Eagle Lake Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Eagle Lake Elementary School

400 CRYSTAL BEACH RD, Eagle Lake, FL 33839

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

Demographics

Principal: Heather Linn

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (48%)
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.

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

Eagle Lake Elementary School

400 CRYSTAL BEACH RD, Eagle Lake, FL 33839

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

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	58%

School Grades History

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

We, at Eagle Lake Elementary, supported by family and community, are committed to teaching a meaningful curriculum in a safe, positive learning environment, where students will be respectful, productive, and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Eagle Lake Elementary School is to become a healthy community of learners that develops high performing students with an emphasis on collaboration, involving families, staff members, and school community.

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
Hardesty, Bradley	Principal	Mr. Hardesty will analyze data, review, and revise the School Improvement Plan based on needs analysis. Mr. Hardesty will plan professional learning opportunities for staff that align and support out school improvement plan goals. An action plan will be established to support this process which includes monitoring and adjusting In addition, as an instructional leader, Mr. Hardesty will collaborate and communicate with stakeholders to support student learning, community needs/concerns, and staff development.
Reimer, Dr. Ruth	Assistant Principal	Dr. Reimer will lead and support the staff in promoting a safe, positive, and secure learning environment through the continuation of the PBIS/RtI behavior implementation plan. A specific focus on discipline and parent communication is the major responsibilities of the assistant principal. Dr. Reimer will also oversee district progress monitoring and state assessment administration.
Anderson, Cory	Other	Mr. Anderson will support the staff members and the school by managing the use/access of technology and its infrastructure. He will also monitor and update the school website and social media pages for Eagle Lake Elementary, thus providing additional methods for maintaining two-way communication with all stakeholders.
Jimenez, Maria	School Counselor	Our school counselor, Ms. Jimenez, will facilitate and support teacher implementation of the PS-RtI/MTSS processes. Ms. Jimenez will counsel small groups and/or individuals students regarding social-emotional wellness and behavioral needs. She will also oversee the utilization of the Sanford Harmony curriculum (school-wide social emotional program) at Eagle Lake Elementary.
Labonte, Jenny	Other	Mrs. Labonte works effectively within systems. understands decision-making processes, and supports district and school initiatives. The LEA also inspires and mobilizes colleagues to achieve goals and implementation plans.
Murphy, Amy	Instructional Coach	Ms. Murphy will lead and support the implementation of literacy curriculum and corresponding data for kindergarten through fifth grade in conjunction with collaborative planning and professional learning communities (PLCs). She will also provide instructional supports to teachers through the utilization of the coaching cycle.
Greenlee, Bobbie	Instructional Coach	Dr. Greenlee will lead and support the implementation of mathematics curriculum and corresponding data for kindergarten through fifth grade in conjunction with collaborative planning and professional learning communities (PLCs). She will also provide instructional supports to teachers through the utilization of the coaching cycle.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Heather Linn

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

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

657

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.

7

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	104	100	78	112	116	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	599
Attendance below 90 percent	0	35	21	31	36	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	8	4	10	16	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Course failure in ELA	0	7	4	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in Math	0	5	3	13	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	31	41	33	55	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201

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	21	17	21	37	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/22/2021

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	122	86	107	117	88	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	610
Attendance below 90 percent	35	17	22	24	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	3	2	2	5	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	11	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	18	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Dec. 2019 Star Reading Level 1	0	0	0	39	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Dec. 2019 Star Mathematics Level 1	0	0	0	27	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	2	6	29	19	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	122	86	107	117	88	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	610
Attendance below 90 percent	35	17	22	24	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	3	2	2	5	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	11	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	18	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Dec. 2019 Star Reading Level 1	0	0	0	39	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Dec. 2019 Star Mathematics Level 1	0	0	0	27	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	2	6	29	19	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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				42%	51%	57%	46%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	51%	58%	50%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	49%	53%	58%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				50%	57%	63%	61%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				49%	56%	62%	65%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	47%	51%	50%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				46%	47%	53%	57%	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	43%	52%	-9%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	35%	48%	-13%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	47%	-1%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

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	39%	56%	-17%	64%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	51%	-1%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	43%	45%	-2%	53%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Progress monitoring tools used to obtain this data include: STAR Early Literacy, STAR Literacy, STAR Mathematics, and District Science Progress Monitoring for 5th Grade.

Grade 1			
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	39	63	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	56	43
	Students With Disabilities	17	56	8
	English Language Learners	11	33	50
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	62	60	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	`56	30
	Students With Disabilities	25	40	25
	English Language Learners	30	18	

Grade 2			
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	65	69	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	70	63	54
	Students With Disabilities	100	67	60
	English Language Learners	100	75	80
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	42	43	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	47	27
	Students With Disabilities	18	25	25
	English Language Learners	33	33	22

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44	50	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	48	51
	Students With Disabilities	27	33	33
	English Language Learners	15	8	15
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	52	68	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	63	58
	Students With Disabilities	36	67	54
	English Language Learners	23	46	54

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36	36	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	27	20
	Students With Disabilities		5	9
	English Language Learners	21	15	10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	37	43	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	38	32
	Students With Disabilities	10	25	18
	English Language Learners	32	25	45

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39	41	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	36	27
	Students With Disabilities	27	33	33
	English Language Learners	7	14	7
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30	36	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	30	25
	Students With Disabilities	13	6	6
	English Language Learners	14	21	7
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47	36	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	33	37
	Students With Disabilities	21	18	18
	English Language Learners	53	33	48

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	9	18	23	20	9	9					
ELL	16	32	40	28	21						
BLK	49	53		38	27		23				
HSP	38	26	33	43	26		28				
WHT	41	39		58	45		41				
FRL	39	35	14	43	28	17	25				
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	7	25	20	22	36	33					
ELL	26	43		39	35		33				
BLK	27	37	73	35	46	54	23				
HSP	42	44	47	51	53	38	50				

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
WHT	49	54	55	58	47		55				
FRL	38	44	63	49	48	43	45				
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	14	39	46	29	53						
ELL	31			64							
BLK	33	57		41	48	45	42				
HSP	43	44	40	61	61		53				
WHT	54	53	50	70	76	57	67				
FRL	40	49	57	55	59	48	50				

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	38
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	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	303
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	13
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	26
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	38
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	34
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 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	45
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	30
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?

According to STAR progress monitoring data, ELA and Mathematics proficiency declined between the winter administration to the spring administration. there is a downward trend in the percentage of student scoring in the proficient range from first grade to through fifth. However there is an upward trend for ELA for STAR progress monitoring for third grade.

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

Progress monitoring showed that our students with disabilities were displaying the largest deficit in most grades. However, in mathematics our ELL population performed better than our overall population.

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

Some of the contributing factors include inconsistent staff and student attendance, both elearning and face-to-face settings. The restricted nature of the learning environment prohibited the ability for collaboration and collaborative learning practices. Inconsistent intervention resources and progress monitoring (MTSS) practices contributed to lack of progress for our SWD population. This year we will be purchasing, implementing additional intervention resources, and professional learning (LLI and SIP). In addition, we are developing a new initiative for staff to track progress regularly using student data folders and specifying specific staff to take on support responsibilities with MTSS.

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

In the current school year, our first grade student performance on the progress monitoring tool showed continued improvement and also third grade literacy.

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

We were intentional with placement of teachers within this grade level for literacy. We intentionally moved a previous fourth grade teacher to third grade for the 2020-2021 school year. In additional third grade was consistent with provision of differentiation and MTSS practices.

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

A focus on analyzing data and differentiating intsruction will provide acceleration. Targeted small group instruction along with individualized working station tasks during ELA and Mathematics will be a a primary focus. Teachers and students will track progress towards the learning standard and quarterly data chats will occur. Writing will be embedded within all content areas. A shift in the mindset to "we" and "our" will be presented and promoted versus a "I" and "mine"

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.

At this time, teachers will be engaged in collaborative planning that promotes with facilitates conversations regarding differentiation of instruction and planning for student learning outcomes. Additional professional learning is necessary for diving deeper into data for planning and monitoring of learning. Training and support for LLI and BBY will occur focusing on questioning strategies and tasks that provide differentiation for acceleration.

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

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Progress monitoring data revealed our overall proficiency percentage decreased from winter to spring, which was also below our goal. Since our collaborative learning efforts were halted during the pandemic during core instruction, we need to resume our focus in this area. All students will receive grade-level, standards-based instruction to improve student achievement in core content areas. Students will be exposed to the intent and rigor (student autonomy and cognitive complexity) of the grade level standards, while we build on their current level of learning, closing the gap in proficiency and increase the number of students making learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	by spring 2022, as a result of aligned standards-based instruction taught within core content areas, 56% of students will earn a level 3, 4, or 5 on the ELA Florida State Assessment, 65% of students will earn a level 3, 4, or 5 on the Mathematics . All ESSA subgroups will perform at a minimum of 41% overall. Student learning will be monitored through grade-level formative assessments and district progress monitoring tools.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring toward our goals will be monitored as teachers and students track learning towards the standard/learning goal/IEP goal. This will occur daily through formative assessments, conducting student data chats, quarterly progress monitoring through STAR, conducting administrative and coach observations, analyzing data and holding data chats with grade levels as well as individual teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dr. Ruth Reimer (ruth.reimer@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence-based strategies include: LSI instructional strategies, Collaborative Planning, Professional Learning Communities (PLC), Instructional Coaches to include for supports: (Collaborative Planning, PLC's, Coaching Cycle, Modeling, etc.) Multi-tiered System of Support/Response to Intervention (MTSS/RtI-Progress Monitoring)* Professional Learning Communities provide a time for teachers to engage in data analysis of common assessments developed and administered to students, along with comparing student samples for alignment purposes. Instructional Coaching is a method for supporting the development of strong instruction in the classroom through the coaching cycle, including follow-up. Collaborative Planning allows teachers in similar grade levels and content areas a time to develop intentional instructional plans with peers and colleagues. This time also allows for in-depth conversations centered around the state standards, their cognitive complexity, and meaningful tasks/ assessments aligned to them.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to STAR and FSA data, our core instruction will benefit from evidence based strategies, when used with fidelity, will increase students learning and achievement.
Action Steps to Implement	

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

Person Responsible   Amy Murphy (amy.murphy@polk-fl.net)

The mathematics coach will provide professional development on LSI strategies and use of BBY strategies. She will monitor the implementation and student data providing classroom support and coaching cycles.

Person Responsible   Bobbie Greenlee (bobbie.greenlee@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During prior years, it has been observed and documented that inconsistent MTSS practices have occurred which have resulted in overall low proficiency in core content areas. in addition, teachers struggle to identify and implement appropriate and effective resources with fidelity. Differentiation needs to occur within the classroom for intervention and acceleration of student learning.
Measurable Outcome:	During the MTSS/designated time, 100% of teachers will track student learning and implement MTSS with fidelity.
Monitoring:	Monitoring will take place by conducting observations, student artifact chats, data analysis and data chats with grade level teams and individual teachers. In addition, teachers will have the opportunity to conduct learning walks to support the implementation of others while monitoring their own learning through the use of self-reflection and provision of feedback.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)
	Differentiation within small groups for interventions and acceleration as well as differentiation of tasks at learning stations. (Inclusive of MTSS)
Evidence-based Strategy:	MTSS/RtI provides teachers and staff with a strategic and intentional way to monitor and support student learning, while adjusting instruction. "The practice of providing high-quality instruction and intervention matched to student need, monitoring frequently to make decisions about changes in instruction or goals, and applying child response data to important educational decisions" (Batsche el al., 2005)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated instruction, in the small group setting, will allow the teachers to closely monitor student learning through formative assessments and provide opportunities for reteaching, interventions, and/or enrichment/acceleration. Administration will conduct walkthroughs to monitor fidelity of instruction and documentation of interventions provided.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development with LLI and additional literacy interventions. Support instructional staff with planning process and implementation of interventions and acceleration resources and practices.

Person Responsible	Amy Murphy (amy.murphy@polk-fl.net)

Provide professional development of mathematics interventions. Support instructional staff with planning process and implementation of interventions and acceleration resources and practices.

Person Responsible	Bobbie Greenlee (bobbie.greenlee@polk-fl.net)

Conduct student support team meetings and support the implementation of MTSS protocol within FOCUS and appropriate documentation.

Person Responsible	Maria Jimenez (maria.jimenez@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In accordance with our most recent Florida Standards Assessment in literacy, more than 50% of our students scored below a level 3 (proficiency)
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase our K-5 reading proficiency through a focus on phonemic awareness and phonics instruction in our primary grades (K-2) and an emphasis on comprehension and fluency in our intermediate grades (3-5). We expect a 5% increase in reading proficiency on the spring assessment in 2022.
Monitoring:	Instructional staff will track growth through the implementation of formative assessments and quarterly running records.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence-based strategies include the implementation of Learning Science International (LSI) strategies with standards-based phonemic awareness, phonics, and comprehension skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to our STAR and FSA data, our students will benefit from phonemic awareness and phonics instruction when taught with fidelity, resulting with an increase in reading comprehension.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide staff with professional development in analyzing data and differentiated instruction in regards to identifying students' needs. Conduct a traning with the implementation of BEST standards, use of running records, and Systematic Instructional on Phonological Awareness and Phonics Instruction (SIPPS).

Person Responsible	Amy Murphy (amy.murphy@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.

In the 2020-2021 school year the number of office discipline referrals increased from 154 in the to 392. Of the 392 referrals, 99 resulted from bus incidents. In addition, 92 referrals from the 392 were written from incidents occurring during specials (PE, Music, and Art). The number of office discipline referrals and out-of-school suspensions increased for some. As a result, we must continue to strengthen our classroom management and behavioral supports. In addition, we need to continue to develop our integration of social emotional learning through resources, such as Drumbeat and Sanford Harmony resulting in stronger relationships with peers and adults.

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.

Eagle Lake Elementary recruits parents and community members for school support/tasks, listens to other people's viewpoints and encourages collaborative decision-making to build a solid foundation for all school/family/community partnerships. We will be targeting every parent by sending home Title 1 newsletters informing parents of events happening in school and how parents can support students at home. Our school marquee will be updated regularly to inform parents of upcoming Title 1 events and additional school related events. We will also inform parents through the use of flyers, grade-level newsletters, and notes in student agendas/Wednesday folders. Social media, including Facebook and our school website, will also be a focal point for maintaining communication and transparency. We will work diligently to inform parents and families of student performance and methods of supports for students in Pre-kindergarten through fifth grade. Our leadership team will share important information regarding our school's programs, procedures, curriculum expectations, and use of technology at home to assist parents and families help their child(ren) succeed. We will also offer family workshops in literacy, mathematics, science (Mad Science Nights), and test-taking skills.

In addition, our campus strives to provide a positive learning environment for all stakeholders through the use of PBIS strategies and the promotion and utilization of pro-social skills.

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

Eagle Lake Elementary' s School Advisory Council brings together a multitude of stakeholders, such as parents, teachers, administration, and community partners. The role of SAC members is to support and provide input regarding the School Improvement Plan and review expenditures of school funds. Community partnerships include local businesses and religious organizations. The partners provide resources for students in need, plan staff appreciation activities, volunteer their time working with students, ad sponsor family engagement events. Administration works to collaborate with school-based leadership teams to plan, organize, and facilitate tasks related to the school improvement plan.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**