

Polk County Public Schools

Medulla 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Medulla Elementary School

850 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

Demographics

Principal: Gale Macleod

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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: C (52%) 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Medulla Elementary School

850 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

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	69%

School Grades History

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

Medulla Elementary Explorers are safe, tolerant and respectful, active learners, and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Medulla Elementary provides a safe, rigorous and supportive environment that fosters curiosity, inquiry, and a life-long pursuit of knowledge so each child will reach his/her fullest potential and become a respectful and productive citizen.

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
MacLeod, Gale	Principal	The principal is an instructional leader and continuous learner who works collaboratively with others engaging in data driven dialogue to problem solve, make decisions, improve instructional practices and organizational structures to achieve shared goals and improve student learning.
Camp, Shelley	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is an instructional leader, who is a continuous learner, which supports the principal. The AP works collaboratively with others engaging in data driven dialogue to problem solve, make decisions, improve instructional practices and organizational structures to achieve shared goals and improve student learning.
Aranda, Ginnie	School Counselor	The School Counselor collaborates with colleagues in using research in order to select appropriate strategies to solve identified problems, make decisions, manage conflict, and promote meaningful change.
Martin, Victoria	Other	The Local Education Agency (LEA) Facilitator works effectively within systems, understands decision-making processes, and supports district and school priorities. The LEA also inspires and mobilizes colleagues to achieve goals and implementation plans.
Spear, Tracey	Instructional Coach	This Instructional Coach develops knowledge and understanding of how to identify and use multiple assessment tools aligned with the B.E.S.T. Standards. In addition, develops a climate of trust and reflection to engage colleagues in conversations about student learning data and ways to use data to improve instructional practices.
Wainwright, Christina	Reading Coach	This Literacy Coach develops knowledge and understanding of how to identify and use multiple assessment tools aligned with the B.E.S.T. Standards. In addition, develops a climate of trust and reflection to engage colleagues in conversations about student learning data and ways to use data to improve instructional practices.
Hutchins, Katrina	Math Coach	This Math Coach develops knowledge and understanding of how to identify and use multiple assessment tools aligned with the B.E.S.T. Standards. In addition, develops a climate of trust and reflection to engage colleagues in conversations about student learning data and ways to use data to improve instructional practices

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Gale Macleod

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

515

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

2

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	72	83	68	73	70	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	455
Attendance below 90 percent	37	27	32	23	24	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172
One or more suspensions	6	8	13	16	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in ELA	3	7	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	1	7	1	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	16	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	17	15	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	26	30	41	24	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150

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	10	9	15	12	28	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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 6/20/2022

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	85	79	68	77	91	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	25	19	15	22	27	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	1	4	1	1	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	10	0	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	5	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	19	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	19	23	29	18	25	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143

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	7	11	12	6	22	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	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	85	79	68	77	91	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	25	19	15	22	27	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	1	4	1	1	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	10	0	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	5	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	19	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	19	23	29	18	25	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143

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	7	11	12	6	22	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	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	43%	47%	56%				53%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						57%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						67%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	50%	42%	50%				61%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	62%						68%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						58%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	49%	59%				54%	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	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	48%	12%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	47%	0%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

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	55%	56%	-1%	62%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	56%	15%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					
	2019	56%	51%	5%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%
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	16	33	43	18	26	21	7				
ELL	31	68	53	43	61	33	39				
BLK	33	43	42	43	70		47				
HSP	37	55	50	42	59	37	43				
MUL	67			67							
WHT	55	63		60	63		65				
FRL	36	50	52	43	64	50	41				
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	16	39		18	28		18				
ELL	18	25	18	29	21	27	15				
BLK	38	50		40	47		42				
HSP	33	32	17	31	24	27	32				
MUL	50	70		61	60						
WHT	62	65		60	61		68				
FRL	38	46	53	38	42	57	39				
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	30	44	53	40	52	56	41				
ELL	41	52		61	69	50	40				
BLK	37	49	80	42	56	62	35				
HSP	53	57	68	63	66	45	55				
MUL	54	64		67	71						
WHT	62	59	50	67	77	83	62				
FRL	47	56	69	52	66	50	48				

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	53
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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	422
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	48
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	46
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	48
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	67
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
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	61
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	49
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?

SWD and ELL students struggle to increase proficiency levels across grade levels. Very few students in the bottom 25% are increasing in achievement in ELA and Math.

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

Based on STAR Reading and STAR Math progress monitoring data students identified in the lowest 25% struggle to make overall learning gains in reading and math.

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

Teacher and student attendance, time needed for teachers to learn new benchmarks, curriculum and how to use interventions, lack of fidelity with MTSS process and leadership intentional focus on bottom 25%.

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

3rd and 4th math proficiency and learning gains showed the most improvement

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

Teachers intentionally and effectively planned differentiated small group tasks that were aligned to standards and student needs.

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

Intentional and effective differentiated tasks for ELL, SWD and bottom 25% of students in ELA. Classroom structure and master schedule designed to provide opportunities for support.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will need to develop an understanding of the ELA and Math benchmarks in order to produce aligned tasks meeting the depth of the benchmark. (Learning Arc) How to Implement the use of formative assessments to drive and plan researched based practices within small group instruction to achieve mastery.

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

To ensure sustainability, frequent monitoring will take place through classroom observations, progress monitoring data, formative assessment tracking records, and attendance reports. Quarterly administrative, teacher, and student data chats will also occur throughout the year while weekly Colaborative Planning will be held, coaching cycles, and continuous supports for staff and students through PBIS.

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.

Based on the achievement gap and lack of movement in proficiency, as well as the need for staff to develop a deeper understanding of the BEST benchmarks. Collaborative planning will utilize the Learning Arc process to design instruction that meets the full intent of the benchmark.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By Spring 2023 overall proficiency will increase by 1% in ELA and Math achievement.

Monitoring:

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

To ensure students are mastering benchmarks, we will use district progress monitoring assessments in conjunction with the classroom walkthrough tool to monitor intentional effective instruction and equivalent experiences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Monitor students engaging in equivalent experiences aligned to state expectations using a benchmark walkthough tool and engage teachers in benchmark based planning using the Learning Arc Framework.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

According to our district progress monitoring data, our core instruction will benefit from evidenced based strategies that when used with fidelity will increase student learning and achievement.

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 consistent collaborative planning schedule for the year.

Person Responsible

Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@polk-fl.net)

Provide professional development on the Learning Arc and best instructional practices in ELA and Math (bby math) to leadership and teachers.

Person Responsible

Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@polk-fl.net)

Monitoring teacher implementation of the Learning Arc through use of the classroom walkthrough tool

Person Responsible

Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@polk-fl.net)

Analysis of student progress monitoring data and completed aligned tasks during collaborative planning.

Person Responsible

Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@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

We will increase our K-2 reading proficiency through a focus on building foundational reading skills related to the BEST benchmarks while providing and tracking differentiated small group instruction and interventions.

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

Our 3-5 reading proficiency will increase through intentionally providing and tracking of differentiated small group instruction based on progress monitoring data.

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)

By spring 2023 students in K-2 will increase proficiency by 1 percentage point on spring district progress monitoring assessments.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By spring 2023 students in 3-5 will increase proficiency by 1 percentage point on spring district progress monitoring assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will take place by conducting observations during small group, analysis of formative assessment and progress monitoring data and conducting student artifact analysis with grade level teams and individual teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Spear, Tracey, tracey.spear@polk-fl.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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

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

The evidence based strategy being implemented for this area is differentiation in small groups for interventions and acceleration as well as differentiation in tasks at learning stations.

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?

Differentiated small group instruction will allow the teacher to closely monitor student learning through formative assessments and provide opportunities for reteaching, interventions, and/or enrichment. Administration will conduct walkthroughs to monitor the fidelity of instruction and documentation of interventions and acceleration provided.

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
Provide professional development with running records, SIPPS and LLI interventions. Assist teachers with decision making in regards to MTSS interventions and acceleration.	Spear, Tracey, tracey.spear@polk-fl.net
Monitor teacher implementation and provide instructional coaching support and feedback.	Spear, Tracey, tracey.spear@polk-fl.net
Analyze student outcomes and make instructional adjustments as needed.	Spear, Tracey, tracey.spear@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.

Medulla builds a positive culture by collaborating with multiple groups of stakeholders, such as SAC, community partnerships, as well as with district and school-based leadership teams.

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

Medulla's School Advisory Council brings together multiple stakeholders, such as parents, teachers, administration, and community partners. The role of members is to support and provide input regarding the School Improvement Plan and review expenditure of school funds. Community partnerships include local businesses and religious organizations. These partners provide resources for students in need, plan staff appreciation activities, volunteer their time working with students and sponsor family engagement events. Administration collaborates with school-based leadership teams to plan, organize, and facilitate tasks related to the School Improvement Plan.