Lake Alfred Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Alfred Elementary School

550 CUMMINGS ST E, Lake Alfred, FL 33850

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

Demographics

Principal: Matt Burkett

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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (44%)
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

Lake Alfred Elementary School

550 CUMMINGS ST E, Lake Alfred, FL 33850

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

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	96%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	75%

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.

The staff at Lake Alfred Elementary is dedicated to helping all students reach their full potential and achieve excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision:
Lake Alfred Elementary will provide highly effective instruction using best practices to increase student achievement.

Motto: "Learners Achieving Excellence" (LAE)

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
Burkett, Matt	Principal	
Wilson, Faye	Assistant Principal	
Crowley, Jennifer	Dean	
Snapko, Rachel	Math Coach	
Hadsock, Jennifer	Reading Coach	
Smith, Elizabeth	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/24/2021, Matt Burkett

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
44

Total number of students enrolled at the school
606

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

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	106	101	94	114	123	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	657
Attendance below 90 percent	28	25	19	25	33	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	0	4	9	13	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Course failure in ELA	0	3	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	37	11	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	21	43	41	48	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	198

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	4	4	18	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 7/20/2021

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	100	107	117	136	120	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	703
Attendance below 90 percent	24	20	14	27	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	4	18	30	25	37	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
Course failure in ELA	3	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	17	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Dec. STAR 2019 ELA Level 1	0	0	0	28	19	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Dec. STAR 2019 Math Level 1	0	0	0	17	11	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	5	6	11	26	24	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111

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	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	100	107	117	136	120	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	703
Attendance below 90 percent	24	20	14	27	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	4	18	30	25	37	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
Course failure in ELA	3	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	17	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Dec. STAR 2019 ELA Level 1	0	0	0	28	19	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Dec. STAR 2019 Math Level 1	0	0	0	17	11	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	5	6	11	26	24	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				46%	51%	57%	55%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	51%	58%	54%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	49%	53%	49%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				60%	57%	63%	59%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				64%	56%	62%	48%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	47%	51%	35%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				54%	47%	53%	65%	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	37%	52%	-15%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	48%	1%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	47%	-5%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

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	56%	56%	0%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2021					
	2019	59%	51%	8%	60%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

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.

Grades 1st-5th ELA & Mathematics- STAR
Science grades 4th & 5th

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	57	69	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	63	41
	Students With Disabilities	13	67	22
	English Language Learners	43	76	47
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	76	72	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	73	67	55
	Students With Disabilities	60	67	50
	English Language Learners	76	76	78

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48	52	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	43	40
	Students With Disabilities	14	14	17
	English Language Learners	39	30	26
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65	58	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	62	50	32
	Students With Disabilities	43	50	25
	English Language Learners	63	35	32

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46	48	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	47	43
	Students With Disabilities	33	22	33
	English Language Learners	42	46	38
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51	61	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	56	38
	Students With Disabilities	22	22	11
	English Language Learners	45	54	35

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41	42	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	38	30
	Students With Disabilities	5	14	5
	English Language Learners	48	35	44
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	44	45	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	38	28
	Students With Disabilities	10	10	0
	English Language Learners	52	55	39

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31	35	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	28	30
	Students With Disabilities	0	6	7
	English Language Learners	10	19	21
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41	40	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	33	24
	Students With Disabilities	7	25	7
	English Language Learners	25	19	12
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	47/0	36/36	24/52
	Economically Disadvantaged	44/0	28/33	15/47
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/7	0/13
	English Language Learners	44/0	36/43	25/53

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	10	31	36	13	12	9	7				
ELL	42	29		40	27		40				
BLK	33	45		33	33		35				
HSP	43	32		46	34		45				
MUL	40			50							
WHT	51	62	55	52	33		56				
FRL	39	38	35	39	28	33	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	18	25	18	29	31						
ELL	36	45	22	56	69	65	26				
BLK	37	42	50	54	62	58	50				
HSP	43	46	28	58	66	60	35				
WHT	61	69	62	69	63		71				
FRL	39	50	50	53	60	55	44				

| 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	38	22	21	39	48	46					
ELL	52	57	44	55	48	43	61				
BLK	38	45	41	41	45	26	52				
HSP	65	62	47	63	38	40	71				
WHT	62	54	70	70	62	50	69				
FRL	52	54	56	54	45	34	63				

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	354
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17
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	40
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	36
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	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	45
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	
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	52
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	39
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?

Reading: 2019 FSA Data: 3rd grade 37% proficient, 4th grade 49% proficient, and 5th grade 42 % proficient.
2021 Spring STAR Data: 3rd grade 44% proficient, 4th grade 38% proficient, and 5th grade 32% proficient.
Math: 2019 FSA Data: 3rd grade 55% proficient, 4th grade 56% proficient, and 5th grade 59% proficient.
2021 Spring STAR Data: 3rd grade 42% proficient, 4th grade 37% proficient, and 5th grade is 39% proficient.

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

Reading: When we compare 2019 FSA to 2021 STAR, we noticed a decline in all grade levels except 3rd grade.

Math: When we compare 2019 FSA to 2021 STAR, we noticed a decline in all grade levels.

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 factors included poor attendance and lack of consistency in the learning environment. Due to the lower numbers of positive covid cases, we expect students' attendance to increase. To improve the learning environment, a focus on small group reading instruction and skill instruction (MTSS) with laser precision planning and implementation. Data driven PLC's and lesson planning will occur weekly. Administration will monitor the implementation of these factors.

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

2021 3rd grade STAR reading increased by 7% from the 2019 FSA.

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

The reading teachers in 3rd grade focused on grade level skills in small groups. Administration monitored the implementation of this strategy. New actions in the 2020-2021 school year included MTSS implementation that was tightly aligned to student's academic needs.

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

We will continue to implement data driven small group instruction in both reading and math. During small group instruction, students will be utilizing grade level materials to accelerate their learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

1. Small Group Instruction for Reading and Math
2. Skills verses Comprehension Reading and Math
3. Cooperative Learning for Reading and Math
4. Questioning Techniques for Reading and Math

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

Vertical planning, peer walkthroughs, support for new and struggling teachers..

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our 2019 FSA reading data was 43% compared to the District, which was 49%. Our 2021 3rd grade reading proficiency was 46%. The instructional review observations, as well as, class walkthrough's showed a need for teachers to utilize small group instructional practices with fidelity.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase proficiency in reading by 7% from 43% to 50% on the 2022 Florida State Assessment and continue in 5% increments until we match the state average. We will then expect 3% incremental increases until we reach our ultimate goal of 90% proficiency.
Monitoring:	Administration will ensure small group instruction is taking placed as intended. The bottom 25% of students will be tracked monthly and each leadership team member will track a group of students in the bottom 25% to ensure fidelity of academic progress within the classrooms. Data chats will be conducted monthly to monitor the proficiency levels of the students. Collaborative planning will focus on acceleration instead of remediation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matt Burkett (matt.burkett@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data will be reviewed weekly during planning to identify students who need additional acceleration. Teachers will use grade level material with research based strategies, such as analyzing the text, questioning, and summarizing during small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our current reading data indicates a need for improvement. We reviewed our 2019 FSA reading data, 2021 Spring STAR data, and the Fountas & Pinnell on-going progress monitoring data. As a result, we need to focus on this area to ensure are students are reading on grade level.

Action Steps to Implement	

1. Weekly Data Review During Planning

Person Responsible	Jennifer Hadsock (jennifer.hadsock@polk-fl.net)

2. Collaborative Planning Facilitated by the Reading Coach

Person Responsible	Jennifer Hadsock (jennifer.hadsock@polk-fl.net)

3. Monitor Small Group Instruction for Acceleration

Person Responsible	Matt Burkett (matt.burkett@polk-fl.net)

4. Monitor Implementation of lesson plan with fidelity

Person Responsible	Faye Wilson (faye.wilson@polk-fl.net)

5. Implement extra supports for bottom 25%.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Hadsock (jennifer.hadsock@polk-fl.net)

6. Monitor supports and makes adjustments as needed for bottom 25%

Person Responsible   Matt Burkett (matt.burkett@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2021 FSA data showed we are at 43% proficiency in ELA.

Measurable Outcome: Increase or school wide reading proficiency by 7% until we match the state average, at which point we will aim for 3% increases until we reach 90%.

Monitoring: Teachers will maintain running records of student progress through their Fountas and Pinnell leveled readers. Our progress monitoring STAR assessment will be used to determine desired outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Matt Burkett (matt.burkett@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use leveled readers (Fountas and Pinnell) to ensure students can read books at their level.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: With the gaps in our students' reading abilities, leveled readers is a proven strategy to assist readers as they progress towards proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher PD on the use of leveled readers and how to keep the running record.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Hadsock (jennifer.hadsock@polk-fl.net)

Additional coaching provided to classes not showing appropriate growth.

Person Responsible   Faye Wilson (faye.wilson@polk-fl.net)

Class walkthroughs to monitor fidelity.

Person Responsible   Faye Wilson (faye.wilson@polk-fl.net)

Overall data (running records and STAR assessment) monitored and reviewed. Changes made as needed to ensure students are on track for proficiency.

Person Responsible   Matt Burkett (matt.burkett@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The number of suspensions for the state is 10.2 per 100 and the school is at 11.3 per 100 students. Incidents for the state is 2.5 per 100 and the school is .4 per 100 students. In the upcoming school year, the monitoring through MTSS will be enforced for students with multiple suspensions. Additionally, RTI-B will be used to monitor minor teacher managed behaviors that are often confused with major behaviors.

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.

The school implements PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention Support) with school-wide expectations and classroom expectations that align to the school-wide expectations. The expected behaviors are taught at the beginning of the year and reinforced throughout the school year. Drum Beat is used to encourage students in specific grade levels to express their feelings and builds confidence in our students. "Ignite" boys club will be used for young men in grades 3-5 who have permission for an after school club where they learn how to become gentlemen. Student leaders are encouraged in each classroom to greet guests as they enter the classroom. Book Buddies is a program that partners with First United Methodist Church to read with students.

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

Jennifer Crowley, Dean of students is responsible for the role of PBIS coach, along with leading the Ignite boys club. Drum Beat is led by Amanda Hall, mental health counselor, and Mary McGregor, school psychologist. Classroom teachers encourage student leaders and leadership roles within the classroom to promote a positive student culture. Classroom teachers also help enforce PBIS in the classrooms. First United Methodist Church donates books to the school and brings in volunteers to assist with the Book Buddies program.

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: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00