

Polk County Public Schools

# James W. Sikes Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

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

# James W. Sikes Elementary School

2727 SHEPHERD RD, Lakeland, FL 33811

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Kerry Chapman**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2015

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	91%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (55%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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

---

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

# James W. Sikes Elementary School

2727 SHEPHERD RD, Lakeland, FL 33811

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

## 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	91%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

## School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

The mission of Sikes Elementary, with the support of the home and the community, is to provide the highest quality education for our students by creating a caring and challenging atmosphere that encourages life long learning.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

In partnership with home and community, Sikes Elementary is committed to educating productive citizens of tomorrow.

### 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
Chapman, Kerry	Principal	The Principal promotes data-based decision making, monitors Rtl, oversees schoolwide professional development for curriculum and instruction, and ensures recruitment and retention of outstanding teachers. She receives, distributes and communicates information to enforce District and State policies and works with staff to maintain a safe school environment. She manages the budget, promotes and supports the PBiS system, and creates a positive school culture by teaching students and staff to value, respect, and embrace differences. She maintains open lines of communication with stakeholders, building trust and ensuring transparency in progress toward school goals.
Leskis, Lindsey	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal ensures the Vision and Mission of the school is evident in every classroom. Empowers Team Leaders to lead Planned Learning Communities among grade or content area teams, promotes data-based decision making, monitors Rtl, ELL student supports, assists with schoolwide professional development for curriculum and instruction, and ensures recruitment and retention of outstanding teachers. She manages discipline, promotes and supports staff with the PBS system, and creates a positive school culture by teaching students and staff to value, respect, and embrace differences.
Marcano, Erica	Math Coach	Mrs. Marcano leads math collaborative planning with all grade level teams. She observes teachers and provides feedback through coaching cycles based on strengths and weaknesses. She assists with identifying systematic pattern of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies. Mrs. Marcano organizes the whole school screening program STAR Math that provides progress monitoring for students, analyzes data for trends and provides support to teachers. She serves as the school's Induction Coordinator and provides differentiated professional learning for teachers based on need and interests. Mrs. Marcano also collaborates with teachers to develop our Math/Science Family Night.
Reed, Danielle	School Counselor	The School Counselor provides support to students through classroom lessons. Act as Harmony facilitator and assists with MTSS process for school. She serves as 504 coordinator for school and Hearth Liaison for our students who qualify as Homeless. Our Counselor provides individual and group counseling as needed as well as conducting self-harm risk assessments for students, support information to parents, and conduct parent/teacher meetings as needed to create school-based safety plans.
Davey, Daniel	Other	The ESE Facilitator coordinates and oversees the ESE department and monitors compliance issues, participates in student data collection, supports teachers with strategies to use in tiered interventions specific to behaviors and collaborates with general education teachers. He provides support to ESE teachers with developing Individual Education Plans (IEP). He leads and facilitates IEP meetings with parents, teachers and district staff.



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Anderson, Renae	Reading Coach	Mrs. Anderson leads ELA collaborative planning with all grade level teams. She observes teachers and provides feedback through coaching cycles based on strengths and weaknesses. She assists with identifying systematic pattern of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies. Mrs. Anderson organizes the whole school screening program STAR ELA that provides progress monitoring for students, analyzes data for trends and provides support to teachers. She serves as the school's Induction Coordinator and provides differentiated professional learning for teachers based on need and interests. Mrs. Anderson also collaborates with teachers to develop our Reading Family Night.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 6/24/2015, Kerry Chapman

**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.*

2

**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.*

12

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

44

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

550

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

0

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

5

#### 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	86	100	109	97	103	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	605
Attendance below 90 percent	29	22	27	23	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	3	6	2	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	9	5	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	11	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	23	33	65	20	20	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170

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	4	9	12	9	24	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	1	5	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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 8/15/2022

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	128	123	133	134	131	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	649
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	13	37	24	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	5	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 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	0	25	52	47	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	178

**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	0	5	25	12	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

**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	4	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	128	123	133	134	131	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	649
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	13	37	24	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	5	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 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	0	25	52	47	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	178

**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	0	5	25	12	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

**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	4	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	54%	47%	56%				54%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						52%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						51%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	55%	42%	50%				61%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	63%						59%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%						50%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	49%	59%				53%	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	59%	52%	7%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	48%	3%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	45%	47%	-2%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

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	65%	56%	9%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	56%	3%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2022					
	2019	56%	51%	5%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	53%	45%	8%	53%	0%
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	18	27	28	21	53	57	13				
ELL	34	50	58	42	48	60	29				
BLK	50	61		45	63		26				
HSP	49	56	53	52	58	56	56				
WHT	58	54	29	58	64	67	41				
FRL	45	49	38	45	62	64	45				

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	5	7	13	12	29	50					
ELL	25	31	47	31	43	50	25				
BLK	30			26			40				
HSP	35	31	40	37	46	53	24				
WHT	50	34	20	46	26		45				
FRL	32	27	36	33	32	43	30				
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	15	29	35	30	37	35	12				
ELL	27	53	50	38	55	56	15				
BLK	43	54		52	36	20	33				
HSP	50	56	54	60	71	62	43				
MUL	61	40		56	67						
WHT	59	50	41	64	56	48	56				
FRL	45	53	56	49	55	50	40				

### 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	442
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	48

English Language Learners	
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	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
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	53
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Seven out of seven cells for school grade increased from the 2020-2021 school year. Our overall point increase was +114 points; earning us the recognition of 7th highest point gain for Polk County Public Schools.

Our ELA and Math Learning Gains increased 23 and 29 percent respectively. These scores are consistent for our school scores prior to COVID. Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest Quartile increased to pre-COVID test scores.

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

Our greatest need for focus involves our Students with Disabilities (SWD). This subgroup has been identified as scoring 33% which is performing below the federal index of 41%.

Our Science scores are the other focus area for our school. Our students scored at 41% proficient. This is below our 54% proficient ELA scores.

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

Contributing factors for Students with Disabilities (SWD): inconsistency in instruction and/or attendance for the past two years due to COVID. However, students are making progress based on the federal index increasing from 21% to 33% for this subgroup. Science scores can be attributed to learning gaps during the third and fourth grade years. Typically, prior to COVID, our Science scores equaled our ELA proficiency levels.

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

Our Learning Gains in Reading and Math showed the most improvement for the 2021-2022 school year. ELA increased 23% while math increased 29%.

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

We implemented new strategies with our data chats with teachers. Research based Reading Interventions were provided to teachers after discussing students. We also used Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) with students struggling with reading comprehension.



We staffed two Reading Interventionists who pulled small groups of students in grades 3-5 daily. We were also fortunate to have AmeriCorps volunteers tutoring our second grade students.

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

For the 2022-2023 school year, we will implement the learning arc framework during our collaborative planning sessions. Teachers will write objectives for the BEST benchmarks and prioritize sequence.

We will continue providing support for teachers by providing specific interventions for struggling students. K-2 teachers will be provided phonics interventions to use while 3-5 teachers will continue using Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) materials with students.

**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.**

For the Learning Arc framework, we will use the gradual release model with teachers. The first few weeks of school have been mapped out and objective written. Then, the academic coaches and administration will model how to create objectives for a benchmark to include resources to use during this process. Teachers will then map out one benchmark and receive support and feedback from the leadership team. The grade level team will continue to unpack each benchmark prior to collaborative planning and develop aligned tasks for students.

We will continue to use the research based LLI program for interventions and train teachers to use the Words Their Way inventory to pinpoint a starting point for phonics instruction.

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

By using gradual release to train our teachers on the learning arc, we will create sustainability. Our teachers will have a deep understanding of the benchmarks, how to create objectives that are aligned, and plan tasks that will provide our students with an equivalent experience.

**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.**

As our proficiency data begins to increase after having dropped from 2019 FSA to 2021 FSA, a focus on aligning tasks with benchmarks during planning will help increase overall proficiency in ELA.

**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 +5% proficiency increase for all grades/ content areas as well as a 5% increase for identified students scoring just below the proficiency line.

**Monitoring:**

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

Progress monitoring toward our goal will be monitored through classroom observations using the District Standardized Walkthrough Tool. The data collected by Academic Coaches and Administration will be reviewed to ensure student mastery of BEST benchmarks.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

1. Monitor classroom instruction using the District's Standardized Walkthrough Tool . This tool will assist in identifying students' access and engagement in equitable experiences based on the state benchmarks and standards.
2. Utilize the learning arc framework during collaborative planning to ensure alignment of student tasks and assessments to BEST benchmarks.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

1. Use of the standardized walkthrough tool will allow leadership to monitor student access to tasks that are aligned to the benchmarks. By ensuring alignment of tasks with benchmarks, students will have the opportunity to develop proficiency on state benchmarks and experience the benchmark tasks similar to what they will see on the state assessment.
2. Through use of the learning arc during collaborative planning, our teachers will have the opportunity to develop a deeper understanding of the state benchmarks. They will utilize the progression of the benchmarks as well as the clarifications to plan instruction and assessments that ensure students are given the opportunity to develop proficiency of the benchmarks.

**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. Train Academic Coaches on the use of Standardized Walk Through tool and create a calendar for calibration walks. Once the team reaches 90% consistency with scores, create monthly calendar for team to conduct walk throughs using the Standardized Walk Through tool.

**Person Responsible**

Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

Review data collected by team weekly to address trends and make changes during collaborative planning if needed.

**Person Responsible**

Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

2. Create a master schedule that allows for collaborative planning time weekly for all teachers.

**Person Responsible** Lindsey Leskis (lindsey.leskis@polk-fl.net)

Train Assistant Principal and Academic Coaches on the steps of the the Learning Arc planning framework.

**Person Responsible** Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

Create a professional learning schedule to train teachers and implement the framework into the collaborative planning process: previewing, modeling steps 1-4, guided practice and then independent practice for teachers.

**Person Responsible** Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

Create schedule for teachers to complete steps 1-4 of the learning arc for current and upcoming BEST benchmarks. Design a template for grade levels to save completed benchmarks with mapped out objectives to include an area to make revisions for repetitive exposures.

**Person Responsible** Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

Leadership will analyze data from Standardized Walk Through Tool to ensure tasks and assessments are aligned to the BEST benchmarks.

**Person Responsible** Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

**#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Attendance****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 our early warning systems data, 20% of our students attended less than 90% of the school days last year. A focus on attendance and high yield strategies to encourage attendance will improve student outcomes.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Through high-yield strategies designed to encourage attendance, we will decrease the percentage of students attending less than 90% of the school days by at least 5%, from 20% to 15%.

**Monitoring:**

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

An attendance monitoring spreadsheet will be created. Students that were identified by the early warning systems with less than 90% attendance will be monitored to start. Administrative/attendance manager and teacher attendance contacts will be documented, as well as attendance letters and meetings conducted.

At least bi-weekly, at leadership meetings, the attendance monitoring spreadsheet and data will be discussed and action steps will be created/adjusted based on new data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

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

Mentor Program with the Leadership Team- each member will have 1/6 of the list of students to monitor and check in with. They will check in at least bi-weekly with students with a focus on building a positive relationship with those students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Creating a culture where students want to come to school and know that someone cares will encourage students to attend.

**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.

Identify list of students with less than 90% attendance during the 21-22 school year.

**Person Responsible**

Lindsey Leskis (lindsey.leskis@polk-fl.net)

Assign each leadership team member 1/6 of the list of students to monitor attendance and meet biweekly to build relationships with them and encourage better attendance.

**Person Responsible**

Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

Create attendance monitoring spreadsheet for the leadership team. Provide team members a mentoring form to use when meeting with identified students.

**Person Responsible**

Lindsey Leskis (lindsey.leskis@polk-fl.net)

Meet with leadership team and discuss strategies, mentoring expectations, and documentation of meetings. Develop a plan with teachers to identify attendance issues and procedures for contacting parents as well as standard documentation of contacts.

**Person Responsible** Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net)

Leadership team members will discuss progress with identified students' attendance and make adjustments as needed.

**Person Responsible** Lindsey Leskis (lindsey.leskis@polk-fl.net)

Administration will communicate weekly with the school's Social Worker and new Community Outreach Facilitator to make additional contact with parents for identified students.

**Person Responsible** Kerry Chapman (kerry.chapman@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

At the end of 21-22 school year, 88% of kindergarten students, 68% of first grade students, and 24% of second grade students were still testing in Star Early Literacy. We believe our primary students need a deeper understanding of phonics, with targeted phonics instruction based on data. Our instructional practice for K-2 students for 22-23 school year will be systematic phonics instruction.

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

On Spring 21-22 Reading FSA, 43% of 3rd grade students were below proficient, 45% of 4th grade students, and 51% of fifth grade students. We believe our intermediate students need additional support with reading comprehension strategies. Our instructional practice for students in grades 3-5 will be reading comprehension.

**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)**

Using the progress monitoring FAST data, we will increase the number of students "on level" by 5% from the August 2022 assessment to the May 2023 assessment.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Using the progress monitoring FAST data, we will increase the number of students "on level" by 5% from the August 2022 assessment to the May 2023 assessment.

**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.

Areas of focus will be monitored during regularly scheduled data chats with teachers. Florida Wonders comprehension tests will be monitored for students in grades 3-5. For students in K-2, we will monitor the FAST assessments along with Words Their Way Bears Spelling Inventory.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Chapman, Kerry, kerry.chapman@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?

For K-2 focus on phonics, our teachers will use the Words Their Way Bears spelling inventory. This formal assessment can provide more information about a child's ability to understand words in the English language and give data to help the teacher group students based on need.

For 3-5 students, teachers will use Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) materials that provide explicit instruction in phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, reading comprehension, oral language skills, and writing.

### **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?

K-2: Childrens' reading development is dependent on their understanding of the alphabetic principle — the idea that letters and letter patterns represent the sounds of spoken language. Phonics instruction teaches children to decode letters into their respective sounds, a skill that is essential for them to read unfamiliar words. Words Their Way uses the spelling inventory for students to discover the common attributes and allow students to actively construct their own knowledge of spelling patterns.

3-5: Without comprehension, children gain no meaning from text. Comprehension strategies are used to increase childrens' understanding of text to help them become active readers by engaging with text. Readers who have strong comprehension can draw conclusions about what they read. The What Works Clearinghouse and the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE) found (LLI) to have a positive effect on reading achievement and fluency based on a comprehensive review of evidence.

### **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>Step 1: K-2 area of focus: Train Teachers on how to give and score the Bears spelling inventory. Work with teachers to group students based on phonics needs.</p> <p>Step 1: Grades 3-5 area of focus: provide new teachers training using the Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) materials.</p>	Chapman, Kerry, kerry.chapman@polk-fl.net
<p>Step 2: K-2 area of focus: Provide teachers with systematic phonics lessons for their different groups using district provided lessons on Schoology.</p> <p>Step 2: Grades 3-5 area of focus: review LLI progress, AP data and Florida Wonders assessment data during regularly scheduled data chats with teachers.</p>	Anderson, Renae, renae.anderson@polk-fl.net
<p>Step 3: K-2 area of focus: Review students' phonics progress with teachers during data chats.</p>	Chapman, Kerry, kerry.chapman@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.

Positive Behavior Support (PBiS) strategies and Harmony Morning Meet Ups are our Tier 1 curriculum. Our school counselor will be providing monthly lessons on character education as well. We will use Class DOJO school-wide to track positive behaviors and communicate with families.

Meet-ups will provide students with a safe and secure environment where they can get to know their teacher and classmates, and build their community within the classroom. Monthly lessons with the school counselor will range in topics, but will promote positive self-image, encourage pro-social character traits, and build upon our school culture. Daily communication with families will provide a bridge between school and home where positive behaviors can be encouraged and celebrated.

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

In order to promote a collaborative environment at Sikes Elementary, we engage with different stakeholders to improve our school's culture. Teachers serve in various roles such as grade chairpersons, members of committees focused on academics, mentoring new teachers and sharing out best practices with colleagues. Teachers also serve on our School Advisory Council (SAC) and Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) to help make decisions that impact our students.

Feedback collected from our parents is used to make many decisions for our school. We plan events based on their needs. Parents also provide feedback on the Title 1 Compact to set expectations for teachers, our



school and our families. We have a very active Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) that supports our students by celebrating their accomplishments, providing fellowship through family events and purchasing much needed materials for students.

Businesses and local Universities also support our students and staff. We host interns each fall and spring to work collaboratively with our teachers. Interns share the very latest strategies they are learning about in college coursework. Local business owners serve on our School Advisory Council (SAC) to help make informed decisions to improve instruction and our school environment. The SAC also reviews school improvement goals and the data collected throughout the year. Many business members volunteer during the year especially on the Great American Teach In. By consulting with various stakeholders, we continue to build a positive culture where our students learn to be the best they can be.