

Holmes District School Board

Ponce De Leon Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Ponce De Leon Elementary School

1473 AMMONS RD, Ponce De Leon, FL 32455

<http://pdle.hdsb.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Sonya Motley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Holmes 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Ponce De Leon Elementary School

1473 AMMONS RD, Ponce De Leon, FL 32455

<http://pdle.hdsb.org/>

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	8%

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 Holmes 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.

It is the mission of Ponce de Leon Elementary and its stakeholders to: Provide a nurturing, caring environment that meets our students' needs by providing a comprehensive curriculum that will allow our students to reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ponce de Leon Elementary is working to educate students of today to be successful in tomorrow's world.

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
Jones, Rodd	Principal	
Motley, Sonya	Assistant Principal	
Brown, Wanda	Other	
Castaneda, Kaitlyn	School Counselor	
Commander, Terry	Teacher, K-12	
Peterson, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Sonya Motley

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

1

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

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

20

Total number of students enrolled at the school

250

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

1

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

3

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	62	41	48	47	47	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	300
Attendance below 90 percent	25	5	12	12	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	7	2	3	9	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	4	1	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	5	1	3	3	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/3/2021

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	34	40	31	37	47	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
Attendance below 90 percent	7	6	6	4	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	34	40	31	37	47	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
Attendance below 90 percent	7	6	6	4	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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				50%	50%	57%	49%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				45%	45%	58%	55%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	36%	53%	59%	59%	48%
Math Achievement				48%	48%	63%	57%	57%	62%
Math Learning Gains				44%	44%	62%	59%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				31%	31%	51%	50%	50%	47%
Science Achievement				53%	53%	53%	42%	42%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	59%	-8%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	55%	-12%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	52%	0%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	47%	47%	0%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	60%	-15%	64%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	54%	50%	4%	60%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	53%	48%	5%	53%	0%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready - Grades 1st- 5th ELA and Math
FSA 5th Grade Science - Spring Score

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39/3%	48/21%	50/30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39/3%	48/21%	50/30%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40/0%	48/27%	50/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40/0%	48/27%	50/60%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32/12%	36/31%	38/35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/12%	36/31%	38/35%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32/3%	36/25%	38/34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/3%	36/25%	38/34%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37/49%	39/47%	39/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37/49%	39/47%	39/61%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36/11%	39/8%	39/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36/11%	39/8%	39/43%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47/40%	50/46%	51/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47/40%	50/46%	51/59%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	46/9%	50/26%	51/66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46/9%	50/26%	51/66%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30/30%	34/36%	36/48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30/30%	34/36%	36/48%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/0%	1/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30/17%	34/27%	36/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30/17%	34/27%	36/53%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/0%	1/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			34/38%
	Economically Disadvantaged			34/38%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/0%

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	26			30							
WHT	56	46		46	36		40				
FRL	46	38		36	29		37				
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	38	58	45	38	54	36	44				
WHT	52	48	40	49	44	35	54				
FRL	47	42	38	46	43	32	55				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	38	52	50	49	65	50	40				
WHT	50	54	55	59	60	50	43				
FRL	43	53	65	51	58	50	32				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	223
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	37
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?

Overall, the upper 25th percentile did not demonstrate a high percentage in learning gains in the content areas.

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

The lowest performance area was in Math Lowest 25th Percentile with 31%.

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

During the 2018-2019 School Year, 4th Grade Math classes had three different teachers and our community was also impacted by Hurricane Michael. In addition to families being displaced, schools were closed for two weeks.

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

The most improved data component was Science Achievement. 54% of 5th Grade Students scored a level 3 or above on the 2019 Florida's Next Generation Sunshine Standards Science Assessment.

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

Science teachers participated in district training focusing on student achievement and understanding the standards. Teachers also met with our Curriculum/Assessment Coordinator on a regular basis to discuss data received from diagnostic assessments given by the school district. Data from these diagnostic assessments allowed teachers to focus on those standards that students had not demonstrated mastery in.

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

Rigorous whole group instruction, differentiated, small group instruction, and individualized online instruction provided to all learners. Remedial instruction will be given to students with a focus on the lowest 25th percentile and students with disabilities receiving instruction as specified in IEP's.

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.

Teachers will meet with grade-level teams weekly to share classroom instructional strategies and procedures. During this time, teachers will share student I-Ready data and identify specific students and standards that have not demonstrated mastery.

Teachers will meet with School Curriculum/Assessment Coordinator bi-weekly to review data and student achievement. Together, they will set goals to be reviewed throughout the school year.

Teachers will participate in professional development on I-Ready and instructional practices throughout the school year.

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

The school literacy team will provide information and support for ELA teachers throughout the school year. This may include assisting with curriculum needs, reviewing data, goal setting, lesson modeling, and participating in observations with feedback,. In addition, the School Curriculum/Assessment Coordinator will assist through the compilation and explanation of student data, as well as providing information about various professional development opportunities outside of the school, that may be used to assist teachers with the information they need to meet their student achievement goals.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our 2020-21 FSA scores, students scoring in the lowest 25% will receive intensive, small group remediation in ELA. Their progress will be closely monitored through weekly data analysis and possible MTSS placement. This remediation will result in at least 50% of our students making learning gains on the 2021-22 ELA FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on our lowest 25%, at least 50% of our students will make learning gains on the 2020-21 ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	Ponce de Leon Elementary School Curriculum and Assessments Coordinator, Mrs. Wanda Brown will be monitoring student progress through diagnostic assessments given throughout the year. She will report required data to the school administration as well as classroom teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Wanda Brown (brownw@hdsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Each classroom teacher will provide small group math instruction to students who are in the lowest 25th percentile. This small group instruction will be devoted to addressing specific reading deficiencies or non-mastered standards identified by progress monitoring assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers use a variety of learning and instructional styles that are essential to student achievement. Small group instruction is one of the most beneficial methods for delivering and monitoring student growth and understanding. A small group setting allows teachers the opportunity to best monitor individual understanding and provide consistent support.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The leadership team will work with the 3rd-5th grade teachers as needed to discuss student data as well as any necessary instructional changes needed.
2. Grade level teachers will meet with the leadership team to review their class performance, and review the curriculum pacing guides in order to make instructional changes if needed to ensure student progress.
3. Administration will look over data, conduct walk-throughs, and will monitor lesson plans.
4. Administration will discuss walk-through observations with teachers, monitor lesson plans, review progress monitoring data, and review state assessment data.
5. The leadership team will meet after FSA Scores are received to determine if goal was achieved.

Person Responsible Rodd Jones (jonesr@hdsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our 2021 Math Assessment scores, students scoring in the lowest 25% will receive intensive, small group remediation in ELA. Their progress will be closely monitored through weekly data analysis and possible MTSS placement. This remediation will result in at least 50% of our students making learning gains on the 2021-22 ELA FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on our lowest 25%, at least 50% of our students will make learning gains on the 2020-21 ELA FSA
Monitoring:	Ponce de Leon Elementary School Curriculum and Assessments Coordinator, Mrs. Wanda Brown will be monitoring student progress through diagnostic assessments given throughout the year. She will report required data to the school administration, as well as classroom teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Wanda Brown (brownw@hdsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Each classroom teacher will provide small group math instruction to students who are in the lowest 25th percentile. This small group instruction will be devoted to addressing specific math deficiencies identified by progress monitoring assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers use a variety of learning and instructional styles that are essential to student achievement. Small group instruction is one of the most beneficial methods for delivering and monitoring student growth and understanding. A small group setting allows teachers the opportunity to best monitor individual understanding and provide consistent support.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The leadership team will work with the 3rd-5th grade teachers as needed to discuss student data as well as any necessary instructional changes needed.
2. Grade level teachers will meet with the leadership team to review their class performance, and review the curriculum pacing guides in order to make instructional changes if needed to ensure student progress.
3. Administration will look over data, conduct walk-throughs, and will monitor lesson plans.
4. Administration will discuss walk-through observations with teachers, monitor lesson plans, review progress monitoring data, and review state assessment data.

Person Responsible Rodd Jones (jonesr@hdsb.org)

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.

When compared to elementary schools across the state, Ponce de Leon Elementary School falls into the moderate category for the number of incidents reported. Within the categories of Drug/ Public Order and Suspensions, other schools in our county were ranked as "high" or "very high,"; whereas, PDLE received "low" and "very low" rankings in the same areas. We will continue to monitor and encourage student behavior in an effort to maintain or improve these rankings.

The administration will meet with the PDLE Threat Assessment team once a month to discuss discipline data recorded through Focus, and identify students who are at risk, or may pose a threat to the safety and security of the school. The administration will work with teachers and PTO to develop a positive reinforcement system to recognize students who exhibit good behavior each nine weeks.

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.

Ponce de Leon Elementary School will use the Title 1 Parent and Family Engagement Policy as a guide in its efforts to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders. Our local community is invited to take part in our school by becoming community partners and/or stakeholders. These community members are encouraged to serve on our School Advisory Council, participate in PTO, and help provide support and resources when possible. In addition, families and community partners are invited to participate in a variety of family-oriented events and activities throughout the year.

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

Teachers, School Support Staff, students, families of students, and volunteers are all stakeholders who have a direct impact on student achievement. Other stakeholders include local daycares/pre-schools, area social services workers, and business partners. Each group has the potential to provide valuable input and Improve student achievement and school/parent/community relations. Individuals from these stakeholder groups are encouraged to be a part of the Ponce de Leon Elementary School, School Advisory Council. As part of the School Advisory Council, stakeholders are able to provide input and concerns that may otherwise go unheard. The SAC makes decisions about how to best use allocated funds to provide the best

educational opportunities, in the safest environment, while keeping communications between families and school personnel at the forefront.

One example of this is the purchase of Student Communicators for all students, to encourage daily communication with families. These communicators assist in relaying information about school sponsored family and community events with families, as well as providing a consistent source of communication between teachers and parents. Using student communicators, as well as social media, stakeholders will be invited to participate in Book Fairs, Family Nights, Vocabulary Parade, Veterans Day Program, Field Day, and other family oriented events to be held throughout the school year. These events promote positive relationships with stakeholders and allow stakeholders to be an active participant in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0111 - Ponce De Leon Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase materials and/or technology resources to improve student achievement on the ELA FSA.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	590-Other Materials and Supplies	0111 - Ponce De Leon Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase materials and/or technology to improve student achievement on the Math FSA.</i>			
Total:						\$1,000.00