

Polk County Public Schools

Socrum 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 |

Socrum Elementary School

9400 OLD DADE CITY RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

Demographics

Principal: Johna Jozwiak

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2022

| | |
|--|---|
| 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) | 100% |
| 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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: D (39%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (51%) |
| 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 |

Socrum Elementary School

9400 OLD DADE CITY RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

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 | 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 | 53% |

School Grades History

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

Pioneers Aimed on Success/All Students WILL Learn!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Develop a common language and understanding, of our school's plan, to align a supportive core value structure by:

- Building Student & Staff Supportive Relationships & Learning Environments through RtIB/MTSS/PBIS Team Protocols and Procedures.
- Administration, Leadership Team, & Peer Support with Feedback & Differentiated Professional Development for Tiered Teachers.
- Open, Honesty, & Direct Communication - How School Leaders Create a Results-Focused Learning Environment - Socrum Elementary School - Protocols and Procedures for Collaboration and Dialogue.
- Effective B.E.S.T. Standards-Based Planning, using the Learning ARC Protocol, and the Gradual Release Architecture, for Socrum Elementary School's Balanced Literacy Instructional Framework, to include mini lessons and writing, as well as Guided Reading and Writing Small Group Instruction, (GRSG & GWSG) including Social Studies, and Gradual Release Architecture, Math Instructional Framework, including Math Small Group Instruction, Science Instructional Framework, including Science Small Group Instruction, while recording and monitoring B.E.S.T. Standards Based Data, Whole Group, using Standards Data/RtIB/MTSS/PBIS Checklist, and Small Group formative assessment data, Logs, for in the moment, instructional decisions, to differentiate and track individual student progress.

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 |
|-------------------|----------------|--|
| JOZWIAK, JOHNA | Principal | <p>Principal: Provides a common mission and vision for the use of formative and summative data based decision making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtIB/MTSS/PBIS Team conducts assessment of RtIB/MTSS/PBIS Student Success skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtIB/ MTSS/PBIS Team implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtIB/ MTSS/PBIS Team plan and activities. Builds leadership capacity among staff - it is the foundation of all or our work. Provide the necessary support to staff so they have the capacity to produce what we are asking for Reciprocal accountability. Monitor students achievement in a collaborative, data driven model. Focus on our kids". Keeps achievement and our work transparent and moving forward. Plans B.E.S.T Standards, using the Learning ARC Protocol, Monitors the fidelity of instruction, using the Standards Walkthrough Tool, implementation of the frameworks ; identify needed supports either individually or for the large group aligned to building trends. Lead and monitor the implementation of School Improvement Plan (SIP), keep focus on students achievement and make sure any program or instructional decisions made are aligned to SIP goals and building initiatives (formative data, Tier Teachers, Differentiated PD, PLCs, instructional programs, district needs). All team members: Analyze formative and summative student data to support teachers in planning standards based lessons, to ensure interventions are implemented as intended, and assess if they are working, in the core instructional objectives and tasks/materials into Tier III instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as studio labs and differentiated individual professional development. Develops, leads, evaluates, revises Gradual Release Architecture for Socrum Elementary School's Balanced Literacy Instructional Framework, including Guided Reading and Writing Small Group (GRSG &GWSG) including Social Studies, and Gradual Release Architecture for Math Instructional Framework, including Guided Math Small Group Instruction (GMSG), Science Instructional Framework, including Science Small Group Instruction, B.E.S.T. Standards Based instruction, school core content standards programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with administration and leadership team to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk"; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, formative data collection, and formative data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Build leadership capacity among staff. Lead and monitor the implementation of School Improvement Plan (SIP) and building initiative.</p> |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| Hardee, Taryn | Assistant Principal | <p>Assists 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 RtIB/MTSS/PBIS Team, further assists the principal in the assessment of RtIB/ MTSS/PBIS Team student skills, implementation of intervention support and documentation, professional learning, and communication with students and parents concerning RtIB/ MTSS/PBIS Team plans and activities. Monitors student achievement for all. Plans B.E.S.T Standards, using the Learning ARC Protocol, Monitors the fidelity of instruction, using the Standards Walkthrough Tool, implementation of the frameworks ; identify needed supports either individually or for the large group aligned to building trends. Analyzes the results of formative and summative standards - based assessments and have deep discussion about the work. Implements and monitors the student targeted worksheet and agenda data for all students. Provide instructional supports where warranted. Lead and monitor the implementation of School Improvement Plan (SIP) and building initiatives.</p> |
| Dyer, Gregory | Behavior Specialist | <p>Assists 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 RtIB/MTSS/PBIS Team, further assists the principal in the assessment of RtIB/ MTSS/PBIS Team student skills, implementation of intervention support and documentation, professional learning, and communication with students and parents concerning RtIB/ MTSS/PBIS Team plans and activities. Analyzes the results of formative and summative standards - based assessments and have deep discussion about the work. Implements and monitors the student data targeted worksheets and agenda data pages for all students. Provides Math Whole Group and Small Group interventions based on Standards Data/RtIB/MTSS/PBIS Checklist.</p> |
| Simonsen, Melissa | Behavior Specialist | <p>Assists 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 RtIB/MTSS/PBIS Team, further assists the principal in the assessment of RtIB/ MTSS/PBIS Team student skills, implementation of intervention support and documentation, professional learning, and communication with students and parents concerning RtIB/ MTSS/PBIS Team plans and activities. Analyzes the results of formative and summative standards - based assessments and have deep discussion about the work. Implements and monitors the student data targeted worksheets and agenda data pages for all students. Provides Math Whole Group and Small Group interventions based on Standards Data/RtIB/MTSS/PBIS Checklist.</p> |
| King, Tiffany | Reading Coach | <p>Coaching Cycle with Primary Grades to plan, model, side by side, feedback, reflection, and implementation of Standards Benchmarks.</p> |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/13/2022, Johna Jozwiak

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.*

1

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Total number of students enrolled at the school

449

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

3

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

3

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 | 32 | 83 | 67 | 84 | 78 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 423 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 40 | 25 | 26 | 32 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 32 | 31 | 53 | 28 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 178 |

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 | 0 | 18 | 12 | 12 | 14 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 |

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 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/13/2022

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 | 0 | 83 | 68 | 67 | 87 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 372 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 26 | 20 | 8 | 22 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 21 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 24 | 32 | 35 | 44 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 |

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 | 16 | 15 | 11 | 30 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 83 | 68 | 67 | 87 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 372 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 26 | 20 | 8 | 22 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| 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 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 21 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 24 | 32 | 35 | 44 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 |

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 | 16 | 15 | 11 | 30 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 36% | 47% | 56% | | | | 48% | 51% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 51% | | | | | | 50% | 51% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 35% | | | | | | 43% | 49% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 36% | 42% | 50% | | | | 59% | 57% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 41% | | | | | | 53% | 56% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 47% | | | | | | 43% | 47% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 26% | 49% | 59% | | | | 43% | 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 | 48% | 48% | 0% | 58% | -10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -52% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 41% | 47% | -6% | 56% | -15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -48% | | | | |

| 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 | 67% | 56% | 11% | 62% | 5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 56% | -1% | 64% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -67% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 51% | -2% | 60% | -11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -55% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 41% | 45% | -4% | 53% | -12% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 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 | 11 | 36 | 29 | 15 | 47 | 55 | 6 | | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 60 | | 31 | 44 | | 18 | | | | |
| BLK | 21 | 37 | | 25 | 45 | 54 | 16 | | | | |
| HSP | 35 | 57 | 55 | 36 | 43 | 46 | 21 | | | | |
| WHT | 41 | 54 | 35 | 36 | 34 | 40 | 33 | | | | |
| FRL | 27 | 47 | 37 | 30 | 38 | 48 | 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 | 7 | 28 | | 22 | 33 | | 31 | | | | |
| ELL | 21 | | | 34 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 24 | 21 | | 26 | 21 | | 45 | | | | |
| HSP | 28 | 47 | | 40 | 53 | | 50 | | | | |
| WHT | 41 | 39 | 40 | 55 | 41 | | 39 | | | | |
| FRL | 30 | 35 | 27 | 40 | 29 | 9 | 38 | | | | |
| 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 | 18 | 34 | 29 | 32 | 55 | 67 | 8 | | | | |
| ELL | 33 | 44 | | 48 | 56 | | 36 | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 48 | 35 | 39 | 29 | 15 | 17 | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 48 | | 65 | 59 | | 29 | | | | |
| WHT | 49 | 51 | 50 | 62 | 58 | 62 | 56 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 46 | 38 | 54 | 52 | 50 | 32 | | | | |

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 | 4 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 69 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 341 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| 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% | 1 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 42 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 33 |
| 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 | 46 |
| 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 | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 39 |
| 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 | 40 |
| 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?

We are below proficiency in all subject areas.

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

Reading proficiency, Math proficiency, & Science proficiency.

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

I am new to the school this year. Strengthening Core Academic Instruction. If teachers plan with the Learning Arc protocol while consistently & effectively delivering B.E.S.T. standards-based instruction, in core academic areas (SIP #1). Teachers need professional development to establish the school's rationale and buy in for the use of the Gradual Release of Responsibility structures including structures for differentiation within our Architectural Framework and Timeline & using formative, observational data, in real time, to drive student instruction (SIP #2).

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

ELA learning gains went from 37% to 51%, Math learning gains went from 39% to 41%, & Math lowest 25% went from 25% to 47%.

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

I am new to this school.

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

Strengthening Core Academic Instruction. If teachers plan with the Learning Arc protocol while consistently & effectively delivering B.E.S.T. standards-based instruction, in core academic areas (SIP #1). Teachers need professional development to establish the school's rationale and buy in for the use of the Gradual Release of Responsibility structures including structures for differentiation within our Architectural Framework and Timeline & using formative, observational data, in real time, to drive student instruction (SIP #2).

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.

Grow teachers' ability to use tools for formative assessments based on district unit goals and grade level standards, use the tools to gather information within the scope of the lesson, and finally analyze the formative assessment information in order to identify next steps in instruction (SIP Goal #1 and #2). As well as Corrective Reading and Number World.

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

Back to School Professional Learning, MOU, July 18 - 20, 2022.

- Mission & Vision of Socrum Elementary School.
- Develop an understanding of the roles, expectations, & procedures of all staff.
- Develop a common understanding of and language for a results-focused learning environment.
- Understand our plans to align a supportive core value structure: All Students WILL Learn, by building student and staff supportive relationships, open, honest, and direct communication, and effective planning, using the Learning Arc Protocol, ELA/Reading, Writing, Math, Science, SS, and RtI/MTSS/PBIS climate, social, emotional, academic, attendance, behavior, and interventions.
- Study importance of rituals and routines, in classrooms, best practices for establishing these rituals, and routines for beginning of the year.
- First 20 Days (Routines and Rituals).
- Small Group / Differentiated instruction Goals:
 1. Understanding questioning of text scaffold ,text -frame questions supporting student understanding - accountable talk stems, questions/responses.
 2. Assessment of readers using a checklist based on grade level of text.
 3. Identifying the lifts between the leveled text to establish goals, plan questioning of text, understand look fors within checklist.
 4. Work through the structure of small group lesson format and practice lesson implementation with each other.
- Understand the underpinning and research base of the Learning Arc Protocol and the Architectural Framework.
- Establish goals for the year.
- Importance of planning for formative assessment and feedback as part of the gradual

release (Who do we research? What do we research? What do we do with this information?).

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 Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Strengthening Core Academic Instruction. If teachers plan with the Learning Arc protocol while consistently & effectively delivering standards-based instruction, in core academic areas, then Socrum will place at or above proficiency statewide, for Reading, 53%, Math, 43%, and 30%, Science proficiency, in 2022-2023.

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

State assessment results, progress monitoring assessments, STAR reading & math assessments. Measurable outcomes for the STAR beginning of the year, PM1, are defined as 940 proficient, for 3rd grade, 983, for 4th grade, 1022 for 5th grade. PM2 the target is 955 or above, for 3rd grade, 995 or above for 4th grade, and 1031 or above, for 5th grade. PM3 970 or above for 3rd grade, 1006 or above, for 4th grade, and 1041 or above, for 5th grade. Teachers will understand or know how to create a culture of learners, thinkers, readers, and writers which will result in students achieving a culture of learning, thinking, reading, and writing.

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

Daily walkthroughs, using SWT, by Leadership team. Journey Observations for Classroom Walkthroughs, Informals, and Formals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

JOHNA JOZWIAK (johna.jozwiak@polk-fl.net)

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

1. Monitor students engaging in equal experiences aligned to state expectations using Standards Walkthrough Tool (SWT).
2. Engage teachers in standards-based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for

Student learning will not improve until the quality of teaching improves, and the quality of teaching will not improve until leaders understand what constitutes high-quality instruction along with the role they play in improving teacher practice using the Learning Arc protocol, standards-based instruction, and aligned tasks.

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

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.

Create a calendar for leadership team to calibrate walks.

Person Responsible JOHNA JOZWIAK (johna.jozwiak@polk-fl.net)

Train the leadership team on SWT in the first 2 calibration walks.

Person Responsible JOHNA JOZWIAK (johna.jozwiak@polk-fl.net)

Conduct walks until 90%-100% calibrated consistently with rationale.

Person Responsible JOHNA JOZWIAK (johna.jozwiak@polk-fl.net)

Add SWT data review to every Leadership Team meeting agenda with rational.

Person Responsible Taryn Hardee (taryn.hardee@polk-fl.net)

Establish protocol to review data including evidence in SWT.

Person Responsible Taryn Hardee (taryn.hardee@polk-fl.net)

Monitor impact between data review from SWT and plan, using the Learning Arc, per content/course/ grade level.

Person Responsible JOHNA JOZWIAK (johna.jozwiak@polk-fl.net)

Provide targeted feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible JOHNA JOZWIAK (johna.jozwiak@polk-fl.net)

Tier teachers and provide differentiated professional development.

Person Responsible JOHNA JOZWIAK (johna.jozwiak@polk-fl.net)

Set school, teacher, and student targeted goals based on Measurable outcomes for the STAR beginning of the year, PM1, are defined as 940 proficient,, for 3rd grade, 983, for 4th grade, 1022 for 5th grade. PM2 the target is 955 or above, for 3rd grade, 995 or above for 4th grade, and 1031 or above, for 5th grade. PM3 970 or above for 3rd grade, 1006 or above, for 4th grade, and 1041 or above, for 5th grade.

Person Responsible JOHNA JOZWIAK (johna.jozwiak@polk-fl.net)

Focus on Learning Arc 1-4 Math & 1-3 ELA. School Based Team, Dr. Henry, Coordinators, & Victoria Cote. Tuesday Planning and MOU (T & TH). October 7 & 26, 2022.

Person Responsible JOHNA JOZWIAK (johna.jozwiak@polk-fl.net)

Math Learning Arc 5 & 6 & ELA 4-6 Learning Arc. School Based Team, Dr. Henry, Coordinators, and Victoria Cote. Tuesday Planning and MOU (T & TH). October 7 & 26, 2022.

Person Responsible JOHNA JOZWIAK (johna.jozwiak@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Gradual Release within the Whole Group and Mini Lesson Architecture Framework using Standards Data & RtIB/MTSS/PBIS Checklist. If students and teachers understand the purpose of how to use formative and summative student data, within Architectural Framework, to include aligning, integrating, recording, and monitoring, existing and new, climate, social, emotional, academic, attendance, behavior, and interventions, then students will receive differentiated instruction to improve student achievement and the learning environment.

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

Measurable Outcome: State assessment results, progress monitoring assessments, STAR reading & math assessments, Corrective Reading (3-5), & Number World (3-5). Measurable outcomes for the STAR beginning of the year, PM1, are defined as 940 proficient,, for 3rd grade, 983, for 4th grade, 1022 for 5th grade. PM2 the target is 955 or above, for 3rd grade, 995 or above for 4th grade, and 1031 or above, for 5th grade. PM3 970 or above for 3rd grade, 1006 or above, for 4th grade, and 1041 or above, for 5th grade.

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

Monitoring: Whole Group and Mini Lesson Standards Data & RtIB/MTSS/PBIS Checklist, Small Group Reading Assessment Checklist, Observational Notes, STAR Reading and Math, STAR Early Lit., FAST PM1, PM2, PM3, Corrective Reading (3-5), & Number World (3-5).

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Taryn Hardee (taryn.hardee@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Monitor teachers Standards Data/RtIB/MTSS/PBIS Checklist
2. Engage teachers in PLC's to train and implement formative, observational data.

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Provide a common mission and vision for the use of formative and summative data decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing research based best practices strategies Whole Group & Mini Lesson Standards Data & RtIB/ MTSS/PBIS Checklist. Inform students and parents of student progress and school-wide information in a timely manner. This will be done through the student's data page, in their school Agenda. Administration, teachers, students, and parents/guardians will hold data chats, set academic goals, social goals, behavioral goals, and celebrate those goals.

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

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.

Create a master schedule that includes collaborative planning, student differentiation, and data chats.

Person Responsible JOHNA JOZWIAK (johna.jozwiak@polk-fl.net)

Plan for teachers to look at data, share the data, and to differentiate instruction.

Person Responsible JOHNA JOZWIAK (johna.jozwiak@polk-fl.net)

Train teachers on how to use school wide procedures and routines, through Studio Lab PDs.

Person Responsible JOHNA JOZWIAK (johna.jozwiak@polk-fl.net)

Train teachers on how to use the Gradual Release Architectural Framework and the Standards Data/RtIB/MTSS/PBIS Checklist, through PLCs and Studio Lab PDs.

Person Responsible JOHNA JOZWIAK (johna.jozwiak@polk-fl.net)

Add planning results to Leadership Team meeting agenda.

Person Responsible Taryn Hardee (taryn.hardee@polk-fl.net)

Conduct planning protocol on a weekly basis, Tuesdays.

Person Responsible Taryn Hardee (taryn.hardee@polk-fl.net)

Review planning findings during Leadership Team and provide Targeted Feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible JOHNA JOZWIAK (johna.jozwiak@polk-fl.net)

Conduct correlation findings between RtIB, MTSS, & PBIS.

Person Responsible Taryn Hardee (taryn.hardee@polk-fl.net)

Training 1 teacher, per grade level, with a Highly Effective Reading Coach, June 20, 21, 22, & 23, 2022.

Training Inclusion teachers July 20, 2022.

Training, from District, on Corrective Reading & Number World (3-5).

Person Responsible JOHNA JOZWIAK (johna.jozwiak@polk-fl.net)

Create PD calendar.

Person Responsible JOHNA JOZWIAK (johna.jozwiak@polk-fl.net)

Set school, teacher, and student targeted goals based on Measurable outcomes for the STAR beginning of the year, PM1, are defined as 940 proficient, for 3rd grade, 983, for 4th grade, 1022 for 5th grade. PM2 the target is 955 or above, for 3rd grade, 995 or above for 4th grade, and 1031 or above, for 5th grade. PM3 970 or above for 3rd grade, 1006 or above, for 4th grade, and 1041 or above, for 5th grade.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Strengthening Core Academic Instruction. If teachers plan with the Learning Arc protocol while consistently & effectively delivering standards-based instruction, in core academic areas, then Socrum will place at or above for Reading, 53%, Math, 43%, and 30%, Science proficiency, in 2022-2023. Gradual Release within the Whole Group and Mini Lesson Architecture Framework using Standards Data & RtIB/MTSS/PBIS Checklist. If students and teachers understand the purpose of how to use formative and summative student data, within Architectural Framework, to include aligning, integrating, recording, and monitoring, existing and new, climate, social, emotional, academic, attendance, behavior, and interventions, then students will receive differentiated instruction to improve student achievement and the learning.

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

4th grade Level 1 & 2 is 64% for ELA, 5th grade Level 1 & 2 is 68%, and 4th grade Level 1 & 2 is 62% for Math.

Strengthening Core Academic Instruction. If teachers plan with the Learning Arc protocol while consistently & effectively delivering standards-based instruction, in core academic areas, then Socrum will place at or above for Reading, 53%, Math, 43%, and 30%, Science proficiency, in 2022-2023. Gradual Release within the Whole Group and Mini Lesson Architecture Framework using Standards Data & RtIB/MTSS/PBIS Checklist. If students and teachers understand the purpose of how to use formative and summative student data, within Architectural Framework, to include aligning, integrating, recording, and monitoring, existing and new, climate, social, emotional, academic, attendance, behavior, and interventions, then students will receive differentiated instruction to improve student achievement and the learning.

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)

State assessment results, progress monitoring assessments, STAR reading & math assessments, and Freckle.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

State assessment results, progress monitoring assessments, STAR reading & math assessments, Corrective Reading (3-5), & Number World (3-5).

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.

Daily walkthroughs, using SWT, by Leadership team. Journey Observations for Classroom Walkthroughs, Informals, and Formals.

Whole Group and Mini Lesson Standards Data & RtIb/MTSS/PBIS Checklist, Small Group Reading Assessment Checklist, Observational Notes, STAR Reading and Math, STAR Early Lit., FAST PM1, PM2, PM3, Freckle, Corrective Reading (3-5), & Number World (3-5).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

JOZWIAK, JOHNA, johna.jozwiak@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?

1. Monitor students engaging in equal experiences aligned to state expectations using Standards Walkthrough Tool (SWT).

2. Engage teachers in standards-based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework.

1. Monitor teachers Standards Data/RtIb/MTSS/PBIS Checklist

2. Engage teachers in PLC's to train and implement formative, observational data.

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?

Student learning will not improve until the quality of teaching improves, and the quality of teaching will not improve until leaders understand what constitutes high-quality instruction along with the role they play in improving teacher practice using the Learning Arc protocol, standards-based instruction, the gradual release architectural framework, and aligned tasks.

Provide a common mission and vision for the use of formative and summative data decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing research based best practices strategies Whole Group & Mini Lesson Standards Data & RtIb/MTSS/PBIS Checklist. Inform students and parents of student progress and school-wide information in a timely

manner. This will be done through the student's data page, in their school Agenda. Administration, teachers, students, and parents/guardians will hold data chats, set academic goals, social goals, behavioral goals, and celebrate those goals.

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 |
|---|---|
| <p>Create calendar, leadership team, calibrate walks. Train leadership team SWT, first 2 calibration walks. Conduct walks (90%-100%) calibrated consistently, rationale. SWT data review at Leadership Team meeting. Establish protocol reviewing data including evidence in SWT. Monitor impact between data from SWT and plan per content/grade level. Create master schedule including collaborative planning, differentiation, and data chats. Plan for teachers to look at data, share the data, and differentiate instruction. Train teachers to use school wide procedures and routines, through Studio Lab PDs. Train teacher to use Gradual Release Architectural Framework and Standards Data/RtIB/MTSS/PBIS Checklist. Add planning results to Leadership Team agenda. Conduct planning protocol weekly, Tuesdays. Review planning findings during Leadership Team and provide Targeted Feedback to teachers. Conduct correlation findings RtIB, MTSS, & PBIS. Training 6 teachers with Highly Effective Reading Coach, June 2022. Training Inclusion teachers July 2022. Training, from District, on Corrective Reading & Number World (3-5).</p> | <p>JOZWIAK, JOHNA, johna.jozwiak@polk-fl.net</p> |

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.

Develop a common language and understanding, of our school's plan, to align a supportive core value structure by:

- Building Student & Staff Supportive Relationships & Learning Environments through RtIB/MTSS/PBIS Team Protocols and Procedures, Studio Lab PD on Evaluation Domains, & Dream Team

Teacher Celebrations.

- Administration, Leadership Team, & Peer Support with Feedback & Differentiated Professional Development for Tiered Teachers.
- Open, Honesty, & Direct Communication - How School Leaders Create a Results-Focused Learning Environment - Socrum Elementary School - Protocols and Procedures for Collaboration and Dialogue.
- Effective B.E.S.T. Standards-Based Planning, using the Learning Arc Protocol, and the Gradual Release Architecture, for Socrum Elementary School's Balanced Literacy Instructional Framework, to include mini lessons and writing, as well as Guided Reading and Writing Small Group Instruction, (GRSG & GWSG) as well as Social Studies, and Gradual Release Architecture Math Instructional Framework, including Math Small Group Instruction, Science Instructional Framework, including Science Small Group Instruction, while recording and monitoring B.E.S.T. Standards Based Data & Small Group formative assessment data, for in the moment, instructional decisions, to differentiate and track individual student progress.

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

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site. Please see attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan for full details on how we plan to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students. Inform students and parents of student progress and school-wide information in a timely manner. This will be done through the student's targeted worksheets & data page, in their school Agenda. Administration, teachers, students, and parents/guardians will hold data chats, set academic goals, social goals, behavioral goals, and celebrate those goals. The instructional planning and parent report will be sent home with students, STAR Reading and Math Test Results/PM1, PM2, & PM3, as well as suggested skills parents/guardians can work on for improvement. Also sending home Guided Reading A-Z, just right leveled text, as a support for students and parents, to practice reading skills learned at school, at home.