
Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 20 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 24 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Scott Lake Elementary School

1140 COUNTY ROAD 540A E, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

Demographics

Principal: Tangela Durham

Start Date for this Principal: 6/20/2018

| | |
|--|--|
| 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) | 80% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (55%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 20 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Scott Lake Elementary School

1140 COUNTY ROAD 540A E, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> | <p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">72%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">43%</p> |

School Grades History

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

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.

Scott Lake Elementary promotes opportunities for all students to achieve to their maximum potential in all aspects of life - academic, social, emotional, and physical for the purpose of educating the whole child.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To educate all students to the highest levels of academic achievement, to enable them to reach and expand their potential, and to prepare them to become productive, responsible, ethical, and compassionate members of society.

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 |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|
| Durham, Tangela | Principal | <p>Our Leadership Team consists of administrators, counselors, academic coaches, and teacher leaders. The team meets weekly to collaboratively plan with teachers as well as assist with interventions for students' success. The team is responsible for the analyzing weekly/monthly data and links that data to instructional decisions. In addition, the team reviews progress monitoring data with teachers to identify students who are at moderate or high risk for not meeting state standards. This team is also responsible for facilitating the process of making decisions about the implementation of effective interventions.</p> <p>Principal: The Principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. She leads and assists in setting up structures for high impact instruction, data-based decision-making, and a collaborative culture. She monitors the progress of intentional planning by attending weekly grade level collaborative planning sessions as well as PLCs. She also conducts daily walkthroughs, provides consistent formative feedback to support the professional growth of all teachers, and openly communicates with parents to build positive relationships.</p> |
| Kaufmann, Ron | Assistant Principal | <p>Assistant Principal: Assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, in the assessment of school staff, and assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas. He provides commentary on a weekly basis and works with the principal to make schedule adjustments as needed. The assistant principal also provides and supports common vision for PBIS and CHAMPS by enforcing protocol and policy. The Assistant Principal will also ensure that classrooms have the necessary materials/furniture/arrangements that are conducive to learning based on teacher discretion.</p> |
| Shim, Candace | School Counselor | <p>School Counselor: Provides training and support in the MTSS process annually and as needed; works with teachers through the problem solving cycle; facilitates leadership meetings related to MTSS. Teaches students through classroom guidance lessons, provides classroom guidance lessons; works with the Principal and/or Assistant Principal on issues of behavior; acts as a parent contact for parents who have academic and/or social and emotional concerns related to their child. Spearheads all aspects of PBIS.</p> |
| Single, Tracy | Other | <p>LEA Facilitator: Coordinates educational placement and appropriate services for students with disabilities. Also serves as the lead representative at staffing meetings and IEP (Individual Education Plan) meetings and provides direct support to students with disabilities and their general education and ESE teachers to promote inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education environment.</p> |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------|---------------------|---|
| Brennan, Chris | Instructional Coach | Analyzes reading and math data in order to identify students in need of extra support; uses supplemental resources to increase achievement; meet with targeted students; plan with teachers to determine additional needs/improvements of students, and provide small group instruction to students in the lowest quartile. Participates in grade level collaborative planning with a standards-focus, monitoring for the rigor of the standards, and teaching with the most effective instructional strategies aligned with Marzano's framework. Delivers professional development aligned with our priorities, provide grade-level, and one-on-one coaching as well as additional support to both teachers and students in meeting the rigor of the standards. Also gathers resources for support within all three tiers, follow up on individual student progress and identify professional development needs in order for interventions to be successful and provide coaching/mentoring support to strengthen core. |
| Thomas, Jackie | Other | Media Specialist: Provides knowledge of availability and suitability of information resources to support curriculum initiatives, engages in the developmental process with the planning team, using knowledge of school curriculum and professional resources, facilitates the use of presentation tools in print, technology, and media for dissemination efforts, and serves as an expert in organizing, synthesizing, and communicating information. Also serves as Title One Coordinator and Parent Engagement Liaison. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/20/2018, Tangela Durham

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.*

3

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

729

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.

1

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 | 107 | 101 | 133 | 108 | 114 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 686 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 17 | 26 | 32 | 22 | 19 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142 |
| One or more suspensions | 4 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Course failure in ELA | 13 | 17 | 23 | 14 | 11 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 |
| Course failure in Math | 5 | 12 | 22 | 7 | 20 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 7 | 8 | 26 | 17 | 24 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 11 | 13 | 21 | 8 | 16 | 26 | 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 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 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 | 101 | 133 | 105 | 129 | 123 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 729 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 25 | 23 | 9 | 14 | 10 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Course failure in ELA | 16 | 13 | 13 | 19 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| Course failure in Math | 8 | 6 | 11 | 17 | 10 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| Dec. Star Early Lit Data scoring <3 | 38 | 48 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 |
| Dec. Star Reading Data scoring <3 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 43 | 39 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 |
| Dec. Star Math Data scoring <3 | 0 | 32 | 19 | 28 | 14 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 |

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 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 13 | 8 | 24 | 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 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 101 | 133 | 105 | 129 | 123 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 729 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 25 | 23 | 9 | 14 | 10 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Course failure in ELA | 16 | 13 | 13 | 19 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| Course failure in Math | 8 | 6 | 11 | 17 | 10 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| Dec. Star Early Lit Data scoring <3 | 38 | 48 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 |
| Dec. Star Reading Data scoring <3 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 43 | 39 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 |
| Dec. Star Math Data scoring <3 | 0 | 32 | 19 | 28 | 14 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 |

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 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 13 | 8 | 24 | 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 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

| School Grade Component | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 57% | 51% | 57% | 60% | 50% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 49% | 51% | 58% | 55% | 51% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 29% | 49% | 53% | 51% | 45% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 70% | 57% | 63% | 63% | 58% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 64% | 56% | 62% | 56% | 56% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 48% | 47% | 51% | 34% | 44% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 63% | 47% | 53% | 71% | 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 | 61% | 52% | 9% | 58% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 48% | 4% | 58% | -6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -61% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 56% | 47% | 9% | 56% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -52% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 78% | 56% | 22% | 62% | 16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 65% | 56% | 9% | 64% | 1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -78% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 65% | 51% | 14% | 60% | 5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -65% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 45% | 15% | 53% | 7% |
| 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 Literacy
- STAR Reading
- STAR Math
- PCPS Science Quarterly Assessments

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 61 | 77 | 72 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 46 | 66 | 66 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 14 | 56 | 36 |
| | English Language Learners | 50 | 50 | 56 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 77 | 83 | 69 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 66 | 70 | 52 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 57 | 60 | 41 |
| | English Language Learners | 60 | 70 | 45 |
| | Grade 2 | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 60 | 67 | 66 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 48 | 58 | 53 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 40 | 33 | 41 |
| | English Language Learners | 42 | 25 | 29 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 53 | 49 | 51 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 40 | 31 | 37 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 38 | 21 | 12 |
| | English Language Learners | 10 | 11 | 50 |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 66 | 63 | 62 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 46 | 44 | 38 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 35 | 21 | 37 |
| | English Language Learners | 21 | 20 | 25 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 58 | 67 | 66 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 41 | 54 | 52 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 21 | 29 | 48 |
| | English Language Learners | 15 | 38 | 57 |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 49 | 59 | 55 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 37 | 48 | 41 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 41 | 38 | 38 |
| | English Language Learners | 14 | 42 | 46 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 62 | 63 | 50 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 48 | 46 | 35 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 50 | 56 | 39 |
| | English Language Learners | 58 | 67 | 46 |

| Grade 5 | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | 49 | 58 | 47 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 39 | 51 | 35 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 24 | 23 | 14 |
| | English Language Learners | | 21 | 29 | 14 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | 56 | 60 | 67 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 48 | 47 | 52 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 30 | 30 | 26 |
| | English Language Learners | | 36 | 29 | 31 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | | 58 | 65 | 68 |
| | 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 | 32 | 45 | 33 | 46 | 61 | 60 | 33 | | | | |
| ELL | 30 | 38 | | 47 | 75 | | 50 | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | 33 | | 55 | 44 | | 35 | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 48 | 50 | 60 | 69 | | 67 | | | | |
| MUL | 40 | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 63 | | 73 | 61 | 60 | 62 | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 34 | 35 | 57 | 61 | 50 | 49 | | | | |
| 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 | 25 | 13 | 45 | 55 | 52 | 33 | | | | |
| ELL | 30 | 29 | | 48 | 47 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 33 | 25 | 44 | 54 | 54 | 30 | | | | |

| 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 | 45 | 33 | 14 | 63 | 56 | 47 | 55 | | | | |
| MUL | 69 | | | 54 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 69 | 60 | 43 | 83 | 73 | 45 | 80 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 40 | 24 | 57 | 53 | 40 | 53 | | | | |

| 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 | 25 | 48 | 47 | 34 | 42 | 29 | 60 | | | | |
| ELL | 19 | 53 | | 33 | 47 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 32 | 27 | 37 | 38 | 26 | 47 | | | | |
| HSP | 48 | 54 | 65 | 50 | 50 | 45 | 60 | | | | |
| MUL | 93 | 82 | | 79 | 50 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 71 | 60 | 60 | 75 | 64 | 32 | 79 | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | 52 | 52 | 51 | 52 | 33 | 64 | | | | |

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 | 56 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 52 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 447 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 44 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 49 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| 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 | 41 |
| 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 | 55 |
| 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 | 40 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 64 |
| 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 | 47 |
| 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?

SWD and ELL proficiency is below 50% across all grade levels and subjects, with the exception of 2nd and 3rd grade math.

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

2019 FSA DATA

Black/African American - 39%

SWD - 36%

Bottom 25% - 22%

2021 STAR Data

SWD - 33% (same for ELA & Math)

Black/African American - 42% ELA 41% Math

ELL - 31% ELA 46% Math

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

- 1) Use of data to identify students and remediate with fidelity was insufficient across the grade levels (especially primary)
New protocols in place that inhibited collaborative structures in whole group instruction
- 2) Small group instruction impacted due to safety protocols
- 3) The number of e-Learning students
- 4) e-Learning students continuously changing modes of learning (campus vs e-Learning)
- 5) The timing of e-Learners coming back to campus learning...3rd/4th quarter
- 6) Teachers changing grade levels, subjects and modes of learning throughout the school year.

NEW ACTIONS

Restructured Coaches

Monthly Data Chats with Instructional Staff

~ Third week of the month dedicated to individual data chats with teachers.

Restructured ESE Inclusion Teachers

Reassigned core teachers

Greater focus and attention on coaches supporting small group instruction

New ELL paraprofessional with focus on pushing in within Primary grades

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

ELA proficiency improved from 57% (Spring 2019 FSA) to 64% (Spring 2021 STAR).

Black/African American subgroup improved from 39% (Spring 2019 FSA) to 42% (Spring STAR). At 42%, SLE would no longer be below the Federal Index Target.

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

Streamlined small group instruction and interventions. Teachers used weekly/monthly data to plan for students interventions and small group instruction. Small groups consistently changed based on specific student needs.

Students were identified through initial test scores, STAR, and AR Diagnostic Data and monitored through the MTSS process. Additionally, they were provided small group instruction from the ELA Interventionist and ELA Coach.

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

1. Administration and coaches will conduct weekly collaborative grade level planning sessions focusing on moving identified students, creating standards based and small group lesson plans, analyzing formative and summative assessment data, student products, and classroom observations.
2. Administration and coaches will conduct classroom observations focusing on small group instruction.
3. STAR & AR Diagnostic Data analyzed by Administration, Leadership Team, and classroom teachers.
4. Analyze student fluency data of students in tier 2 and 3 instruction.
5. Coaches, interventionist, and media para will provide content rich nonfiction text for classroom libraries and media/library books.
6. Students not making learning gains will meet and conference with administration, coaches, interventionist, and/or classroom teacher.
7. Continuously adjust instruction and/or supports based on data.
8. Coaches and Interventionist will provide enriched extended learning opportunities which will include hands on learning experiences for academic vocabulary.

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.

Monthly data chats with the Curriculum & Instruction Coach
BEST Standards Training
Restructuring Coaches to prove job embedded training and small group instruction

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

The additional services are aimed at improving teacher capacity in the area of small group instruction and use of student data. This will be achieved through monthly data chats and job embedded training.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ~ Although the 2021 Spring STAR Reading data indicates growth within the Black/African American subgroup, there remains to be a significant gap compared to students in other ethnicity groups. The overall number of white students scoring proficient in ELA was 70%, Hispanic 57%, American Indian 50%, Asian 88% and the number of African American was 46%. This is well below the overall school proficiency of 62%.
 ~ 2019 FSA ELA scores indicate a gap between the performance of African American students compared to students in other ethnicity groups. The overall number of white students scoring proficient in ELA was 68.9%, Hispanic 44.5%, Multiracial 66.7% and the number of African American was 39%. This is well below the overall school proficiency of 57%.

Measurable Outcome: Increase proficiency within the African American subgroup by at least 10%.

Monitoring: Daily classroom walkthroughs, feedback from coaches, analysis of student work samples, discussions through weekly collaborative planning, monthly data chats with teachers, formative assessments, progress monitoring from STAR Early Literacy, STAR, Istation and AR.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use weekly/monthly data to plan for student interventions and small group instruction. Students in this group will receive daily small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: To ensure we are meeting the needs of our African American students to move them towards grade level proficiency

Action Steps to Implement

Administration and coaches will conduct weekly collaborative grade level planning sessions focusing on moving identified students, creating standards based and small group lesson plans, analyzing formative and summative assessment data, student products, and classroom observations.

Person Responsible Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net)

Administration and coaches will conduct classroom observations focusing on small group instruction.

Person Responsible Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net)

STAR & AR Diagnostic Data analyzed by Administration, Leadership Team, and classroom teachers.

Person Responsible Chris Brennan (christopher.brennan@polk-fl.net)

Analyze student fluency data of students in tier 2 and 3 instruction.

Person Responsible Chris Brennan (christopher.brennan@polk-fl.net)

Coaches and media para will provide content rich nonfiction text for classroom libraries and media/library books.

Person Responsible Jackie Thomas (jaqueline.thomas@polk-fl.net)

Students not making learning gains will meet and conference with administration, coaches, interventionist, and/or classroom teacher.

Person Responsible Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net)

Continuously adjust instruction and/or supports based on data.

Person Responsible Chris Brennan (christopher.brennan@polk-fl.net)

Coaches and para will provide enriched extended learning opportunities which will include hands on learning experiences for academic vocabulary

Person Responsible Chris Brennan (christopher.brennan@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: FSA scores indicate a gap between the performance of general education students and those identified as SWD. The overall percentage of SWD students scoring proficient in ELA was 36%. This is well below the overall school proficiency of 57%.

Measurable Outcome: Increase SWD proficiency by at least 15%

Monitoring: Daily classroom walkthroughs, feedback from coaches, analysis of student work samples, discussions through weekly collaborative planning, monthly data chats with teachers, formative assessments, progress monitoring from STAR Early Literacy, STAR, Istation and AR.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will be identified through initial test scores, STAR, and AR Diagnostic Data and monitored through the MTSS process. Additionally, they will be provided small group instruction from the ELA Interventionist and ELA Coach.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data on student with disabilities and district early warning system data through the MTSS processes and procedures.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration and coaches will conduct weekly collaborative grade level planning sessions focusing on moving identified students, creating standards based and small group lesson plans, analyzing formative and summative assessment data, student products, and classroom observations.

Person Responsible Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net)

STAR & AR Diagnostic Data analyzed by Administration, Leadership Team, and classroom teachers.

Person Responsible Chris Brennan (christopher.brennan@polk-fl.net)

Analyze student fluency data of students in tier 2 and 3 instruction.

Person Responsible Chris Brennan (christopher.brennan@polk-fl.net)

Coaches, interventionist, and media para will provide content rich nonfiction text for classroom libraries and media/library books.

Person Responsible Jackie Thomas (jaqueline.thomas@polk-fl.net)

Students not making learning gains will meet and conference with administration, coaches, interventionist, and/or classroom teacher.

Person Responsible Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net)

Continuously adjust instruction and/or supports based on data.

Person Responsible Chris Brennan (christopher.brennan@polk-fl.net)

Coaches and Interventionist will provide enriched extended learning opportunities which will include hands on learning experiences for academic vocabulary.

Person Responsible Chris Brennan (christopher.brennan@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.

Based on the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org website, we have 0.1 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all elementary schools statewide, it falls into the very low category. We will monitor our school culture and environment by:

- 1. All staff will work to build a positive relationship with our students and with all other staff members. We will speak to each child and adult in a positive manner when we see them in the hallways, classrooms, cafeteria, and arrival/dismissal areas.**
- 2. All staff will report all concerns to the administration immediately. These concerns could be as simple as a student might need to talk with someone. We will encourage all staff to also report concerns of other staff members who might be going through issues, etc. We will work on being attentive to any need, no matter how small.**
- 3. We will work on promoting positive behavior through student and teacher recognition on morning announcements and throughout the day. We will have positive behavior systems in place in each classroom and on a school-wide level.**
- 4. We will encourage all students to see it, say it. We will strive to get our students and staff to report any concerns they have.**
- 5. We will work to keep our campus clean and inviting.**
- 6. We will provide a safe environment for all students and staff. All doors will be locked to meet safety protocols at all times. All visitors will check in through one entrance only.**

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.

Scott Lake Elementary School continually assess and address school culture. Positive school culture and environment is built on strong parental and community involvement, celebrating achievements, creating school norms that build positive value in classrooms and school, and engaging students in ways that will benefit them and society. SLE will engage parents and community through, school wide family and parent events, encouraging parental participation in student's learning, and projects that give back to the community. SLE business partners, School Advisory Committee, and Parent Teacher Association will provide feedback and involvement in school activities in a meaningful way that will foster positive relationships.

SLE will celebrate student, classroom, teacher, and school achievements throughout the school year. As students, classrooms, teachers, and school reach goals set for academic, attendance, and behavioral recognition and encouragement will be provided. Classrooms and teams will be encouraged to celebrate small and large achievements within the classroom as well.

SLE will engage students in meaningful activities that will create a supporting and fulfilling environment. Students will recognize and learn social emotional skills for the classroom and in life. Through Sanford harmony, PBIS, and Collaborative & Proactive Solutions students will learn behavioral expectations as well as why these expectations are necessary in school and in the community. Teachers will establish classroom meeting and check in times with students to allow students to proactively address concerns or issues in a positive manner and with support of the teacher.

SLE will monitor and assess classroom and school culture throughout the school year through monthly social emotional surveys, class discipline reports, teacher feedback and stakeholder feedback. As needed adjustments will be made in ensure a positive, supportive, and encouraging environment that is conducive to learning.

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

Scott Lake Elementary stakeholders include but are not limited to, all school staff including teachers, administration, office staff, para educators, lunchroom, and custodial staff, students, parents, advisory board members, business partners, and local community members. Stakeholders will provide ongoing feedback about school culture and environment through surveys, meetings, events, and social media. By understanding our mission and values stakeholders will be provided opportunities to enhance and support our school culture. Stakeholders in the school will model and uphold school norms and values. Through classroom lessons, parent meetings, and school events stakeholders will be engaged, interactive and in collaboration with each other to ensure a positive culture and environment.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |