

Polk County Public Schools

Loughman Oaks Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Loughman Oaks Elementary School

4600 US HWY 17- 92 N, Davenport, FL 33837

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

Demographics

Principal: Sara Stoquert

Start Date for this Principal: 7/18/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
2021-22 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: D (40%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (42%)
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	CSI

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Loughman Oaks Elementary School

4600 US HWY 17- 92 N, Davenport, FL 33837

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	92%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D	D	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Loughman Oaks Elementary is to provide a high quality education for all learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Loughman Oaks is to provide a high quality education for all learners through collaboration, community outreach, commitment and strong leadership.

The staff at Loughman Oaks Elementary believes that:

- * All children deserve the opportunity to be empowered to think, dream, believe, and achieve.
- * The home, school, and community must share the responsibility for the needs and development of children.
- * Differences in learning styles exist; therefore, students have the right to learn in a way that brings them personal success by providing and implementing strategies, as well as best practices.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stoquert, Sara	Principal	<p>Principal- The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, models the problem solving process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure for implementation of MTSS, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures and participates in adequate professional learning to support MTSS implementation, develops a culture of expectation with the school staff for the implementation of MTSS school-wide, ensures resources are assigned to those areas in most need, and communicates with parents regarding school based MTSS plans and activities. Provides technology necessary to manage and display data, provides professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and graphic display. Ensures safe environment for all stakeholders.</p>
Gekakis, Lauren	Assistant Principal	<p>Assistant Principal- Assists the principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of MTSS, further assists the principal in the assessment of MTSS skills, implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures and participates in professional learning, and communicates with parents concerning MTSS plans and activities. Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data, facilitates development of intervention plans, provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation, assists with professional development for behavior concerns, assist in facilitation of data-based decision making activities. Ensures safe environment for all stakeholders.</p>
Hunter, Arnetta	Assistant Principal	<p>Assistant Principal- Assists the principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of MTSS, further assists the principal in the assessment of MTSS skills, implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures and participates in professional learning, and communicates with parents concerning MTSS plans and activities. Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data, facilitates development of intervention plans, provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation, assists with professional development for behavior concerns, assist in facilitation of</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		data-based decision making activities. Ensures safe environment for all stakeholders.
Hughes, Sabrina	Math Coach	MATH School-based Coach is responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. This position will also be responsible for coaching teachers about: data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools.
Turner, Alissa	Reading Coach	ELA School-based Coach is responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. This position will also be responsible for coaching teachers about: data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools.
Tederous, Rachael	School Counselor	
Krueger, Nicole	Teacher, ESE	
Mahon, Steven	ELL Compliance Specialist	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/18/2022, Sara Stoquert

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

980

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

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

21

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	204	170	192	193	210	206	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1175
Attendance below 90 percent	118	80	88	88	88	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	547
One or more suspensions	7	8	14	19	26	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	59	90	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	73	100	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	287
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	40	36	35	45	81	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	326

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/11/2022

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	97	123	159	157	160	169	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	865
Attendance below 90 percent	0	30	47	27	35	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171
One or more suspensions	0	3	9	8	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	44	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	47	50	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	30	62	60	67	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	266

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	14	32	32	37	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167

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	1	0	1	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	97	123	159	157	160	169	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	865
Attendance below 90 percent	0	30	47	27	35	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171
One or more suspensions	0	3	9	8	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	44	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	47	50	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	30	62	60	67	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	266

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	14	32	32	37	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167

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	1	0	1	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	44%	47%	56%				45%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	50%						41%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%						40%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	35%	42%	50%				51%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	42%						52%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%						39%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	26%	49%	59%				34%	47%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	52%	52%	0%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	35%	48%	-13%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	37%	47%	-10%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	61%	56%	5%	62%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	56%	-5%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					
	2019	38%	51%	-13%	60%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	30%	45%	-15%	53%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	22	41	38	18	44	36	25				
ELL	32	47	35	29	39	28	21				
BLK	43	53		30	36		25				
HSP	40	51	50	32	42	47	26				
MUL	54			50							
WHT	50	42	8	44	46	45	33				
FRL	38	48	35	28	36	37	21				

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	13	36		17	42						
ELL	31	26		37	29		20				
BLK	42			30							
HSP	31	30	31	34	32		26				
WHT	49	33		52	43		38				
FRL	31	31	31	34	35	31	23				

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	28	29	27	24	25	30	23				
ELL	34	41	36	43	49	41	19				
BLK	45	50		47	53		24				
HSP	43	42	42	46	50	40	35				
MUL	60			60							
WHT	49	36	31	66	57	46	37				
FRL	42	42	39	45	46	28	30				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
---	----

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	52
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	38
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Several trends have occurred.

1. Math achievement for grades 3-5 has decreased by 16% over the past 3 years.
2. Science achievement for 5th grade has decreased 8% over the past 3 years.
3. Students with disabilities show under 41% according to ESSA data over the past 3 years.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

1. Math: Our overall achievement on FSA has decreased from 51% proficient to 35% proficient over the past 3 years.
2. Science: Our overall achievement on the Science State Assessment has decreased from 34% to 26% over the past 3 years.

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 downward trends to 3-5th grade were due to inconsistency of instructional staff, new educators and out of field educators with a lack of classroom experience, significant overages in classrooms due to over 400 new students, ineffective planning and implementations practices in place.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our overall ELA learning gains on FSA increased from 31% proficiency to 50%.

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

Focus on intentional whole group instruction that aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards/benchmarks. Small groups formed using data that drove instruction and planning to close the academic gaps.

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

Continuation of previous practices and a heightened focus on task alignment to the standards and benchmarks. Maintaining student that are proficient.

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.

Professional development will be tailored to the specific needs of our teachers. Heavy focus for grades 3-5 on the B.E.S.T. standards, small group instruction, data analysis to drive instruction and classroom walk through tool to monitor task alignment.

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

Professional development for instructional coaches, administration team and leadership team members to ensure sustainability. Professional development will include B.E.S.T. standards student task alignment, targeted lesson planning using data to drive instruction, and classroom engagement strategies.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

According to 2021-22 FSA data, our school math proficiency decreased 3% from 38% to 35% for grades 3-5. Our goal is to increase our 3rd-5th grade proficiencies from 35% to 41% on the 2022-23 FAST assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

State data will show a minimum of plus 1% proficiency increase for all core content. Our students will increase math proficiency from 35% to a minimum of 40%

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

1. Review of bi-weekly assessments data, STAR assessment data and FAST. The leadership team will have conversations and data chats with the teachers to ensure progress.
2. Use of benchmarks and objectives to drive the instruction.
3. Academic coaches and support staff will provide strategies to assist teachers with interpreting the complexity levels of objectives in order to collect accurate student data for differentiated instructional purposes.
4. Progress monitoring data offered by district/state level platforms will be used to ensure students are mastering benchmarks, being taught after collaborative planning is properly implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Bi-weekly collaborative planning with math coach (using the learning ARC framework). Implementation of highly effective core instruction and small group instruction to achieve success. Teacher training in best practices for whole group and small group instruction, emphasizing the usage of differentiated materials and manipulatives. Monitor students engaging in equivalent experiences aligned to state expectations using classroom walk through tool.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Highly effective core instruction will ensure that all students are receiving grade level equivalent experiences. Targeted small group instruction and remediation will provide students with their individualized needs. Bi-weekly collaborative planning allows teachers to deepen their understanding of best practices and developing objectives/tasks to meet all students needs using the ARC framework. TNTP Opportunity Myth speaks to the relationship between academic success and ensuring students are able to engage in grade level standards based expectations. It is imperative we all monitor for alignment and plan for teachers understanding of the benchmarks and aligned tasks and assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. The leadership team, along with teacher individual conferences and MTSS meetings, will review the following student progress monitoring: FAST, STAR, and formative assessments.

Person Responsible Arnetta Hunter (arnetta.hunter@polk-fl.net)

2. Instructional benchmarks and objectives will be discussed in collaborative planning. Coaches and administration will ensure fidelity with classroom walkthroughs. Math instructional coach will use the ARC framework to facilitate collaborative planning with all Math teachers during a common planning period on Thursdays (bi-weekly) focusing on improving target/task alignment.

Person Responsible Sabrina Hughes (sabrina.hughes@polk-fl.net)

3. During collaborative planning, leveled groups will be discussed with general education, ESE and ESOL teachers. Materials will be used to increase student fact fluency. Differentiated materials will be used to increase student comprehension of math benchmarks.

Person Responsible Sabrina Hughes (sabrina.hughes@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

According to 2021-22 Science statewide assessment data, our school decreased in student proficiency from 34% (2019) to 29% (2020) to 26% (2021). Our goal is to increase science proficiency from 26% to 35% on the 2022-23 science statewide assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Science state data will show a minimum of 9% increase in proficiency. Minimum goal will be 35% proficient.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

1. Review of bi-weekly assessments data, and district quarterly assessments. The leadership team will have conversations and data chats with the teachers to ensure progress.
2. Use of data and standards to drive the instruction with target/task alignment as the main focus (using the learning ARC framework)
3. Academic coaches and support staff will provide strategies to assist teachers with interpreting the complexity levels of standards in order to collect accurate student data for differentiated instructional purposes.
4. Teachers will incorporate the use leveled readers relating to science concepts during their small group instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based

Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Weekly collaborative planning with the school based Science coach. Implementation of highly effective core instruction and small group instruction to achieve success. Teacher training in best practices for whole group and small group instruction, emphasizing the usage of differentiated materials and hands on activities that give students an equivalent experience.

Rationale for Evidence-

based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Highly effective core instruction will ensure that all students are receiving grade level equivalent experiences. Targeted small group instruction and remediation will provide students with their individualized needs. Weekly collaborative planning allows teachers to deepen their understanding of best practices to meet all students needs.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. The leadership team, along with teacher individual conferences and MTSS meetings, will review the following student progress monitoring: bi-weekly tests, district quarterly assessments, and formative assessments.

Person Responsible

Arnetta Hunter (arnetta.hunter@polk-fl.net)

2. Instructional benchmarks and objectives will be discussed in collaborative planning. Coaches and administration will ensure fidelity with classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Sabrina Hughes (sabrina.hughes@polk-fl.net)

3. During collaborative planning, leveled groups will be discussed with general education and ESE teachers. Science based leveled readers and hands on materials will be used to increase student proficiency of science standards.

Person Responsible Sabrina Hughes (sabrina.hughes@polk-fl.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on the 2021-22 ESSA data, our students with disabilities fell below the 41% federal index consecutively for 3 years. Our school goal is to increase proficiency for our students with disabilities from 32% to 37%.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to raise the federal index of students with disabilities by the end of the 2022-23 school year to above 41%.
50% of students with disabilities will show a half years growth or learning gains as measured by the F.A.S.T.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

1. Monitoring of appropriate implementation of accommodations per the IEP
2. Use of benchmarks and objectives to drive the instruction
3. Implement the use of rubrics and explicit teacher feedback
4. The following assessments will be monitored by leadership team and staff: FAST Progress Monitoring, STAR, Science Quarterly Assessments, district provided writing prompts, and formative assessments.
5. Support staff and ESE teachers will conduct small groups across grade levels 1 through 5
6. Academic coaches and support staff will provide strategies to assist teachers with interpreting the complexity levels of objectives in order to collect accurate student data for differentiated instructional purposes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Evidenced based strategies used are classroom walkthroughs, both non-evaluative and evaluative in Journey, Evidence of student work posted in the classroom with appropriate rubrics and explicit student feedback. Implementation of high yield strategies and interventions for struggling students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The rationale is to take an intentional approach to meeting the needs of students with disabilities in order to reduce the score gap between SWD and the non-SWD while also increasing staff capacity of ESE best practices.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Professional development on accommodation implementation, along with implementation sheet.

Person Responsible Nicole Krueger (nicole.krueger@polk-fl.net)

2. Instructional benchmarks and objectives will be discussed in collaborative planning. Coaches and administration will ensure fidelity with classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Lauren Gekakis (lauren.gekakis@polk-fl.net)

3. Rubrics and explicit feedback will be emphasized and supported during collaborative planning.

Person Responsible Alissa Turner (alissa.turner@polk-fl.net)

4. The leadership team, along with teacher individual conferences and MTSS meetings, will review the following student progress monitoring: FAST, STAR, Science Quarterly Assessments, district provided writing prompts, and formative assessments.

Person Responsible Lauren Gekakis (lauren.gekakis@polk-fl.net)

5. During collaborative planning, leveled groups will be discussed with ESE and general education teachers. Leveled readers and differentiated materials will be used to increase student fluency, reading comprehension, and writing skills.

Person Responsible Alissa Turner (alissa.turner@polk-fl.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

According to the 2021-22 STAR/Star Early Lit data 48 % of our students in K-2 grade were proficient.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

According to the 2021-22 FSA ELA data, more than 62% of our students in third-fifth grade scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide ELA assessment.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on the 2022-23 F.A.S.T. ELA data, students in K-2 grades will increase by 5% in overall ELA proficiency.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on the 2022-23 F.A.S.T. ELA data, students in 4th and 5th grade will increase in overall proficiency to 50%.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Monitoring: Standard/benchmark mastery check list and classroom walk through tool, write score results, and STAR Reading results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Stoquert, Sara, sara.stoquert@polk-fl.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The use of the research based intervention materials for our Tier 3 and Tier 2 students during targeted ELA small group instruction and Power Hour. Support will be provided by the SLT during collaborative planning using the ARC framework to ensure target/task alignment during small group instruction is being utilized. All tasks will be monitored or alignment to the B.E.S.T. ELA standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

This strategy would provide students with targeted intensive support through small group learning opportunities which includes a variety of instructional approaches foundational skills, fluency, comprehension, gradual release model and technology integration based on their specific real time data. Analyzing weekly data will clarify any misconceptions, deepen understanding of the standard to increase overall student proficiency while closing learning gaps.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Engaging weekly PLC's focused on analyzing student ELA data from summative and formative assessments.	Stoquert, Sara, sara.stoquert@polk-fl.net
After analyzing summative and formative data, small group instruction lesson plans and tasks aligned to the benchmarks, will be created for Power Hour and ELA center time.	Stoquert, Sara, sara.stoquert@polk-fl.net
Based on lesson plan implementation, conduct to do, doing and done meetings with SLT (daily focus-DF) including use of the Standards Walkthrough Tool.	Stoquert, Sara, sara.stoquert@polk-fl.net
Use of write score results and lessons tailored to student instructional needs throughout the year	Stoquert, Sara, sara.stoquert@polk-fl.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Loughman Oaks aspires to provide a positive school climate and culture through shared visioning and community building inside and outside of school. Staff, Parent and Student Surveys gives us a lot of information to address any major concerns in a timely manner, School-wide focus on growth mindset to encourage, perseverance and understanding that academic excellence can be acquired through planning, practice and sustained effort.

LOE focuses on building a positive relationship between home and school by inviting our community partners to be active participant in the education experience. Partnerships, with Kiwanis 4Corners/ Davenport and High Vista Community group provide funding for our backpack program to supply weekend food for our neediest families.

We offer several academic infused family nights to allow families to discover the fun of learning while spending quality time together. Teachers use various forms of communication to maintain parents informed about their child's progress and school wide activities.

Implementation of social skills small group sessions with our at risk students across all grade levels
Please see attached Parent Family Engagement Plan for full details for how we plan to include our community stakeholders in fulfilling the school mission and vision.

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

Sara Stoquert - Principal
Lauren Gekakis- Assistant Principal
Arnetta Hunter- Assistant Principal