Auburndale Central Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Auburndale Central Elementary School

320 LEMON ST, Auburndale, FL 33823

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

Demographics

Principal: Octavia May

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2021

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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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.](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

Auburndale Central Elementary School

320 LEMON ST, Auburndale, FL 33823

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

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	71%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is for every learner to reach academic excellence by becoming creative problem solvers and change makers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a nurturing environment committed to achieving academic excellence through the use of high yield strategies in preparation for college or career.

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
May, Octavia	Principal	Principal- The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, models the problem solving process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure for implementation of MTSS, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures and participates in adequate professional learning to support MTSS implementation, develops a culture of expectation with the school staff for the implementation of MTSS school-wide, ensures resources are assigned to those areas in most need, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. Provides technology necessary to manage and display data, provides professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and graphic display. Ensures safe environment for all stakeholders.
Stoquert, Sara	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal- Assists the principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of MTSS, further assists the principal in the assessment of MTSS skills, implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures and participates in professional learning, and communicates with parents concerning MTSS plans and activities. Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data, facilitates development of intervention plans, provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation, assists with professional development for behavior concerns, assist in facilitation of data-based decision making activities. Ensures safe environment for all stakeholders.
Butler, Todd	Other	Reading Interventionist- Analyzes ELA data in order to identify students in need of extra support; uses supplemental resources to increase achievement; meet daily with targeted students; meet with teachers to determine additional needs/ improvements of students, and provide small group instruction daily to students in the lowest quartile.
Lott, Sandria	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor- Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment, guides and provides intervention with individual students, in small groups and in whole classroom settings, communicates with child serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.
Thomas, Renard	Reading Coach	Literacy Coach- Develops, leads and evaluates school core content standards/ programs, identifies and analysis existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches, identifies patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence based intervention strategies, assists with whole school screening programs that provides early intervention services for children to be considered "at risk", assists in the design and implementation for progress

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development, provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring, and models/coaches teachers in areas that need development (coaching cycle) in order to better meet the students educational needs.
Gonzalez, Nikki	Math Coach	Develops, leads and evaluates school core content standards/programs, identifies and analysis existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches, identifies patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies, assists with whole school screening programs that provides early intervention services for children to be considered "at risk", assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development, provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring, and models/coaches teachers in areas that need development (coaching cycle) in order to better meet the students educational needs.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/21/2021, Octavia May

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

18

Total number of students enrolled at the school

373

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

4

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	0	53	49	49	65	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	276
Attendance below 90 percent	0	9	11	12	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	15	20	20	25	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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	7	8	6	17	29	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	61	66	50	70	63	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	374
Attendance below 90 percent	5	19	6	18	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	3	4	5	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	1	0	1	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	18	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	10	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
December STAR ELA Level 1	0	0	0	22	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
December STAR ELA Level 3-5	0	0	0	24	28	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
December STAR Math Level 1	0	0	0	12	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
December STAR Math Level3-5	0	0	0	40	37	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	5	4	27	12	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	61	66	50	70	63	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	374
Attendance below 90 percent	5	19	6	18	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	3	4	5	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	1	0	1	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	18	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	10	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
December STAR ELA Level 1	0	0	0	22	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
December STAR ELA Level 3-5	0	0	0	24	28	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
December STAR Math Level 1	0	0	0	12	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
December STAR Math Level3-5	0	0	0	40	37	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	5	4	27	12	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				35%	51%	57%	36%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	51%	58%	48%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	49%	53%	54%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				39%	57%	63%	38%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				40%	56%	62%	44%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				21%	47%	51%	33%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				43%	47%	53%	45%	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	35%	52%	-17%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	32%	48%	-16%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	47%	-9%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	43%	56%	-13%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	35%	56%	-21%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	34%	51%	-17%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	41%	45%	-4%	53%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

STAR Early Lit/STAR Reading and Math

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39	67	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	63	46
	Students With Disabilities	17	67	33
	English Language Learners	27	64	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	69	63	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	65	59	46
	Students With Disabilities	50	50	50
	English Language Learners	73	82	73

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58	60	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	60	65	59
	Students With Disabilities	40	40	60
	English Language Learners	54	58	50
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65	66	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	63	65	57
	Students With Disabilities	40	40	40
	English Language Learners	77	69	62

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	43	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	34	26
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	20
	English Language Learners	38	38	17
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51	52	17
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	54	15
	Students With Disabilities	0	20	0
	English Language Learners	46	54	27

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30	38	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	38	29
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	26	43	32
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	38	38	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	39	29
	Students With Disabilities	17	17	17
	English Language Learners	30	35	29

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27	26	26
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	27	30
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	13
	English Language Learners	25	8	7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30	28	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	29	28
	Students With Disabilities	29	25	13
	English Language Learners	25	15	21
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	34	42	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	46	48
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	13
	English Language Learners	32	43	50

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	14	10		17							
ELL	39	64		28	38		30				
BLK	32	40		21	27		33				
HSP	36	47		34	22		38				
WHT	29	16		24	16		20				
FRL	33	36	38	26	18	21	29				
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	16	50	46	28	29	17	10				
ELL	31	46		35	51		38				
BLK	32	57		38	52	40	40				
HSP	35	39		41	45		56				
WHT	38	49	53	39	33	8	35				
FRL	34	47	64	36	45	24	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	17	21	21	3	17	25					
ELL	32	48		32	45	42	10				
BLK	16	18		16	23		20				
HSP	36	58	67	44	51	50	41				
WHT	42	45	60	39	47	18	64				
FRL	37	50	55	37	47	38	43				

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	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	253
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	14
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	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	31
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	38
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
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	21
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	31
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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

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

• ELA Proficiency rates from Fall to the Spring STAR test decreased in 3rd: 44% to 33%, 4th: 31% to 29% and 5th : 27% to 26%.
• 3rd Grade FSA scores shown our proficiency increased from 35% (2018-19) to 48% (2020-21). An increase of 13%.
• Math Proficiency rates from Fall to Spring STAR test decreased in 3rd: 52% to 17%, 4th: 39% to 35% and 5th: 30% remaining at 30%.
• The trend is a decrease in proficiency rates in both ELA and Math for grades 3-5 according to STAR.
• Our Economically Disadvantages students increased slightly in proficiency in ELA in 4th and 5th grade but decreased by 14% in 3rd grade. In Math, our Economically Disadvantaged students decreased in proficiency in grades 3-5.
• Our Students with Disabilities decreased slightly in proficiency in both ELA and Math for grades 3-5.
• Our ELL students decreased in 3rd and 5th grade and increased in 4th grade 6% according to STAR reading. Our ELL students decreased in proficiency in math in grades 3-5.

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

• Proficiency in Math grades 3-5 (based on STAR) and Proficiency in ELA in 4th and 5th grade.

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

• Increasing proficiency will also contribute to overall learning gains and gains for our bottom 25%.
• Monitor/accountability for core instruction and planning and ensure targeted lessons and the delivery of the lessons.

• Ensuring that teachers are using data to drive the small group instruction in Power Hour and ELA/Math small groups.

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

• Proficiency in 3rd grade ELA (FSA) had substantial growth. 3rd grade increased from 35% on the previous FSA to 48%.
• Learning gains increased in 5th grade for ELA based on Spring STAR data.

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

• Targeted small group instruction, instructional support in classrooms to help provide additional instruction to students during small group time.

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

• Accountability/Monitoring of implementation of instruction and student progress.
• Instructional coaches working with tier teachers to provide coaching cycle/modeling.
• Collaborative planning with a focus of understanding the standard, what it should look like in instruction, student work samples to show mastery and reteach based on student needs and data.

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.

• New B.E.S.T. Standards training
• New Reading Wonders Series training
• Using data to provide differentiation, remediation, and acceleration.

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

• New teacher mentors
• Purposeful scheduling of instructional support staff
• Instructional coach providing coaching cycle/modeling
• Professional development weekly
• Accountability and monitoring of instruction/remediation and acceleration.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on ESSA data, our white subgroup and students with disabilities subgroup scored below the 41% federal index. Our white subgroup is at 36% and students with disabilities is at 28%.
Measurable Outcome:	At the end of the 2021-22 school year, ESSA data will show an increase from 36% to 41% for our white subgroup and from 28% to 35% for our students with disabilities subgroup.
Monitoring:	Monthly MTSS data meetings Weekly mastery assessments on target benchmarks based on previous standard taught
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing daily push in instructional support for our tier 3 students which includes our two focus subgroups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy would provide tier 3 students multiple small group learning opportunities with a variety of instructional approaches. Daily push in support could clarify misconceptions, deepen understanding of the standard to increase overall student proficiency while closing learning gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify students falling below proficiency in both subgroups

Person Responsible	Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)

Scheduling daily push in support for tier 3 students during power hour and core block times.

Person Responsible	Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)

Tracking student progress by using a standard mastery check list based on current learning target.

Person Responsible	Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on classroom instructional observations and progress monitoring tools, there is a need for additional professional learning communities. This area is a critical need of focus to ensure teachers are provided professional development and learning opportunities to enhance instructional practices in the classroom. Improving teacher instructional practices will positively impact student learning and proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021-22 school year, the number of teachers rated needs improvement in Domain 2: Instructional Delivery and Facilitation of the EPC rating system, should decrease by 25% with the provided professional development.
Monitoring:	Weekly review of classroom observation data in Domain 2 will be used to evaluate the implementation of strategies based on the professional development provided.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sara Stoquert (sara.stoquert@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing professional development based on teacher evaluation data and student data, which would include strategies focused on instructional interventions for tier 3 students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Consistent and purposeful professional development for teachers with multiple learning opportunities on a variety of instructional approaches and best practices. Weekly professional development should clarify misconceptions, deepen understanding of the standards that would lead to an increase overall student proficiency while closing learning gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify teacher areas of need (using teacher evaluations, data etc.)

Person Responsible	Sara Stoquert (sara.stoquert@polk-fl.net)

Create/provide professional development based on teacher tier groups. Including implementation, timely and specific feedback and teacher self-reflection to ensure best practices are being used in the classroom with fidelity.

Person Responsible	Sara Stoquert (sara.stoquert@polk-fl.net)

This strategy would provide tier 3 students multiple small group learning opportunities with a variety of instructional approaches. Daily push in support could clarify misconceptions, deepen understanding of the standard to increase overall student proficiency while closing learning gaps.

Person Responsible	Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the 2020-21 FSA ELA data, more then 50% of our students in third-fifth grade scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide ELA assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on the 2021-22 FSA ELA data, students in fourth and fifth grade will increase overall ELA proficiency to 50%.
Monitoring:	Bi-weekly PLC's based on student formative and summative assessments that are aligned with the standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Tier direct instruction and targeted groups based on weekly data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy would provide students multiple small group learning opportunities with a variety of instructional approaches based on their specific real-time data. Analyzing weekly data would clarify misconceptions, deepen understanding of the standard to increase overall student proficiency while closing learning gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

Engaging PLC's focused on analyzing student ELA data from formative assessments to drive the small group instructional practices.

Person Responsible	Octavia May (octavia.may@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.

Our school is not listed.

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.

Auburndale Central Elementary School builds a positive school culture and environment in a variety of ways. Diversity is encouraged and celebrated through various extra curricular events. High expectations are encouraged school-wide for both students and staff by holding all members accountable through individualized goal setting. Positive behavior support systems (PBIS) are modeled and implemented daily. We encourage and demonstrate respect for others. All stakeholders are expected to share the same values and beliefs of our school culture to help maintain cohesiveness. We celebrate small victories to encourage positive momentum and growth for both students and staff. Our mission and vision statements are clearly presented and included in motivational daily school wide announcements.

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

Auburndale Central Elementary builds positive relationships with families to increase involvement by conducting a minimum of three face to face conferences between teachers and parents in order to keep parents informed of their child's progress. Report cards and interims are sent home every 9 weeks. A monthly newsletter is sent home stating the curriculum each grade level is teaching and other important school-wide information. The mission and vision is stated in the newsletter. We build positive relationships with our families by having a "Family Friendly" office staff. Throughout the year we have family nights to encourage parent involvement. Teachers use student agendas, Class Dojo, Google Voice and Schoology to communicate with parents. Teachers frequently communicate and document parent phone conferences on a conference log that is submitted to administration.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**