

Polk County Public Schools

# Medulla 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>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>23</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>23</b> |

# 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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <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>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (60%)<br>2017-18: C (47%)<br>2016-17: C (52%)   |
| <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>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>23</b> |

# Medulla Elementary School

850 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

## School Demographics

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

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

**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**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | 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. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | During the MTSS/STAR time, 100% of teachers will track student learning and implement MTSS with fidelity.  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | 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.                              |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@polk-fl.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | 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.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | 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**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | According to the most recent Florida Standards Assessment more than 50% of students scored below level.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | 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. |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Instructional staff will track growth through the implementation of formative assessments and quarterly running records.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@polk-fl.net)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Evidence-based strategies include the implementation of Learning Science International (LSI) strategies with standards based phonemic awareness, phonics, and comprehension instruction.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | 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 Instructional 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        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |   | <b>\$0.00</b> |