring at proficient level in ELA. Only ___ students scored a level three or higher in ELA. This percentage is down/up from 2019 school year by %.

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

ELA proficiency and learning gains for ELA show areas of need for improvement.

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

Lack of pulling small groups and intentionally planning small group instruction contributed to lower percent proficient in ELA. Lack of planning intentional small groups based off data analysis. School wide focus on curriculum planning and using data to intentionally plan differentiated small group instruction

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

Science scores and math. Science proficiency has continued to increase on Quarterly assessments and 2019 Science scores

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

Incorporating science in the reading block, reading and writing in the science block and including all content area teachers in curriculum planning.

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

During curriculum planning, the schoolwide focus will be on intentionally planning small group instruction based of different data types. Enrichment and extension activities must be implemented to increase learning gains of those students at the proficient level. Use formative and STAR data to intentionally plan small groups for these students- to accelerate learning.

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.

Teachers will participate in a year long study of small group instruction and planning. Professional development on utilizing multiple data types to plan small group instruction and implementing an effective small group/center rotation.

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

Administration and Coaches planning weekly with teachers as well as lesson plan checks, walk throughs, etc. Modeling from coaches, support from administration and coaches in planning, professional development

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will collaboratively plan intentional small group lessons and tasks with literacy coach for all content areas to meet the full intent of the standards and benchmarks. Students will be identified for small group instruction based on STAR scores, FSA, and formative data. Interventionist will utilize standards report in STAR to determine interventions to provide. Teachers will use monthly progress monitoring data to identify and monitor students in the MTSS process.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2022 when teachers intentionally plan small group instruction collaboratively based on data sources in our area of focus and release learning to students, then student achievement will increase as follows: ELA proficiency: ELA learning gains: ELA learning gains bottom 25th percentile:
Monitoring:	Leadership team will monitor monthly progress monitoring data with teachers during data chats. Administration will conduct walkthrough observations and share feedback with teachers based on instructional practice supporting our area of focus. Administration and literacy coach will monitor teacher participation in curriculum planning, view completed lesson plans, and analyze student work samples.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will meet weekly with the literacy coach and collaboratively plan all content areas. Reading interventionist will deliver instruction in small groups using research based materials and strategies. Reading interventionist will provide monthly progress monitoring and meet with teachers and leadership team in order to discuss the effectiveness of interventions provided. Interventionist and teachers will monitor results and make changes as necessary.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Present teachers with research based strategies that support the importance of intentional small group instruction. Reflect on school wide data using STAR and FSA.

Action Steps to Implement

Make use of Instructional coach in collaborative planning and resources with modeling in the classroom. Teachers will plan intentional small groups utilizing curriculum maps with standards and benchmarks. Teachers will have weekly common planning with the literacy coach as well as two curriculum planning days during the school year.

Person Responsible	Tiffany Beardsley (tiffany.beardsley@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will use District Progress Monitoring Data in Inzata to lead instruction.

Person Responsible	julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)

Title 1 paras will be used to provide math and reading small group support within the classroom setting.

Person Responsible	julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)

News ELA, Scholastic, Florida Ready, SIPPS, and other resources will be utilized to provide the instruction via direct instruction and the use of IPADS and other technology devices.

Person Responsible julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)

The school will also offer extended learning opportunities by providing after school tutoring for students in grades 3-5 for both reading and math.

Person Responsible Brady Draper (brady.draper@polk-fl.net)

Additional small group instruction will be provided by the Reading Interventionist

Person Responsible Lindsey Runnels (lindsey.runnels@polk-fl.net)

Provide professional development on intentional small group instruction, Teaming and cooperative structures.

Person Responsible Brady Draper (brady.draper@polk-fl.net)

Increase time with eyes on text by increasing classroom libraries and media center books.

Person Responsible julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When analyzing supportive environment data such as attendance and discipline, it is evident that additional supports must be utilized to improve student to student and student to teacher relationships.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2022, we will reduce the gap between African American students and other subgroups for discipline referrals by 10%. By May 2022, we will reduce the amount of tardies and absences for all students by 10%.
Monitoring:	Utilizing the early warning system, the leadership team will analyze attendance and discipline data. The leadership team will adjust incentives as needed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brady Draper (brady.draper@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS system, CHAMPS, Sanford Harmony, and mentors will be utilized to increase attendance and reduce discipline issues.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our attendance for the 20-21 school year was XXXXX%. Additional supports are needed to reach the 95% attendance rate. PBIS system will be implemented with 100% teacher participation. By following the PBIS plan with fidelity, 80% or higher of students will progress through the available PBIS incentives. In addition, CHAMPS and Sanford Harmony will be utilized school wide to foster relationship building.

Action Steps to Implement

Incorporate the PBIS system, CHAMPS, and Sanford Harmony program with fidelity school wide.

Person Responsible	Brady Draper (brady.draper@polk-fl.net)

Utilize the check-in-check-out strategy to reach at risk students.

Person Responsible	Kelly Leonard (kelly.leonard@polk-fl.net)

Assign mentors for at risk students.

Person Responsible	Kyle Lawton (kyle.lawton@polk-fl.net)

Seamlessly incorporate the behavior MTSS checklist and process.

Person Responsible	Kelly Leonard (kelly.leonard@polk-fl.net)

Monitor and utilize the early warning system and have consistent communication with parents and social workers to improve attendance.

Person Responsible	Brady Draper (brady.draper@polk-fl.net)

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The instructional leadership team will work together to implement intentional small group instruction. Using intentional small group instruction in all content areas is imperative to improve student achievement. Our intensive data review indicates a need for students to own their own learning as well as a laser focus on increasing intentional small group instruction. The instructional leadership will communicate this by modeling lessons, providing coaching opportunities with feedback loops, participating in planning and data chats, and providing professional development opportunities.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2022 the leadership team will see a 100% participation in teachers effectively implementing intentional small group instruction and releasing learning to students.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through observations in the classroom, administrative checks of lesson plans, and leadership participation in curriculum planning
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	By focusing on small group instruction, the leadership team will guide teachers in implementing small group instruction best practices and appropriately releasing learning to students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Noted by the most recent instructional review by the district, the leadership team is needed to support teachers in facilitating intentional small groups.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development on planning and implementing effective intentional small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Brady Draper (brady.draper@polk-fl.net)

Data Analysis and biweekly team meetings.

Person Responsible	julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)

Providing opportunities for teachers to observe in model classrooms.

Person Responsible	julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will intentionally use multiple exposures to grade level texts with students in order to increase reading proficiency. • 2020-2021 FSA data: ELA 3-5 62% not proficient • Fall 2021 ELA STAR Progress Monitoring K-3: 54% not proficient
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2022 when teachers intentionally use multiple exposures to grade level texts with students in order to increase proficiency, then student achievement will increase as follows: • ELA proficiency will increase 8% • ELA learning gains will increase by 13% • ELA learning gains for bottom 25% will increase by 6%
Monitoring:	Leadership team will monitor monthly progress monitoring data with teachers during data chats. Administration will conduct walkthrough observations and share feedback with teachers based on instructional practice supporting our area of focus. Administration and literacy coach will monitor Accelerated Reader reports, Florida Wonders unit assessments, and other student work samples.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will meet with the literacy coach and collaboratively plan exposure to on grade level ELA content. Teachers will monitor Accelerated Reader reports, Florida Wonders weekly and unit assessments, STAR reports, and other district provided assessment. Literacy coach teachers will monitor results and make changes as necessary.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Present teachers with research-based strategies that support the importance of exposure to grade level text instruction. Reflect on schoolwide data using STAR and FSA.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Make use of literacy coach in collaborative planning.

Person Responsible	Tiffany Beardsley (tiffany.beardsley@polk-fl.net)

2. Make use of literacy coach in providing evidence-based resources.
3. Make use of literacy coach with modeling lessons in the classroom.
4. Teachers will participate in planning with literacy coach as well as be provided two curriculum planning days throughout the school year.

Person Responsible	Tiffany Beardsley (tiffany.beardsley@polk-fl.net)

4. Teachers will plan and implement instruction aligned to the B.E.S.T. Standards and/or LAFS.

Person Responsible	julie sloan (julie.sloan@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.

By utilizing PBS, Champs and Sanford Harmony the leadership will focus on decreasing office referrals and suspensions. A school wide attendance incentive will be created.

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.

Southwest Elementary promotes a positive environment for all stakeholders. The staff diligently focuses on improving student academic achievement with the support of a campus wide family atmosphere. Parents feel welcomed into our Southwest family as we strive to build strong family and school partnerships. Students are the ultimate recipients of the positive environment Southwest offers. We believe every child can learn and we work together to ensure student learning is engaging, meaningful, and successful. Southwest Elementary positively impacts all who enter.

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

Southwest Elementary staff strives to promote a positive and inclusive environment for all staff, students, parents, and community members. Students are lead to support one another, and become independent life long learners. Parents are charged with becoming educated in their child's academic journey and encouraged to stay involved in school activities.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	$0.00

4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00