

Polk County Public Schools

Medulla Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Medulla Elementary School

850 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

Demographics

Principal: Gale Macleod

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (52%)
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	23

Medulla Elementary School

850 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	67%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Medulla Elementary provides a safe, rigorous, academic environment. Each child will reach his/her fullest potential and become a respectful and productive citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As a part of the Medulla community, Medulla Elementary provides a safe, supportive environment that fosters curiosity, inquiry, and a life-long pursuit of knowledge.

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
MacLeod, Gale	Principal	The principal is an instructional leader and continuous learner who works collaboratively with others engaging in data driven dialogue to problem solve, make decisions, improve instructional practices and organizational structures to achieve shared goals and improve student learning.
Sherman, Timothy	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is an instructional leader and continuous learner who supports the principal and works collaboratively with others engaging in data driven dialogue to problem solve, make decisions, improve instructional practices and organizational structures to achieve shared goals and improve student learning.
Aranda, Ginnie	School Counselor	The School Counselor collaborates with colleagues in using research in order to select appropriate strategies to solve identified problems, make decisions, manage conflict, and promote meaningful change.
Martin, Victoria	Instructional Coach	This Instructional Coach develops knowledge and understanding of how to identify and use multiple assessment tools aligned to standards. In addition, develops a climate of trust and reflection to engage colleagues in conversations about student learning data and ways to use data to improve instructional practices.
Spear, Tracey	Reading Coach	This Reading Coach develops knowledge and understanding of how to identify and use multiple assessment tools aligned to standards. In addition, develops a climate of trust and reflection to engage colleagues in conversations about student learning data and ways to use data to improve instructional practices.
Wainwright, Christina	Math Coach	This Math Coach develops knowledge and understanding of how to identify and use multiple assessment tools aligned to standards. In addition, develops a climate of trust and reflection to engage colleagues in conversations about student learning data and ways to use data to improve instructional practices.
Wallace, Heather	Teacher, ESE	The Local Education Agency (LEA) Facilitator works effectively within systems, understands decision-making processes, and supports district and school priorities. The LEA also inspires and mobilizes colleagues to achieve goals and implementation plans.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Gale Macleod

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.*

1

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

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

540

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

3

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

2

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	85	79	68	77	91	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	25	19	15	22	27	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	1	4	1	1	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	10	0	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	5	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	19	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	19	23	29	18	25	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143

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	7	11	12	6	22	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/24/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	87	72	90	90	112	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	557
Attendance below 90 percent	11	9	5	10	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	4	0	2	3	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	19	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 Dec. STAR Reading	0	0	3	17	34	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2019 Dec. STAR Math	0	23	30	28	41	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151

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	4	14	28	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	87	72	90	90	112	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	557
Attendance below 90 percent	11	9	5	10	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	4	0	2	3	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	19	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 Dec. STAR Reading	0	0	3	17	34	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2019 Dec. STAR Math	0	23	30	28	41	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151

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	4	14	28	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				53%	51%	57%	49%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	51%	58%	44%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				67%	49%	53%	44%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				61%	57%	63%	54%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				68%	56%	62%	50%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	47%	51%	38%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				54%	47%	53%	53%	53%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	48%	12%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	47%	0%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	55%	56%	-1%	62%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	56%	15%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	51%	5%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Progress monitoring data for 1st grade was compiled using STAR Literacy for ELA and Star Math. ELA progress monitoring data for 2-5 was compiled using Star Reading and for math STAR math. Science quarterlies were used for progress monitoring Science in grade 5.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	SEL44	SEL51	SEL56
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	48	52
	Students With Disabilities	38	29	56
	English Language Learners	33	33	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	54	61	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	58	33
	Students With Disabilities	43	29	33
	English Language Learners	38	40	18
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	SEL35/SR90	SEL52/SR94	SEL54/SR71
	Economically Disadvantaged	SEL35/SR92	SEL38/SR90	SEL45/SR69
	Students With Disabilities			SEL20/SR50
	English Language Learners	SEL24/SR80	SEL39/SR100	SEL40/SR67
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	47	51	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	54	49
	Students With Disabilities		25	20
	English Language Learners	29	41	41

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48	54	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	45	39
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	25	27	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	50	64	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	57	47
	Students With Disabilities			25
	English Language Learners	24	40	35
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47	43	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	35	29
	Students With Disabilities	17	15	36
	English Language Learners	29	28	32
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	42	56	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	51	42
	Students With Disabilities	17	42	43
	English Language Learners	38	52	32

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38	46	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	41	48
	Students With Disabilities	7	7	27
	English Language Learners	5	13	33
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46	45	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	38	42
	Students With Disabilities	29	14	20
	English Language Learners	41	35	33
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49	39	58
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	16	39		18	28		18				
ELL	18	25	18	29	21	27	15				
BLK	38	50		40	47		42				
HSP	33	32	17	31	24	27	32				
MUL	50	70		61	60						
WHT	62	65		60	61		68				
FRL	38	46	53	38	42	57	39				
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	30	44	53	40	52	56	41				
ELL	41	52		61	69	50	40				
BLK	37	49	80	42	56	62	35				

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	53	57	68	63	66	45	55				
MUL	54	64		67	71						
WHT	62	59	50	67	77	83	62				
FRL	47	56	69	52	66	50	48				
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	21	37	35	28	42	45	34				
ELL	43	59	69	55	45		25				
BLK	33	38	33	41	49	38	35				
HSP	49	53	70	58	54	29	48				
MUL	61	44		57	44		60				
WHT	52	38	20	56	48	50	65				
FRL	44	42	40	52	47	37	49				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	358
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	25
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	31
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	60
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	63
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

According to STAR progress monitoring data, ELA and Math proficiency declined between Winter and Spring in all grade levels. In addition, the ELL population showed the largest deficit. Fifth grade Science progress monitoring showed a steady increase each quarter. Based on Early Warning Systems, we noted a high number (28) of fifth grade students have been identified with more than 2 indicators.

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

Progress monitoring data showed ELLs have the highest deficiency in both ELA and Math. However, all grades scored below our ELA proficiency goal of 56% and Math goal of 64%.

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

Some of the contributing factors are attributed to inconsistent staff and student attendance, restricted learning environments that prevented the implementation of highly effective cooperative learning practices, inconsistent use and lack of intervention resources and monitoring MTSS practices with fidelity. New actions include the implementation of running records, purchasing additional intervention materials (SIPPS and LLI) along with providing professional development, developing a new initiative for staff and students to track progress regularly using student data folders, and creating a new instructional coach position with a focus on MTSS.

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

Fifth grade science showed continuous improvement throughout the year on progress monitoring this school year.

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

Classroom teachers focused on standards and engaged students with hands on activities which included frequent opportunities to write in response to learning. A newly hired Science Coach was directly involved in lesson planning and developing targeted hands on experiences.

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

A focus will be on analyzing data and differentiating instruction to provide acceleration. Targeted small group instruction along with individualized learning station tasks during ELA and Math will

be a primary focus. Teachers and students will track progress towards the learning standard and quarterly data chats will occur. Writing will be emphasized and embedded in all subjects.

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.

Currently, teachers are involved in a book study regarding small group instruction and designing differentiated tasks; however further professional development will be needed to dive deeper into planning for and monitoring learning. We will revisit the book study during PLCs while analyzing various assignments and outcomes. Professional development on BEST standards will also take place. Meanwhile, BBY training will focus on questioning strategies and tasks that provide differentiation for acceleration.

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

To ensure sustainability, frequent monitoring will take place through classroom observations, progress monitoring data, formative assessment tracking records, and attendance reports. Quarterly administrative, teacher, and student data chats will also occur throughout the year while weekly CLCs will be held, coaching cycles, and continuous supports for staff and students through PBIS.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Progress monitoring data revealed we were below our goals and overall proficiency percentages had decreased from Winter to Spring in all grade levels. Since our student collaborative teaming efforts were halted during the pandemic during core instruction, we need to regain our focus in this area. Meanwhile, continue our efforts of tracking student learning during instruction. With new BEST standards being introduced this year in K-2, we need to strengthen our core instruction and ensure task/target/success criteria are aligned to the standards within all grade levels.
Measurable Outcome:	By spring 2022, 56% of students will demonstrate proficiency in ELA and 64% proficient in math. To reach this goal, we expect task/target/success criteria alignment in 85% of classrooms by October and 100% by January. Furthermore, we expect collaborative teaming to occur in 50% of our classrooms by October and 85% by January. Tracking learning will occur in 100% of classrooms.
Monitoring:	Progress toward our goals will be monitored as teachers and students track student learning towards the standard/learning goal/IEP goal daily through formative assessments, conducting student data chats, quarterly progress monitoring through STAR, conducting administrative and coach observations, analyzing data and holding data chats with grade levels as well as individual teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Timothy Sherman (timothy.sherman@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence-based strategies include Learning Science International (LSI) strategies including standards based instruction with task/target/success criteria alignment and collaborative teaming, writing across the curriculum, and bby math strategies which include problem solving through curiosity baits, place value and number literacy.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to our STAR and FSA data, our core instruction will benefit from evidence based strategies that when used with fidelity will increase student learning and achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

The reading coach will provide professional development with LSI strategies, and use of running records. She will monitor the implementation and student data providing classroom support and coaching cycles.

Person Responsible Tracey Spear (tracey.spear@polk-fl.net)

The math coach will provide professional development with LSI strategies, and use of bby strategies. She will monitor the implementation and student data providing classroom support and coaching cycles.

Person Responsible Christina Wainwright (christina.wainwright@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During previous years, it has been observed that inconsistent MTSS practices have occurred which have resulted in overall low proficiency. In addition, teachers struggle to implement effective resources with fidelity and/or have a limited quantity available. Differentiation needs to occur within the classroom for intervention purposes and to accelerate student learning.
Measurable Outcome:	During the MTSS/STAR time, 100% of teachers will track student learning and implement MTSS with fidelity.
Monitoring:	Monitoring will take place by conducting observations, student artifact chats, data analysis and data chats with grade level teams and individual teachers. In addition, teachers will have the opportunity to conduct learning walks to monitor the implementation of others while monitoring their own learning through self-reflection and feedback.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy being implemented for this area is differentiation in small groups for interventions and acceleration as well as differentiation in tasks at learning stations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated small group instruction will allow the teacher to closely monitor student learning through formative assessments and provide opportunities for reteaching, interventions, and/or enrichment. Administration will conduct walkthroughs to monitor the fidelity of instruction and documentation of interventions and acceleration provided.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide staff professional development in analyzing data and differentiated instruction in regards to small groups. Conduct a book study using "Climbing the Literacy Ladder - Small-Group Instruction to Support All Readers and Writers, PreK-5 by Beverly Tyner.

Person Responsible Victoria Martin (victoria.martini@polk-fl.net)

Provide professional development with SIPPS and LLI interventions. Assist teachers with decision making in regards to MTSS interventions and acceleration.

Person Responsible Victoria Martin (victoria.martini@polk-fl.net)

Monitor teacher implementation and tracking of all students as well as provide instructional coaching support and feedback.

Person Responsible Victoria Martin (victoria.martini@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

According to the most recent Florida Standards Assessment more than 50% of students scored below level.

Measurable Outcome:

We will increase our K-5 reading proficiency through a focus on phonemic awareness and phonics instruction in grades K-2, with an emphasis on comprehension and fluency in grades 3-5. We expect an increase of 5% in reading proficiency on the spring assessment in 2022.

Monitoring:

Instructional staff will track growth through the implementation of formative assessments and quarterly running records.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Evidence-based strategies include the implementation of Learning Science International (LSI) strategies with standards based phonemic awareness, phonics, and comprehension instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

According to our STAR and FSA data, our students will benefit from phonemic awareness and phonics instruction when taught with fidelity resulting in an increase in comprehension.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide staff professional development in analyzing data and differentiated instruction in regards to identifying student needs. Conduct a training with implementation of BEST Standards, use of running records, and Systematic Instruction on Phonological Awareness and Phonics Instruction (SIPPS).

Person Responsible

Victoria Martin (victoria.martini@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.

According to the data we fall in the moderate category. Our primary focus is decreasing the frequency of students with multiple referrals. A secondary area of focus is increasing the consistency of reinforcing positive behaviors in the classroom.

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.

Medulla builds a positive culture by collaborating with multiple groups of stakeholders, such as SAC, community partnerships, and school-based leadership teams.

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

Medulla's School Advisory Council brings together multiple stakeholders, such as parents, teachers, administration, and community partners. The role of members is to support and provide input regarding the School Improvement Plan and review of expenditure of school funds. Community partnerships include local businesses and religious organizations. These partners provide resources for students in need, plan staff appreciation activities, volunteer their time working with students, and sponsor family engagement events. Administration collaborates with school-based leadership teams to plan, organize, and facilitate tasks related to 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: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00