

Polk County Public Schools

Spessard L Holland Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Spessard L Holland Elementary

2342 EF GRIFFIN RD, Bartow, FL 33830

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

Demographics

Principal: Lacey Golden

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2021

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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Spessard L Holland Elementary

2342 EF GRIFFIN RD, Bartow, FL 33830

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

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	87%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

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.

The mission of Spessard L. Holland Elementary is to provide high quality education for all students in an environment where students are eager to learn, willing to serve, and preparing to lead.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Spessard L. Holland is that every student will achieve at his or her maximum potential in engaging learning environments in preparation for the next grade level.

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
		Principal - as defined by Polk County Public Schools job description.
		All school leadership team roles and responsibilities include:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Monitoring student progress with on going assessments and data analysis to adjust groups for students achievement and close achievement gaps. *Mentor new teachers for growth and retention. *Planning, leading, and supporting professional learning. *Monitoring conditions for learning in classroom. *Collaborating with grade level teams and vertical teams on standards based instruction. *Ensuring quality core instruction to the depth of standards. *Alignment of strategies and activities with appropriate target tasks alignment. *Communication with stakeholders and community members. *Monitoring the implementation of the SIP. *Maintaining focus on student achievement. *Making decisions based on needs with appropriate resources and budget alignment. *Building relationships through communication, mentoring and the shared ownership of student achievement. *Using the adult coaching model to build capacity of teachers and monitor growth.
Jurnigan, Lacey	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal- as defined by Polk County Public Schools job description and listed above.
Willis, Kacy	Math Coach	Math Coach- as defined by Polk County Public Schools job description and listed above.
Wilkinson, Berney	Psychologist	Psychologist- as defined by Polk County Public Schools job description and listed above.
Buchanan, Melanie	Teacher, ESE	ESE Facilitator- as defined by Polk County Public Schools job description and listed above.
Koon, Mary Ann	School Counselor	As defined by Polk County Public Schools job description and listed above.
Rodgers, Erin	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/24/2021, Lacey Golden

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

712

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

11

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

11

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	55	123	110	124	124	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	643
Attendance below 90 percent	28	27	30	32	28	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
One or more suspensions	130	1	7	5	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
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	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	55	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	17	20	8	17	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 6/25/2021

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	113	119	110	113	133	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	689
Attendance below 90 percent	9	11	9	11	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	7	20	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	20	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	5	15	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
STAR Math Level 1	0	9	10	14	13	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	4	5	11	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	113	119	110	113	133	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	689
Attendance below 90 percent	9	11	9	11	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	7	20	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	20	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	5	15	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
STAR Math Level 1	0	9	10	14	13	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	4	5	11	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				55%	51%	57%	60%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	51%	58%	49%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	49%	53%	42%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				62%	57%	63%	66%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				57%	56%	62%	45%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	47%	51%	36%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				40%	47%	53%	60%	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	65%	52%	13%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	48%	5%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	35%	47%	-12%	56%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	65%	56%	9%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	56%	8%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	51%	-7%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	37%	45%	-8%	53%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Renaissance STAR Reading, Renaissance STAR Mathematics, District Quarterly Science Test

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50	77	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	75	64
	Students With Disabilities	33	47	38
	English Language Learners	25	63	38
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	85	76	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	78	74	53
	Students With Disabilities	40	71	28
	English Language Learners	50	50	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	51	47	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	36	31
	Students With Disabilities	15	12	12
	English Language Learners	38	31	29

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58	56	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	38	37
	Students With Disabilities	40	71	28
	English Language Learners	50	50	33
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58	64	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	36	31
	Students With Disabilities	15	12	12
	English Language Learners	25	50	38
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50	49	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	34	27
	Students With Disabilities	13	8	7
	English Language Learners	11	10	18
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48	53	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	40	27
	Students With Disabilities	25	23	24
	English Language Learners	11	22	9

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46	60	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	49	41
	Students With Disabilities	4	27	15
	English Language Learners	27	38	46
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39	42	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	29	27
	Students With Disabilities	4	4	0
	English Language Learners	27	23	15
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	62	48	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	36	53
	Students With Disabilities	40	16	21
	English Language Learners	64	48	65

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	11	8		16			8				
ELL	29	36		25	18		9				
BLK	29	33	20	25	12		31				
HSP	48	33	33	42	20	9	25				
MUL	44			63							
WHT	58	43		57	34	21	57				
FRL	33	30	22	31	25	16	36				
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	23	34	39	32	53	46	15				
ELL	13	43	58	42	50	55	18				
BLK	37	28	46	49	63	39	19				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
HSP	51	54	41	59	50	58	21				
WHT	63	54	38	68	58	43	56				
FRL	44	41	42	49	53	50	33				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	26	18	19	37	31	29	35				
ELL	35	36		71	64						
BLK	54	40	24	46	35	24	40				
HSP	54	46	60	68	43	38	64				
MUL	64			55							
WHT	63	50	41	72	48	39	63				
FRL	55	52	44	59	45	41	58				

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	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	305
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	6
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	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	25
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	34
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	45
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	31
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Due to COVID and the pandemic, we see a decline in all subject area proficiency levels.

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

While all subject areas ELA, Math, and Science have recently declined. The greatest decline is in the area of Math. Based on STAR progress monitoring data we've declined in all grades 3-5.

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

A huge contributing factor to the decline is the pandemic which includes virtual learning, increased absences, extended quarantines for staff and students, and socially distancing requirements that inhibit collaboration and small groups. See action steps listed..

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

ELA scores in grades 3-4 show the least amount of decline resulting in single digit drops.

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

Factors include purposeful purchasing of supplemental materials like Ready books and PD on how to use them in small groups settings. Increased fidelity with the MTSS process and purposeful selection of interventions. Increased circulation of books in the media center including a book cart schedule. Using the AR program and reports, the time spent reading daily increased in these grade levels.

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

Intentional project-based learning in the gifted program. A focus on small group lessons and formative assessments will allow teachers to determine mastery and challenge all students where they are. With the help of STAR and AR, encouraging students to read challenging texts at the top of their ZPD level.

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.

PD on BEST standards, Florida Wonders, AR reports, best practices with small groups, best practices in creating and implementing formative assessments, writing across content areas, project-based learning, phonics and foundational skills, SIPPS

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

An additional summer planning day will be used to introduce teachers to a new ELA coach, the new BEST standards, the new reading curriculum, and this year's focus areas. An optional planning day

will be used weekly for coaches to meet with teachers to discuss data and implement look-fors. After school tutoring will be offered to students in the bottom quartile. Reading Pals will be offered when volunteers are allowed to return to campus. A new media specialist with a renewed vision for AR and accelerated groups. Scheduled MTSS time for tier 3 students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to a decline in both ELA and math, we've decided on a two-prong focus. Our first focus will be intentional planning and implementation of targeted small groups. With a decline in small groups due to social distancing and virtual learning last year, a renewed emphasis on meaningful planning and standards based resources will close the achievement gap with all students and especially our ESSA subgroups. Small groups are a great tool to accelerate learning for students including those who have mastered grade level content.
Measurable Outcome:	With purposeful small groups, we plan to increase our learning gains in ELA and Math by 10%. Within particular subgroups, we also plan to increase our students with disabilities federal index score by 8% and our African American students federal index by 5%.
Monitoring:	Small groups will be monitored through observations with feedback from administration and academic coaches on a weekly basis. Learning gains will be monitoring through STAR Reading and Math assessments. Students' scores should show growth between the fall and winter administration and between the winter and spring administration.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melody Butler (melody.butler@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Benchmark-Task Alignment for small groups *Fluid groups based on data *Success Criteria defining what is mastery *Collaborative Planning with small group plans *Purposeful selection of research-based resources *High Performing Professional Learning Communities *Tiered Supports for Teachers *Feedback via Journey, emails, checklists, and notes *Monitoring Conditions for Learning with small groups *Coaching for Implementation *The use of the MTSS process with fidelity
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting the strategies above will result in successful conditions and the amount of rigor for optimal learning for all students with small group fidelity. These strategies will ensure engaging, student-led learning environments, where students are equipped to apply their knowledge, question new content, and demonstrate their mastery of each standard based on the specific needs of the students based on data monitoring, adjusting groups and instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Educate teachers on our current data and the purpose of small group instruction in improving student outcomes.

Person Responsible Lacey Jurnigan (lacey.jurnigan@polk-fl.net)

2. Provide teachers with PD on how to intentionally plan for small group instruction and how to monitor student progress during small groups.

Person Responsible Kacy Willis (kacy.willis@polk-fl.net)

3. Provide teachers feedback on small group practices during learning walks and evaluations by administration and coaches. Assign and/or offer coaching cycles to teachers who need need additional support.

Person Responsible Melody Butler (melody.butler@polk-fl.net)

4. Progress monitor learning gains throughout the year using STAR Reading and Math assessments. Make next step decisions based on data received during the winter administration.

Person Responsible Melody Butler (melody.butler@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our second focus will be the creation and implementation of formative assessments. After many observations last year, a school consensus was reached that we need more data driven instruction and less map driven instruction. Informative assessments will allow teachers to progress monitor and adjust instruction based on the needs of all students including those in our ESSA subgroups.
Measurable Outcome:	By using formative assessments, we plan to increase our proficiency in ELA and Math by 10%. Within particular subgroups, we also plan to increase our students with disabilities federal index score by 8% and our African American students federal index by 5%.
Monitoring:	The creation and implementation of formative assessments will be monitored during collaborative planning. ELA and Math proficiency will be monitored through STAR Reading and Math assessments. Students' proficiency should increase by 5% between the fall and winter administration and by 5% between the winter and spring administration.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lacey Jurnigan (lacey.jurnigan@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Formative assessments will be used to guide whole group and small group instruction. Formative assessments include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exit Tickets Dos and Don'ts Three Common Misunderstandings Yes/No Chart Three Questions Explain What Matters Big Picture Venn Diagram Draw It Self-Directed Response The Popsicle Stick The Exit Ticket The Whiteboard Corners Think-Pair-Share Two Stars and a Wish Carrousel Brainstorming Jigsaw ABCD Cards Basketball Discussions Keep the Question Going 30 Second Share Parking Lot One-minute Paper 3-2-1 Assessment Reflection The Writing Revolution Quick Check Strategies to integrate writing in the content area
Rationale for Evidence-	Formative assessments allow teachers to cater their instruction to the needs of the students. By creating and implementing formative assessments, teachers know where their students are on the road to mastery and begin teaching whole group and small group

based Strategy: based on students skills and not solely on the curriculum maps. Teachers will also use formative assessments to create small groups that will clarify misconceptions in a timely manner. Teachers can accelerate learning for all student by knowing students' progress.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Educate teachers on our current data and the purpose of formative assessments in improving student outcomes.

Person Responsible Lacey Jurnigan (lacey.jurnigan@polk-fl.net)

2. Provide teachers with PD on how to create and intentionally plan for quick checks and how to create small groups based on the data.

Person Responsible Kacy Willis (kacy.willis@polk-fl.net)

3. Provide teachers feedback on formative assessment practices during learning walks and evaluations by administration and coaches. Assign and/or offer coaching cycles to teachers who need additional support.

Person Responsible Melody Butler (melody.butler@polk-fl.net)

4. Progress monitor learning gains throughout the year using STAR Reading and Math assessments. Make next step decisions based on data received during the winter administration.

Person Responsible Lacey Jurnigan (lacey.jurnigan@polk-fl.net)

5. Returned to departmentalization with teachers focusing intentionally on a core content area in third, fourth, and fifth grade. In addition, restructuring the fifth grade team took place to ensure quality standards based lessons.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

5. Returned to departmentalization with teachers focusing intentionally on a core content area in third, fourth, and fifth grade. In addition, restructuring the fifth grade team took place to ensure quality standards based lessons.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA was identified by the state as an area of critical need because students in grade 4 are 46% proficient and students in grade 5 are 44% proficient.
Measurable Outcome:	By tracking and analyzing multiple data sources, teams will collaborative plan instruction to the current needs of the students in their path to mastery or partial mastery. Focusing on students who are approaching proficiency, we will gather data sources such as STAR to pinpoint areas of deficiency and plan small group instruction, continuously monitoring and adjusting strategies to increase student proficiency by 10% and increase learning gains on FSA ELA and STAR Reading/ Early Literacy.
Monitoring:	Teachers and administration will monitor a variety of data sources including iStation, STAR Reading, STAR Early Literacy, SmartyAnts, and other district provided resources. The leadership team will print and distribute the score reports and teachers will conference with students to make a goal for the following month. Students will monitor their goal and teachers will track who meets their monthly goal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lacey Jurnigan (lacey.jurnigan@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data driven differentiated instruction during the tier 1 ELA block using conferencing with student driven goal setting and student friendly progress reports.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We chose this strategy because of the importance of students partaking in their education and creating ownership with students to increase achievement. Students who play an active role in their education are more likely to be successful and reach their goal.

Action Steps to Implement

Discuss the data with teachers during data chats.

Person Responsible Melody Butler (melody.butler@polk-fl.net)

The leadership team will identify students who are approaching proficiency in each class on each grade level.

Person Responsible Lacey Jurnigan (lacey.jurnigan@polk-fl.net)

Coaches will share with the teachers how to access progress reports and the data template for goal setting during data chats. Teachers are responsible for data conversations with the students and assisting them with goal setting.

Person Responsible Lacey Jurnigan (lacey.jurnigan@polk-fl.net)

Coaches will track students who achieve their STAR goal.

Person Responsible Lacey Jurnigan (lacey.jurnigan@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.

While our school incident ranking on SafeSchoolforAlex.org is very low, our reported suspension is rated very high and an internal audit of our discipline data suggest we need to focus on how to decrease suspensions with our African American males and our ESE population. In order to decrease the suspensions of these two populations we plan on improving our PBIS procedures, implementing Zones for Regulation, monitor use of Stanford Harmony, improve our counseling groups (like anger management, etc), and utilize in-school suspension over OSS so learning can continue. The dean will continue to monitor the discipline data monthly and report it out to administration and teachers through our monthly PBIS newsletter and leadership meetings.

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.

Spessard L. Holland works at building positive relationships with families using the following methods:

1. Daily communication in student agendas, student Tuesday folders, and Class Dojo.
2. Back to School and Parent Orientation Nights
3. Classdojo School Story, school's Facebook page, and other social media sources are used to communicate important events.
4. Parent/Teacher Conferences
5. Volunteer orientation, training, and implementation program
6. Chorus, Gator News Network, Tivitz, A-Team, Art club, Uke Club, and Red Ribbon Run with parent participation
7. Family Literacy, FSA, and Curriculum Nights
8. The school website highlights the mission, vision, and school events.
9. Participation in community event such as parades, singing at locations in the community, and participation in speech, writing and art contest.
10. MLK banquet attendance
11. Blooming Arts Participation
12. Tag Art Participation
13. Hosting a spring art showing with an invitation to community members.

14. Hosting concerts and inviting the community.
15. Hosting school tours for new parents who move into the community.
16. Hold a Kindergarten Roundup Night to acclimate the new parents and children coming in the fall.
17. Joining the Bartow Chamber of Commerce yearly and participating in events sponsored by them.
18. Using local businesses for events held on campus building positive relationships with them.
19. Continues partnership with a hybrid model for field studies students at Polk State on campus at Spessard L. Holland Elementary two days a week.
20. Continued partnership with Southeastern University and Florida Southern College with internships on campus with with teachers.
21. Continued partnership with mental health providers, Peace River Center in Bartow, the school physiologist, and school social worker.
22. Continued participation in the Great American Teach In with volunteers, parents, local fire department, police agencies, and community members sharing about their business or occupation.
23. Continued partnership with Bartow High School and Teacher Academy in the school with the students to coming two days a week to work in classrooms with the students and teachers.
24. Continued partnership with United Way and Reading Pals.

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

Melody Butler- Coordinate teacher appreciation events
 Lacey Jurnigan- Organize staff morale building activities
 Erin Rodgers- PBIS Team Leader
 Holly Cobble, Lindsay Petermeier, Rhea Diyorio, Shelby South, Brittany Deliz, Marci Richardson, LeeAnn Duncan, Berney Wilkinson, Heather Patrias- PBIS Team Members
 Shannon Bumpus- Sunshine Committee Lead
 Kacy Willis, Jamie Schweim- Organize and plan parent nights
 Barbara Vanorsdale, Kerry Villeneuve, April Cruz, Cheryl Lee, Gabrielle Roman, Whitney Corbeil- Grade Chairs/Morale Builders

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: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00