

Polk County Public Schools

# Polk City Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>25</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>26</b> |

# Polk City Elementary School

125 BOUGAINVILLEA AVE S, Polk City, FL 33868

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Jennifer Erb Hancock**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (50%)<br>2017-18: C (43%)<br>2016-17: B (54%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southwest   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   |   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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](http://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

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>26</b> |

## Polk City Elementary School

125 BOUGAINVILLEA AVE S, Polk City, FL 33868

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

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 32%  |

### 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.**

Polk City Elementary will demonstrate high expectations by collaborating and communicating with the community, parents, staff and students to foster a safe, respectful and diverse learning environment that provides differentiated opportunities for all to think critically and participate in student centered, rigorous, standards based, high quality instruction.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Polk City Elementary School students will be independent thinkers and problem solvers who work cooperatively to meet high expectations in order to become lifelong learners.

### 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  |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Erb-hancock, Jennifer | Principal           | To provide the vision and leadership necessary to develop and administer educational programs that optimize the human and material resources available. These programs will ensure implementation of learning processes for all students leading to enhanced student achievement within the context or providing a safe and successful school for students, staff, parents and community in support of enhanced student learning.  |
| Menetre, Ashley       | Assistant Principal | Assists the school principal in sharing the vision and leadership necessary to develop and administer educational programs that optimize the human and material resources available. These programs will ensure implementation of learning processes for all students leading to enhanced student achievement within the context of providing a safe and successful school for students, staff, parents and community in support of enhanced student learning.                                 |
| Miller, Jessica       | Reading Coach       | The school based coach is responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. The coach is also responsible for professional development, coaching teachers about data collection, analysis, interpretation, and usage; research based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools. |
| Fuller, Courtney      | Math Coach          | The school based coach is responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. The coach is also responsible for professional development, coaching teachers about data collection, analysis, interpretation, and usage; research based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools. |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2012, Jennifer Erb Hancock

**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.*

5

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

27

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

497

**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.**

1

**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           | 93 | 77 | 92 | 84 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 422   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 19 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 90    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 2  | 5  | 4  | 4  | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |
| 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           | 20 | 37 | 32 | 18 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 132   |

**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           | 5 | 13 | 13 | 11 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 68    |

**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     | 4           | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| 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**

Friday 7/16/2021

**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               | 110         | 79 | 101 | 106 | 73 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 555   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 25          | 13 | 7   | 14  | 11 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 88    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 2  | 4   | 3   | 9  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 5           | 2  | 5   | 4   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Course failure in Math                    | 4           | 0  | 1   | 0   | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0   | 4   | 6  | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 31    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0   | 2   | 10 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| Dec. 2019 Star Reading Level 1            | 0           | 1  | 2   | 27  | 16 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 64    |
| Dec. 2019 Star Math Level 1               | 0           | 8  | 15  | 15  | 13 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 70    |

**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 | 5           | 3 | 8 | 22 | 20 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 84    |

**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     | 4           | 3 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |

**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               | 110         | 79 | 101 | 106 | 73 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 555   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 25          | 13 | 7   | 14  | 11 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 88    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 2  | 4   | 3   | 9  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 5           | 2  | 5   | 4   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Course failure in Math                    | 4           | 0  | 1   | 0   | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0   | 4   | 6  | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 31    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0   | 2   | 10 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| Dec. 2019 Star Reading Level 1            | 0           | 1  | 2   | 27  | 16 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 64    |
| Dec. 2019 Star Math Level 1               | 0           | 8  | 15  | 15  | 13 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 70    |

**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 | 5           | 3 | 8 | 22 | 20 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 84    |

**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     | 4           | 3 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 19 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 4  |

**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             |        |          |       | 52%    | 51%      | 57%   | 47%    | 50%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 46%    | 51%      | 58%   | 44%    | 51%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 48%    | 49%      | 53%   | 37%    | 45%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 53%    | 57%      | 63%   | 54%    | 58%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 53%    | 56%      | 62%   | 48%    | 56%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 50%    | 47%      | 51%   | 27%    | 44%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 47%    | 47%      | 53%   | 47%    | 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 | 61%    | 52%      | 9%                         | 58%   | 3%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 43%    | 48%      | -5%                        | 58%   | -15%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -61%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 39%    | 47%      | -8%                        | 56%   | -17%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -43%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 54%    | 56%      | -2%                        | 64%   | -10%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -52%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 42%    | 51%      | -9%                        | 60%   | -18%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -54%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 38%    | 45%      | -7%                        | 53%   | -15%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

1-2 utilized STAR Early Lit, Reading and Math

3-4 utilized STAR Reading and Math

5 utilized STAR Reading and Math; quarterly science assessments

| Grade 1               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 47   | 69     | 56     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 38   | 61     | 56     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 25   | 58     | 31     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 17   | 43     | 2      |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 69   | 58     | 43     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 62   | 51     | 37     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 58   | 50     | 29     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 33   | 29     | 17     |

| Grade 2               |                            |        |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 35,100 | 51,72  | 61,52  |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 23,100 | 43,63  | 55,44  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 33,100 | 20,25  | 21,33  |
|                       | English Language Learners  | na     | 40,100 | 33,33  |
|                       |                            |        |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 44     | 50     | 45     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 34     | 39     | 38     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 17     | 31     | 28     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | na     | 25     | 25     |
|                       |                            |        |        |        |
| Grade 3               |                            |        |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 48     | 48     | 43     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 43     | 42     | 35     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 19     | 6      | 10     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | na     | 33     | 20     |
|                       |                            |        |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 37     | 48     | 38     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 30     | 43     | 30     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 10     | 11     | 10     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 20     | 25     | 20     |
|                       |                            |        |        |        |

| Grade 4               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 51   | 48     | 43     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 42   | 31     | 34     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 15   | 31     | 14     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 100  | 75     | 50     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 51   | 52     | 57     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 44   | 38     | 46     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 23   | 31     | 29     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 75   | 50     | 50     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
| Grade 5               |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 45   | 42     | 43     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 44   | 42     | 37     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 33   | 45     | 45     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 38   | 50     | 43     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 40   | 31     | 28     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 40   | 25     | 22     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 8    | 27     | 27     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 50   | 13     | 29     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science               | All Students               | 57   | 49     | 47     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 54   | 44     | 43     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 50   | 45     | 60     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 58   | 48     | 52     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| <b>2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2019-20</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2019-20</b> |
| SWD  | 20              |               |                    | 18               | 50             |                     | 40              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 59              |               |                    | 35               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 47              | 33            |                    | 39               | 46             |                     | 46              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 37              | 35            | 45                 | 41               | 36             | 55                  | 46              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 33              | 35            | 50                 | 35               | 34             | 50                  | 42              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b> |
| SWD  | 26              | 25            | 27                 | 41               | 52             | 70                  |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 52              | 57            |                    | 32               | 60             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 53              | 55            |                    | 43               | 42             |                     | 37              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 52              | 44            | 48                 | 56               | 55             | 52                  | 54              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 46              | 46            | 44                 | 41               | 44             | 42                  | 30              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b> |
| SWD  | 32              | 44            | 42                 | 36               | 50             | 50                  |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 31              | 70            |                    | 44               | 64             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 40              |               |                    | 60               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 50              | 42            |                    | 49               | 50             | 30                  |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 48              | 48            | 44                 | 55               | 45             | 13                  | 54              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 41              | 43            | 33                 | 47               | 40             | 22                  | 44              |                |                  |                          |                                |

**ESSA Data Review**

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

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 47  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 56  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 378 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |
| Percent Tested  | 98% |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>  |     |

| Students With Disabilities   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 32  |
| 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                                      | 50  |
| 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                                |     |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 45  |
| 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   | 42 |
| 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                                | 41 |
| 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?

According to 20-21 STAR Early Lit and STAR Math there is a lack of proficiency in grades 1-2 for ELL students and SWD. According to 20-21 STAR Reading and Math there is a lack of proficiency in grade 3 for ELL students and SWD. According to 20-21 STAR Reading and Math there is a lack of proficiency in grade 4 for SWD. According to 20-21 STAR Reading and Math all students in grade 5, regardless of subgroups, are making similar achievement progress. When comparing 2019 FSA and 2021 Spring STAR there is a decline in proficiency rates among students in grades 3-5 in ELA and Math.

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

SWD across all grade levels in both ELA and math demonstrate the greatest 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?

The contributing factors to this need for improvement was e-learning, students and/or teachers attendance, and scheduling of SWD adversely impacted the level of IEP support and instructional practices. Additionally, teacher misconceptions about MTSS have contributed to the low SWD scores. Furthermore, analysis of student progress towards mastery of both remedial skills and grade level skills we lacking.

The new actions needed to be addressed for need of improvement is bringing back all students to campus and equally distribute SWD among homeroom teachers to effectively schedule ESE teacher support. Instructional practices will be adjusted to meet the specific needs of the learners. Support teachers in learning about MTSS and implementing best practices with fidelity. We also need to regularly analyze SWD data with a holistic approach and make adjustments to both the level and area of supports being provided.

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



According to progress monitoring students in grades K-2 showed the most improvement, moving from Early Lit to STAR Reading.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement was professional development about the importance of foundational skills, collaborative planning focused on foundational skills and intentional use of small group instruction. New actions in this area included intentional planning in teaching and tasks for small group instruction, and data analysis of STAR Early Lit. and formative assessments. Additionally, the use of guided reading utilizing decodable texts increased the authentic application and use of foundational skills.

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

In order to accelerate learning, data will be analyzed in all content areas to effectively plan rigorous and engaging Tier 1 instruction. As well as plan for purposeful, small group instruction in ELA and Mathematics to support students in what they need currently to succeed as well as closing the gaps from their previous learning. Teachers will also need to know what is required of the new Florida BEST standards. Teachers will also need to regularly monitor small group data and adjust their instruction to meet the needs of their students.

**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 focused on the new Florida BEST standards, guided reading, number talks, MTSS problem solving will be offered to teachers. In addition, on demand professional development through PLC's and coaching will be provided as necessary (requested or by need). We will also utilize the on demand PD in Schoology to support teacher's specific needs. Teacher leaders will be identified as model classrooms based on specific areas of success. These classrooms will be utilized through side-by-side coaching, offering teachers the opportunity to learn from each other and grow in their practice.

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

In order to ensure sustainability of improvement it is important that we continuously monitor our plan and adjust as necessary to meet the needs of our students, families, and teachers. Constant communication between all stakeholders in necessary for success. In addition, we will need mental health services and counseling to support students with trauma. We will utilize extended learning opportunities for students. Additional parent and family engagement events to increase parent and family support is necessary. It is also important to create teacher leaders throughout the campus that can support the work of the instructional coaches through distributed leadership. Continuous professional development and implementation support is also necessary for sustainability. Finally, creating a culture where teachers, students, and families feel supported and valued is imperative to success.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Based on STAR Progress Monitoring data, K-5 students with disabilities are underperforming compared to their general education peers in both ELA and Math. Overall student data shows students who are not proficient with Tier 1 instruction will require Tier 2/3 interventions to close the achievement gap. Teachers will use data to diagnose student deficiencies, intentional planned targeted intervention and acceleration lessons, consistently deliver targeted intervention and acceleration lessons, monitor student progress and adjust instruction based upon response to intervention and acceleration. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Increase ELA proficiency levels as measured by STAR for SWD in grades 1-5 from 42% proficient overall to 55%. Increase Math proficiency levels as measured by STAR for SWD in grades 1-5 from 48% proficient overall to 55%.  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Teachers will monitor student data and adjust instruction. Leadership team will conduct walkthroughs, provide feedback and coaching as well as support MTSS problem solving process (including data chats).   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Teachers will use data to diagnose student deficiencies, intentionally plan targeted intervention lessons, consistently deliver targeted intervention and accelerations lessons, monitor student progress and adjust instruction based on response to intervention. Teachers will use guided reading strategies and targeted interventions to address specific weaknesses and provide acceleration in ELA . Teachers will use targeted interventions to address specific weaknesses and provide acceleration in Math. Teachers will monitor data and adjust interventions consistently.                                 |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Research supports that guided reading and small group instruction increases proficiency and closes the achievement gap by scaffolding instruction and differentiating tasks to meet the student at their current instructional level. Monitoring student response to intervention, and making instructional adjustments to meet the needs of diverse learners will increase student achievement.  |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Academic coaches will provide professional development on the MTSS process and monthly monitoring and support of PLCs.

Literacy coach will provide quarterly guided reading professional development.

Math coach will provide professional development in math small group instruction.

Professional development will be provided wither during the school day (subs required) or after school (special activity log required).

**Person Responsible** Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will administer progress monitoring and diagnostic assessments.  
 Teachers will analyze data to plan for an form/adjust groups.  
 Teachers will monitor student progress and adjust instruction accordingly.  
 Teachers will conference with parents to keep them informed.  
 Teachers will use research based materials.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

The leadership team will monitor small group instruction, data, and plans.

The leadership team will provide feedback and coaching.

The leadership team will conduct regular RtI analysis meetings with all teachers, including inclusion and self contained teachers.

**Person Responsible** Ashley Menetre (ashley.menetre@polk-fl.net)

The reading interventionist will analyze data and utilize guided reading and small groups instruction to support teachers and students with the MTSS process.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

Inclusion teachers as well as self contained teachers will support SWD in meeting their IEP goals by analyzing data to plan for instruction.

Inclusion teachers as well as self contained teachers will monitor student progress and adjust instruction accordingly.

Inclusion teachers as well as self contained teachers will conference with parents to keep them informed.

Inclusion teachers will conference with classroom to keep them informed.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Raysin (jessica.raysin@polk-fl.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Strengthen Tier 1 instruction to increase student achievement in literacy, mathematics and science. Research supports that student use of learning targets, success criteria, and student discourse increases proficiency and closes the achievement gap by increasing student engagement and rigorous standards based instruction.

**Measurable Outcome:** ELA proficiency will reach 55%, math proficiency will reach 55% and science proficiency will reach 55%.

**Monitoring:** Using a trend tracker tool the leadership team will monitor and provide feedback/coaching on standards based instruction, the use of learning targets, success criteria and academic teaming.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will implement student use of learning targets, success criteria, teaming to impact rigorous instruction and increase student engagement. Tasks and lessons will be planned according to the standards. Academic coaches will provide professional development, utilize PLC processes and engage in coaching cycles.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Research supports that student use of learning targets, success criteria, and student discourse increases proficiency and closes the achievement gap by increasing student engagement and rigorous standards based instruction.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Academic coaches will provide professional development on the new Florida BEST standards.

Academic coaches will provide professional development on learning targets, success criteria, and academic teaming.

Academic coaches will provide professional development on data collection based on formative and summative assessments aligned to standards.

Academic coaches will provide professional development on PLCs.

Academic coaches will support teachers in planning lessons and tasks that meet the demand of the standards.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

Utilize PLC processes to collaboratively plan, develop common formative assessments, analyze assessment data, and act on assessment results.

Utilize PLC processes to reflect on teaching practices through peer/self observations.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

Coaches will engage in coaching cycles with individual teachers on learning targets, success criteria, academic teaming, and in the moment tracking data collection.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

Using a trend tracker tool the leadership team will monitor and provide feedback/coaching on the use of learning targets, success criteria, academic teaming, and in the moment tracking.

**Person Responsible** Ashley Menetre (ashley.menetre@polk-fl.net)

Inclusion teachers will support classroom teachers and SWD during tier i instruction.

Inclusion teachers will utilize IEP goals to drive their instruction.

Inclusion teachers will provide SWD support through the use of scaffolding skills, so students have the tools necessary to master the grade level standards.

The LEA will support inclusion teachers by coaching and identifying areas of need for professional development.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Raysin (jessica.raysin@polk-fl.net)

Utilize ELP to increase student proficiency and close the achievement gap, as well as provide acceleration in ELA, Math, and Science.

**Person Responsible** Ashley Menetre (ashley.menetre@polk-fl.net)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Effectively implement PBIS to increase positive students behavior and improve attendance rates. Students who are present daily and authentically engaged will exhibit less disruptive behaviors.

**Measurable Outcome:** We will have less than 100 ODRs and we will decrease violent incidences, specifically bullying by 50%. We will also decrease the number of students with less than 90% attendance from 88 to 50.

**Monitoring:** Classroom behavior data will be monitored monthly. Additionally, the number and types of ODRs will be monitored monthly. Behavior data, both classroom and school-wide, will be analyzed to determine supports necessary. Attendance data will be monitored both monthly and quarterly.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Ashley Menetre (ashley.menetre@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Social Skills lessons and Sanford Harmony lessons will be taught daily in all classrooms. All staff will use strategies learned through the PBIS trainings and refresher trainings. The Tier 2 PBIS team will target specific groups of students, based on data, to address targeted needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Due to the high percentage of low SES students, it is necessary to teach social skills and implement PBIS strategies to increase student autonomy.

**Action Steps to Implement**

The PBIS team will provide professional development on PBIS strategies, school-wide expectations, rules, procedures, and data collection tools.

The Tier 2 PBIS team will provide professional development on Tier 2 behavior interventions and necessary documentation.

The Tier 2 PBIS team will utilize Check-in/Check-out to support students with Tier 2 behavior plans.

The PBIS grade level liaison will support new or struggling teachers with implementation of school wide PBIS program.

**Person Responsible** Ashley Menetre (ashley.menetre@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will reach out to families after two consecutive absences.

Teachers will use Class Dojo and/or phone calls to communicate classroom expectations, as well as behavior concerns with families on a regular basis.

Teachers will utilize the PBIS grade level liaison and/or PBIS Tier 2 team to assist in creating Tier 2 behavior plans and interventions.

Teachers will utilize Google Forms to collect behavioral data on specific students.

Teachers will utilize provided social skills/Sanford Harmony lessons and morning meetings.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

PBIS team will analyze behavior and attendance data to monitor implementation and determine needs for additional support for both teachers and students.

PBIS team will provide on-going professional development based on student data.

PBIS team will create an Attendance Task Force to address attendance concerns through the creation of an attendance program and parent communication.

**Person Responsible** Ashley Menetre (ashley.menetre@polk-fl.net)

The guidance counselor will provide small group instruction to students identified through the behavior data analysis.

The guidance counselor will support students with chronic absenteeism.

The guidance counselor will communicate with parents and work to create intervention plans for students with chronic absenteeism.

**Person Responsible** Ashley Menetre (ashley.menetre@polk-fl.net)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Less than 50% of students were proficient on the statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | 55% of students will be proficient on the statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Standards based instruction and guided reading will be observed, with feedback provided to teachers by the leadership team.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | PLCs for ELA standards to support collaborative planning, PD and data monitoring to make instructional decisions for small group/guided reading instruction and coaching cycles to support teachers. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Through PLCs, teachers will be able to collaboratively plan ELA standards based tier 1 lessons, obtain professional development on ELA standards and guided reading as well as analyze student data. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teachers will collaboratively plan tier 1 lessons and tasks that are aligned to the standards.  
Teachers will analyze formative assessment data to make instructional decisions.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

Professional development to support guided reading practices will be provided to all reading teachers.  
Teachers will be provided feedback and coaching support on guided reading practices.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will keep running records on guided reading so that students move fluidly through guided reading levels and so teachers can identify additional foundational needs.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

STAR data will be analyzed to build tier 2 and tier 3 intervention groups. Students will receive specific interventions according to their need. Teachers will track data through the MTSS process.  
Students who excel in ELA will be provided enrichment opportunities.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

Extended learning opportunities will be provided to students who show a need.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@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.

**The school's primary concern based on the discipline data is bullying. PBIS/MTSS data will be monitored behavior plan and expectations**

#### **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.**

At Polk City Elementary School, we address building a positive school culture and environment in many ways through ensuring all stakeholders are involved. First and foremost, we involve our families in the education of their students through engaging and purposeful family events that leave them with ways to assist their child in their education outside of the school's walls. We also engage a school Advisory Council toward guiding the school in continuous improvement. Lastly, our partnerships with various businesses and community members provide opportunities for our staff and students growth.

For new teachers we have the Campus Induction Program, T.I.P.S. which provides information on specific campus orientation, curriculum, resources, and district initiatives. Academic coaches then provide mentoring supports to newly hired staff, then they are assigned a teacher that becomes their Engagement Ambassador. There is also a School social committee that plans regular events to build and sustain staff relationships.

The leadership team will recognize and celebrate individual attempts at trying new instructional strategies, team improvements, and teachers that are excelling at a new strategy using a method of their choice determined by a survey.

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

Stakeholders include more proximal to the school include teachers, students, families of students, volunteers, school board members and district staff. Other stakeholders include early childhood providers,, social services and local business partners. All stakeholders will support the implementation of the vision and the mission of the School Improvement Plan.

## Part V: Budget

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

|   |          |  |  |                 |        |             |
|---|----------|--|--|-----------------|--------|-------------|
| 1 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities                          |  |                 |        | \$19,250.00 |
|   | Function | Object   | Budget Focus   | Funding Source  | FTE    | 2021-22     |
|   | 6300     | 140-Substitute Teachers  | 0881 - Polk City Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |        | \$9,250.00  |
|   |          |  | Notes: Classroom/ESE teachers will be provided additional planning days that will require substitute teachers. These planning days will support data analysis and targets intervention and acceleration lessons. |                 |        |             |
|   | 5100     | 500-Materials and Supplies   | 0881 - Polk City Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |        | \$10,000.00 |
|   |          |  | Notes: Guided Reading materials and supplies purchased for teachers to implement guided reading lessons.   |                 |        |             |
| 2 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction              |  |                 |        | \$12,250.00 |
|   | Function | Object   | Budget Focus   | Funding Source  | FTE    | 2021-22     |
|   | 6300     | 140-Substitute Teachers  | 0881 - Polk City Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |        | \$9,250.00  |
|   |          |  | Notes: Teachers will be provided additional Tier 1 planning days which will require substitute teachers.   |                 |        |             |
|   | 6150     | 500-Materials and Supplies   | 0881 - Polk City Elementary School   | Title, I Part A |        | \$3,000.00  |
|   |          |  | Notes: Provide family engagement events to support student learning.   |                 |        |             |
| 3 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports |  |                 |        | \$0.00      |
| 4 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA  |  |                 |        | \$0.00      |
|   |          |  |  |                 | Total: | \$31,500.00 |