

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics Purpose and Outline of the SIP School Information Needs Assessment Planning for Improvement Positive Culture & Environment Budget to Support Goals | 3 |
|--|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement | 21 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 24 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Monroe - 0161 - Poinciana Elementary School - 2021-22 SIP

Poinciana Elementary School

1407 KENNEDY DR, Key West, FL 33040

https://www.keysschools.com/domain/1295

Demographics

Principal: Tara Whitehead L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 71% |
| 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: A (64%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (55%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Inf | ormation* |
| 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. F | or more information, <u>click here</u> . |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Monroe 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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

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 School Information Needs Assessment Planning for Improvement Title I Requirements | 4 |
|--|----|
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement | 21 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Monroe - 0161 - Poinciana Elementary School - 2021-22 SIP

Poinciana Elementary School

1407 KENNEDY DR, Key West, FL 33040

https://www.keysschools.com/domain/1295

School Demographics

| School Type and Gra (per MSID F | | 2020-21 Title I School | Disadvant | Economically aged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|------------------------|---------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Elementary So PK-5 | chool | Yes | es 58% | | | | | | | | |
| Primary Service (per MSID F | ••• | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) | | | | | | | |
| K-12 General Ed | ucation | No | | 68% | | | | | | | |
| School Grades Histor | У | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year Grade | 2020-21 | 2019-20 A | 2018-19 A | 2017-18 B | | | | | | | |
| School Board Approv | al | | | | | | | | | | |

This plan is pending approval by the Monroe 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.

MISSION: Building Leaders - Every Day!

Provide the school's vision statement.

VISION: Building Leaders for Life!

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 |
|-----------------|------------------------|---|
| Whitehead, Tara | Principal | Principal Primary Responsibilities include, but are not limited to: Provides leadership and management of assigned elementary school, including all instructional and administrative programs and activities. Supervises all professional and classified staff members, including selecting or recommending selection, training, assigning and evaluating work, counseling, disciplining and terminating or recommending termination; prepares periodic employee performance evaluations. Assigns responsibilities to Assistant Principals to foster professional growth and effective instructional programming; assigns responsibilities to professional staff, including assignments to instructional groups, rooms and supervision duties. Plans, organizes and implements staff development programs. Seeks to maintain an atmosphere conducive to good teacher-teacher and teacher-administrator relationships. Prepares and administers the school's operating budget; serves as overall custodian of school funds allocated to or collected by the school; adheres to state statute and District policies related to financial accounting to ensure judicious management of all school funds; approves expenditures and prepares related reports. Seeks, secures and administrative school-level grants for projects and programs. Plans, evaluates and recommends school-wide programs, policies, goals and objectives. Ensures that all School Board and administrative policies are effectively explained and implemented. Ensures school compliance with the requirements of state and regional accreditation standards and regulations. Provides leadership in the school improvement process. Coordinates school enrollment. Supervises, reviews and evaluates the instructional program; observes classroom environment and makes recommendations for improvement in instruction and class management data. Assists in the selection of and supervises the development and adoption of the District's testing program; matages and administers the testing program for the school; analyzes and makes recommend |
| Lanier, Kelley | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal Primary Responsibilities include, but are not limited to: Performs a variety of leadership duties to assist the Principal in managing the school; assumes the duties of the Principal in the absence of the Principal and as assigned. Analyzes, interprets and facilitates the sharing of |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------|----------------|---|
| | | assessment findings and student achievement data for the purpose of designing and modifying instruction. Supervises, observes and evaluates the performance of designated certificated and/or classified personnel; assigns duties to faculty and staff as appropriate to meet school objectives; assists with the recruiting, interviewing, and selection of new faculty and staff. Assists the Principal in providing instructional leadership to the school including assisting in the development, implementation, and evaluation of intervention programs that address the needs of at-risk students. Provides direction to a variety of faculty, staff, and student programs and services; participates in formal and informal classroom visitations and observations; provides recommendations and suggestions for improvement as appropriate. Develops and administers disciplinary procedures in accordance with district policies and state laws; receives referrals and confers with students, parents, teachers, community agencies, and law enforcement; responds to and resolves parent, student, and staff concerns and complaints; serves on discipline or expulsion panels as assigned. |
| Finigan, Lesley | Reading Coach | Instructional Coaches Primary Responsibilities include, but are not limited to: Assist teachers in data driven, student centered planning processes that intensify instructional focus on students' mastery of essential standards. Observe and conference with teachers posing questions with reflection regarding examples and non-examples of best practice. Model or co teach lessons. Develop standard based curriculum, resources, assessments and intervention programs for and with teachers. Collect and analyze school and district data. Facilitate professional development in content, lesson planning, instructional strategies, assessments and the implementation of the Florida State Standards. Facilitate curricular team leadership meetings and study groups. Assist in the development of a district-wide instructional focus calendar. Facilitate Reading Endorsement program for the school district. |
| Galvan, Jean | Math Coach | Jean Galvan - Instructional Coaches Primary Responsibilities include, but are not limited to: Assist teachers in data driven, student centered planning processes that intensify instructional focus on students' mastery of essential standards. Observe and conference with teachers posing questions with reflection regarding examples and non-examples of best practice. Model or co teach lessons. Develop standard based curriculum, resources, assessments and intervention programs for and with teachers. Collect and analyze school and district data. Facilitate professional development in content, lesson planning, instructional strategies, assessments and the implementation of the Florida State Standards. Facilitate curricular team |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|------------------|---|
| | | leadership meetings and study groups. Assist in the development of a district-wide instructional focus calendar. Facilitate Reading Endorsement program for the school district. |
| Keenum, Rebecca | School Counselor | Rebecca Keenum - Guidance Counselor Primary Responsibilities include, but are not limited to: School counselor's primary goal is to encourage, support, and foster positive academic, career, social, and personal development for students in schools. Poinciana Elementary School's counselor serves students and their school in numerous ways, but the list below gives the major roles and responsibilities that are included in a comprehensive school counseling program. Student development curriculum consists of structured lessons designed to help students achieve the desired competencies and to provide all students with the knowledge and skills appropriate for their developmental level. The student development curriculum is delivered throughout the school's overall curriculum and is systematically presented by school counselors in collaboration with other educators in PreK12 classroom and group activities. School Counselor activities include the following: • Individual counseling and advisement to help students • Consultation—working with administrators, teachers, and staff to meet student needs • Student appraisal—coordinating information that goes into confidential student files and interpreting the information to help qualify students for special programs, services, and/or remediation • Parent help—meeting individually and in groups with parents and providing resources and information on child development and other specific topics • Referral—providing referrals to appropriate professionals in the schools and in the outside community • Program planning, management, and coordinating work of various school personnel, parents, and other interested parties in the implementation of the school cunseling program • Change agent for the school atmosphere • Student advocate in meetings with teachers and staff • Classroom observations on behaviors and relationships so that feedback can be provided to teacher, students, and parents • Public relations—informing school staff, parents, teachers, students, and community members about |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|--|
| | | counseling program. Local research—identifying student population characteristics, such as drug use on campus Student Screening—interviewing new students, etc. Staff development—focusing around particular issues Using data to show the impact of the school counseling program on school improvement and student achievement |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Tara Whitehead L

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.*

4

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.

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school 53

Total number of students enrolled at the school 560

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

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year. 10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

| Monroe - 0161 - Poinciana Elementary School - 2021-22 SIP |
|---|
|---|

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|----|-------------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | Κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 75 | 87 | 82 | 83 | 88 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 492 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 17 | 9 | 14 | 9 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 58 | 29 | 35 | 37 | 41 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 249 |

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/26/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | | | | | Gr | ade | Le | ve | I | | | | | Total |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Number of students enrolled | 76 | 78 | 81 | 82 | 76 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 466 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | vel | I | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indiantar | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | ve | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator | | | | | Gr | ade | Le | ve | I | | | | | Total |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| Number of students enrolled | 76 | 78 | 81 | 82 | 76 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 466 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | ve | I | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indiantar | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | ve | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 63% | 70% | 57% | 56% | 68% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 63% | 55% | 58% | 58% | 58% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 62% | 46% | 53% | 56% | 49% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 65% | 71% | 63% | 60% | 62% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 67% | 64% | 62% | 52% | 50% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 66% | 56% | 51% | 55% | 48% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 61% | 66% | 53% | 60% | 67% | 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 | 64% | 70% | -6% | 58% | 6% |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 58% | 2% | 58% | 2% |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | -64% | | | · · | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 61% | 62% | -1% | 56% | 5% |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | -60% | | | · · · | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 62% | 1% | 62% | 1% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 60% | 3% | 64% | -1% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -63% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 68% | 66% | 2% | 60% | 8% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -63% | | | | |

| | | | SCIEN | CE | | |
|-------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 65% | -3% | 53% | 9% |
| Cohort Corr | nparison | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool that was used to compile the data below was the STAR ELA, STAR Math, and Illuminate for Science.

| | | Grade 1 | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 38/48% | 35/44% | 22/27% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 21/40% | 24/45% | 35/66% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8/53% | 6/43% | 8/57% |
| | English Language Learners | 10/36% | 9/32% | 14/48% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 56/71% | 60/75% | 63/78% |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 35/66% | 37/70% | 38/72% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7/47% | 6/43% | 8/57% |
| | English Language Learners | 13/46% | 12/43% | 15/52% |
| | | Grade 2 | | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | Fall 58/68% | Winter 54/65% | Spring 57/70% |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | 58/68% | 54/65% | 57/70% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 58/68% 38/66% | 54/65% 34/59% | 57/70% 35/63% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency | 58/68% 38/66% 7/41% 16/52% Fall | 54/65% 34/59% 3/19% | 57/70% 35/63% 5/31% 15/52% Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | 58/68% 38/66% 7/41% 16/52% | 54/65% 34/59% 3/19% 14/45% | 57/70% 35/63% 5/31% 15/52% |
| | ProficiencyAll StudentsEconomicallyDisadvantagedStudents WithDisabilitiesEnglish LanguageLearnersNumber/%ProficiencyAll StudentsEconomicallyDisadvantaged | 58/68% 38/66% 7/41% 16/52% Fall | 54/65% 34/59% 3/19% 14/45% Winter | 57/70% 35/63% 5/31% 15/52% Spring |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | 58/68% 38/66% 7/41% 16/52% Fall 52/62\$ | 54/65% 34/59% 3/19% 14/45% Winter 59/71% | 57/70% 35/63% 5/31% 15/52% Spring 65/79% |

| | | Grade 3 | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 47/58% | 50/60% | 54/67% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 26/52% | 28/54% | 30/59% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 11/46% | 11/44% | 12/50% |
| | English Language Learners | 12/38% | 12/38% | 16/50% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 57/72% | 53/65% | 56/69% |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 31/63% | 30/59% | 32/63% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 12/52% | 13/54% | 13/54% |
| | English Language Learners | 18/56% | 18/56% | 18/56% |
| | | Grade 4 | | |
| | Number/% | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency | Fall | vvii itor | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | 44/56% | 54/69% | 50/67% |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | 44/56% | 54/69% | 50/67% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 44/56% 19/42% | 54/69% 26/59% | 50/67% 20/48% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language | 44/56% 19/42% 4/24% | 54/69% 26/59% 6/35% | 50/67% 20/48% 5/31% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | 44/56% 19/42% 4/24% 6/21% | 54/69% 26/59% 6/35% 12/44% | 50/67% 20/48% 5/31% 10/38% |
| | ProficiencyAll StudentsEconomicallyDisadvantagedStudents WithDisabilitiesEnglish LanguageLearnersNumber/%ProficiencyAll StudentsEconomicallyDisadvantaged | 44/56% 19/42% 4/24% 6/21% Fall | 54/69% 26/59% 6/35% 12/44% Winter | 50/67% 20/48% 5/31% 10/38% Spring |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | 44/56% 19/42% 4/24% 6/21% Fall 55/71% | 54/69% 26/59% 6/35% 12/44% Winter 63/81% | 50/67% 20/48% 5/31% 10/38% Spring 61/81% |

| | | Grade 5 | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 42/55% | 37/51% | 49/64% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 21/50% | 16/40% | 23/56% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 10/53% | 11/58% | 10/53% |
| | English Language Learners | 7/29% | 6/25% | 6/25% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 49/65% | 51/70% | 56/73% |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 22/54% | 24/60% | 25/61% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7/39% | 10/53% | 10/53% |
| | English Language Learners | 13/57% | 14/53% | 13/54% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 16/24% | 16/25% | |
| Science | Economically Disadvantaged | 23/8% | 6/17% | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/13% | 2/13% | |
| | English Language Learners | 3/14% | 4/18% | |

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 | 34 | 38 | | 40 | 38 | | 45 | | | | |
| ELL | 43 | 50 | 18 | 55 | 50 | | 39 | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | 40 | | 51 | 33 | | 33 | | | | |
| HSP | 53 | 53 | | 57 | 50 | | 59 | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 70 | | 72 | 55 | | 65 | | | | |
| FRL | 48 | 42 | 9 | 53 | 36 | 38 | 37 | | | | |
| | | 2019 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 41 | 48 | 50 | 44 | 65 | 52 | 25 | | | | |
| ELL | 38 | 50 | 53 | 51 | 65 | 60 | 21 | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | 54 | 50 | 43 | 56 | 53 | 29 | | | | |
| HSP | 59 | 60 | 65 | 62 | 65 | 65 | 53 | | | | |

| | 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 | 77 | 73 | | 81 | 73 | | 82 | | | | |
| FRL | 53 | 58 | 60 | 55 | 66 | 66 | 47 | | | | |
| | | 2018 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 35 | 55 | 60 | 33 | 63 | 83 | 38 | | | | |
| ELL | 38 | 51 | 50 | 35 | 49 | 57 | 31 | | | | |
| ASN | 69 | | | 77 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 44 | 63 | 69 | 37 | 50 | 69 | 50 | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 60 | 50 | 57 | 56 | 43 | 56 | | | | |
| WHT | 69 | 58 | | 75 | 47 | | 67 | | | | |
| FRL | 52 | 55 | 53 | 53 | 52 | 53 | 61 | | | | |

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 | 52 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 72 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 413 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities

Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?

Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%

Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%

43

NO

47

NO

Monroe - 0161 - Poinciana Elementary School - 2021-22 SIP

| 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 | 44 |
| 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 | 58 |
| 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 | |
| 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 | 67 |
| 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 | 42 |
| | NO |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | |

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 the 2018-2019, 2019-2021 data, each school grade component increased from 2018-2019 and decreased from 2019-2021. There is no data for 2020 school year. Poinciana demographics over the last 4 years, show an increase in the EL student population with limited English language and limited formal education.

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

According to the 2021 progress monitoring and 2019 data, each school grade component decreased in achievement level. Based on the subgroup data, EL performed the lowest with an achievement level at 36%.

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

The contributing factors are the increase of EL students with limited English language, interrupted or no formal education, lack parental involvement in child's education, and the pandemic. The actions that need to be implemented this school year is for more intensive and differentiated EL support to address this need for improvement.

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

Based off the 2021 progress monitoring and the 2019 state assessments, grade 4 progress monitoring spring administration 74% proficiency compared to 2019 FSA Math proficiency at 63%. No improvement was made in all other school grade components.

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

The contributing factor to this improvement was the departmentalized 4th grade cohort that allowed for the 4th grade teacher to focus on the specific content area standards.

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

The strategies that will be implemented for the 2021-2022 school year to support the EL students is the development and implementation of a co-teach model that will provide support to the students within the classroom from the EL teacher, Gen Ed teacher, and the EL parapro.

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.

The professional development opportunities that will be provided throughout the school year are support from the site-based EL contact, weekly data meetings with the grade level EL co-teachers, and professional development provided by the EL curriculum coordinator.

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

The continuation of the program will be supported by additional services as follows; EL Student Ambassador Program, continuation of EL professional development, utilization of Ellevation, and a parent support group focused on the EL parent population.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| | Environment opeenrearly relating to coolar Enretional Eduling |
|--|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Based on CoVitality, we found that the overall social emotional climate of the school was in need of support. 20% of 4th and 5th grade students fell into the Tier 2 bracket while 14% of 4th and 5th grade students fell into the Tier 3 bracket. The CoVitality domain area which needed the most growth was zest. Zest is the degree of enthusiasm and energy with which a student approaches work. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Poinciana Elementary School will increase the number of students in Tier 1 from 64% to 68% by the second administration (February) of the Panorama Survey. |
| Monitoring: | This focus will be monitored by the Leadership Team (principal, assistant principal, and instructional coaches) conducting walkthroughs utilizing an aligned walkthrough form to check for fidelity of the strategy. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Kelley Lanier (kelley.lanier@keysschools.com) |
| Evidence- based Strategy: | The evidence-based strategy being implemented is collaborative conversations. Collaborative conversations fall under collaborative structures which enhance academic talk with a focus on higher order cognitive thinking. |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy: | Due to the pandemic, there was a lack of student talk in the classroom. Collaborative conversations will provide more opportunities for students to engage with their peers socially and academically. |

Action Steps to Implement

AVID Site Coordinator will communicate with 4th and 5th grade teams about the site goals, strategies, and implementation process.

Person

Responsible Lesley Finigan (lesley.finigan@keysschools.com)

AVID site team will create the walkthrough template that is aligned with the determined priorities in order to monitor student participation and interaction with one another and critical thinking around the content

Person Responsible Tara Whitehead (tara.whitehead@keysstudents.net)

AVID site coordinator will share the walkthrough template with 4th and 5th grade teachers.

Person Responsible Lesley Finigan (lesley.finigan@keysschools.com)

Leadership team will create a calendar to organize walkthrough dates and times as well as meetings to discuss data and share results with the grade levels.

Person

Responsible Kelley Lanier (kelley.lanier@keysschools.com)

Leadership team will begin walkthroughs.

Person

Responsible Jean Galvan (jean.galvan@keysschools.com)

Leadership team will share the data and provide feedback during the AVID site team monthly meetings.

Person Responsible Tara Whitehead (tara.whitehead@keysstudents.net)

| #2. Instructio | nal Practice specifically relating to ELA | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | According to our FSA component data, our overall ELA proficiency decreased when compared to the 2018-2019 school year. The school struggles with overall ELA achievement for EL students. The contributing factors are due to the interrupted learning, limited English language skills, and academic vocabulary. | | | | | |
| Measurable Outcome: | By May 2022, grades 3-5 ELA achievement for the EL subgroup, will increase from 37% - 42% by scoring a level 3 or higher on the FSA. | | | | | |
| Monitoring: | STAR ELA progress monitoring will be used to evaluate advancement toward the desired outcome. Data chats will take place by grade levels to drive instruction and to create intervention groupings. Teachers will hold individualized data chats with students after PM1 and PM2. | | | | | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Lesley Finigan (lesley.finigan@keysschools.com) | | | | | |
| Evidence- based Strategy: | The evidence-based strategy that will be implemented throughout each grade level is a co- teaching model. The model will consist of the general education teacher paired together with an EL teacher to share the responsibilities of planning, instructing, and assessing. This co-teaching model will provide a more inclusive classroom environment by having the EL teacher co-teacher during the ELA blocks for 3rd-5th grade | | | | | |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy: | Students that are included in a co-teach environment will have the opportunity to improve academic performance, increased time and attention from teachers, increased emphasis on cognitive strategies and study skills, increase social skills and improved classroom communities. | | | | | |
| Action Steps | to Implement | | | | | |
| 1. Hired teach | ers to expand the co-teaching model | | | | | |
| Person Responsible | Tara Whitehead (tara.whitehead@keysstudents.net) | | | | | |
| 2. Master sch | edule was created to prioritize co-teaching within the grade levels. | | | | | |
| Person Responsible | Jean Galvan (jean.galvan@keysschools.com) | | | | | |
| General ed classrooms. | ucation teachers were recruited to partner with EL teachers to support co-teaching | | | | | |
| Person Responsible | Tara Whitehead (tara.whitehead@keysstudents.net) | | | | | |
| 4. Provide pro | fessional development to support a co-teaching classroom model. | | | | | |
| Person Responsible | Kelley Lanier (kelley.lanier@keysschools.com) | | | | | |

5. Teachers will implement a co-teaching model classroom with integrity.

Person

Kelley Lanier (kelley.lanier@keysschools.com) Responsible

6. Administration will check for fidelity of the co-teaching classroom by using a classroom walkthrough tool.

Person Responsible Tara Whitehead (tara.whitehead@keysstudents.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

Poinciana Elementary School did not have SESIR discipline data to report.

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.

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.

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

At Poinciana Elementary School, we utilize several methods to engage all stakeholders in building a positive culture and environment at the school.

1. Administrators - Creating a school climate that is welcoming and supportive of all stakeholders.

Teachers - Supporting the school mission and vision throughout their instructional lessons and building a classroom climate that is inclusive to all students and accepting to different backgrounds and cultures.
 Staff - Supporting the school's mission and vision. Working collectively with the teachers and parents to

support the students academic achievement level.

4. Students - Being respectful, responsible and ready to learn.

5. Parents, families, community members and local civil service groups - promoting the importance of school, supportive of the mission and vision of the school, attending activities and after school community nights.

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 III.A. Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | | | | \$0.00 |
|---|---|--------|---|--------|
| | 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| | | | Total: | \$0.00 |