Dixieland Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dixieland Elementary School

416 ARIANA ST, Lakeland, FL 33803

http://schools.polk-fl.net/dixieland

Demographics

Principal: Elizabeth Smith   Start Date for this Principal: 1/3/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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 (45%) 2018-19: D (40%) 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

Dixieland Elementary School

416 ARIANA ST, Lakeland, FL 33803

http://schools.polk-fl.net/dixieland

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 KG-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	71%

School Grades History

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

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.

Dixieland Elementary will provide authentic learning experiences that will enable and empower students to become lifelong learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All Dixieland Elementary students will achieve personal growth and success academically, socially, and emotionally.

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
Smith, Elizabeth	Principal	The job duties and responsibilities of the principal are to be an instructional leader on campus through the following practices: -Communicate a common vision of providing standards-based instruction aligned to state expectations and data driven interventions -Set and monitor expectations for instruction, progress monitoring, and conditions for learning -Provide appropriate professional learning opportunities to allow staff to build capacity in areas that will support School Improvement Goals -Conduct regular classroom walkthroughs/observations providing timely feedback -Participate in weekly professional learning community meetings with teachers -Progress monitor implementation of initiatives across the campus and provide timely feedback. -Meet weekly with the leadership team to discuss progress on action steps toward School Improvement Goals -Coordinate with instructional coaches to ensure professional development and support are provided with fidelity in a timely manner to all staff members. -Monitor and provide feedback related to discipline data and provide support for teachers as the need arises. -Establish structures and routines for sharing and reviewing short and long cycle data in order to provide timely and appropriate support
Hilgenberg, Craig	Assistant Principal	The job duties and responsibilities of the assistant principal are to be an instructional leader on campus through the following practices: -Assist the principal in communicating a common vision of standards-based instruction aligned to state expectations and data driven interventions - Assist in setting and monitoring expectations for instruction, progress monitoring, and conditions for learning -Provide appropriate professional learning opportunities to allow staff to build capacity in areas that will support School Improvement Goals -Conduct regular classroom walkthroughs/observations providing timely feedback -Participate in weekly professional learning community meetings with teachers -Progress monitor implementation of initiatives across the campus and provide timely feedback. -Meet weekly with the leadership team to discuss progress on action steps toward School Improvement Goals -Coordinate with instructional coaches to ensure professional development and support are provided with fidelity in a timely manner to all staff members. -Monitor and provide feedback related to discipline data and provide support for teachers as the need arises. -Establish structures and routines for sharing and reviewing short and long cycle data in order to provide timely and appropriate support

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Menzies, Nicholas	Instructional Coach	The job duties and responsibilities of the instructional coaches are to provide support to instructional staff through the following practices: -Provide appropriate professional development related to building effective, research-based instructional strategies that support standards based instruction. -Build trusting relationships with staff to support the implementation of coaching cycles as identified by administration -Coordinate and conduct coaching cycles and differentiated support for teachers in all grade levels. -Provide regular feedback to teachers participating in coaching cycles, as well as those observed following differentiated professional development. -Facilitate collaborative planning sessions -Facilitate data review of weekly formative/summative assessments to plan for action steps -Regularly monitor the progress of students utilizing the various data analysis tools , MTSS documentation, class assignments, interventions, grades, etc. in order to provide support to teachers -Collaborate with classroom teachers to ensure that interventions used with students are utilized and reinforced consistently in class.
Williams, Cheris	Instructional Coach	The job duties and responsibilities of the instructional coaches are to provide support to instructional staff through the following practices: -Provide appropriate professional development related to building effective, research-based instructional strategies that support standards based instruction. -Build trusting relationships with staff to support the implementation of coaching cycles as identified by administration -Coordinate and conduct coaching cycles and differentiated support for teachers in all grade levels. -Provide regular feedback to teachers participating in coaching cycles, as well as those observed following differentiated professional development. -Facilitate collaborative planning sessions -Facilitate data review of weekly formative/summative assessments to plan for action steps -Regularly monitor the progress of students utilizing the various data analysis tools , MTSS documentation, class assignments, interventions, grades, etc. in order to provide support to teachers -Collaborate with classroom teachers to ensure that interventions used with students are utilized and reinforced consistently in class.
Cowans, Vanessa	School Counselor	The job duties and responsibilities of the school counselor are to support students and teachers through the following practices: -Maintain accurate records of students requiring social/emotional/behavioral support -Provide timely and appropriate instruction to grade levels to help teach students social/

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		emotional skills, such as conflict resolution on a consistent schedule -Collect, monitor and provide feedback on regularly updated MTSS documentation

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 1/3/2020, Elizabeth Smith

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

16

Total number of students enrolled at the school

330

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

4

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

4

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	62	52	42	55	55	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	334
Attendance below 90 percent	18	15	13	11	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	12	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	25	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	18	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	22	25	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	3	2	5	7	26	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	1	2	19	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 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	48	45	53	52	62	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	324
Attendance below 90 percent	19	9	5	10	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	3	4	2	7	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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	13	9	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	6	7	11	18	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	48	45	53	52	62	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	324
Attendance below 90 percent	19	9	5	10	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	3	4	2	7	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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	13	9	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	6	7	11	18	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	28%	47%	56%				39%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	45%						40%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						40%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	50%	42%	50%				50%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	69%						42%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%						31%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	25%	49%	59%				39%	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	39%	52%	-13%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	30%	48%	-18%	58%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	46%	47%	-1%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

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	59%	56%	3%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	27%	56%	-29%	64%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	51%	1%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	38%	45%	-7%	53%	-15%
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	4	22		19	56		10				
ELL	20	44		50	82	64	27				
BLK	20	30	29	31	57	64	6				
HSP	26	50		56	71	64	32				
WHT	35	45		59	74						
FRL	28	47	45	45	69	68	23				

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	18	50		29							
ELL	26	55		43	50						
BLK	15	11		35	50		11				
HSP	35	57		51	64		56				
WHT	37	44		49	47		31				
FRL	22	30	50	38	53		29				
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	21	40	42	29	50	50					
ELL	24	23		32	23	15					
BLK	33	36	45	46	47	40	32				
HSP	33	30	29	48	29	20	29				
MUL	45			27							
WHT	52	63		61	58		56				
FRL	36	33	36	43	34	31	38				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
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	52

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	34
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	53
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?

Low ELA Proficiency is pervasive across all grade levels and subgroups.
Attendance below 90% is pervasive across all grade levels.
Low Science Proficiency is a trend year to year.

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

ELA Proficiency
Science Proficiency
Subgroup Proficiency and Gains Data

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

Low ELA and Science Proficiency factors include limited exposure to tasks and assessments that meet the full intent of grade-level standards. Instruction has been over-scaffolded for students. Students have a lack of foundational knowledge.
The actions needed to address this is increase in teacher capacity around the full intent of grade level standards and creating appropriate equivalent practice for these standards.

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

Math Proficiency and Learning Gains
Subgroup Learning Gains Data

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

Contributing factors to this improvement was Response to Data Intervention Groups and high performing teachers using data in an intentional way to move student proficiency.

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

Utilizing the Learning Arc to increase teacher capacity around the standards and benchmarks. Utilizing Response to Data (RtD) Interventions to strategically target grade level benchmark deficiencies. Utilizing LLI, Corrective Reading and SIPPS groups to target skill deficiencies during Intervention Time.

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 receive facilitated PLCs for the Learning Arc. Teachers will receive professional development on using data to create appropriate RtD groups. LLI, Corrective Reading and SIPPS facilitators will be trained on implementing these programs with fidelity.

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

By building capacity in these systems (Learning Arc, RtD, LLI, Corrective Reading and SIPPS) with all teachers through professional development and PLCs we will ensure these measures can be replicated from year to year.

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.	Dixieland will provide benchmark aligned instruction in all core subjects. Students will learn and work to the intent of grade-level benchmarks through appropriately scaffolded instruction and research-based instructional practices. Students will be provided with meaningful practice with appropriate tasks that require students to work at the full depth of the grade-level standards. Students will be held to high expectations for achieving mastery of grade-level benchmarks. This area of focus was chosen based on the low percentage of students from all ESSA subgroups showing both proficiency & learning gains in ELA, Math, and Science.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By Spring 2023, 41% of students all students including students in Black, Hispanic, SWD and ELL subgroups will score at proficiency or higher on the ELA State Progress Monitoring assessment (F.A.S.T). By Spring 2023, 47% of students eligible for Learning Gains will demonstrate a Learning Gain based on ELA F.A.S.T. #1 and F.A.S.T. # 3 & 45% of the Lowest 25th Percentile will demonstrate a Learning Gain based on ELA F.A.S.T. #1 and F.A.S.T. # 3. By Spring 2023, 54% of students overall and % of students in Black, Hispanic, SWD and ELL subgroups will score at proficiency or higher on the Math F.A.S.T assessment. By Spring 2022, 60% of students eligible for Learning Gains will demonstrate a Learning Gain based on Math F.A.S.T. #1 & F.A.S.T. #3 & 50% of the Lowest 25th Percentile will demonstrate a Learning Gain based on Math F.A.S.T. #1 & F.A.S.T. #3.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The Area of Focus will be monitored through weekly walk-throughs from Administration and Instructional Coaches to provide feedback on use of research-based practices, release of work/thinking to students, and quality of instructional tasks. These walk-throughs will be input in a digital platform to identify instructional trends and alignment to state benchmarks. Administration will monitor mastery of weekly Focus Benchmarks using formative and summative data that is entered into Performance Matters (our data management system). Administration and Instructional coaches will meet with teachers weekly in order to provide support in creating benchmark aligned whole group lessons and tasks that meet the expectations set forth for the BEST standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Smith (elizabeth.smith01@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	To address the proficiency rate and percentage of students making learning gains we will focus on providing students with benchmark aligned whole group lessons, tasks, and equivalent experiences that meet the expectations set forth for the BEST standards. We will accomplish this by utilizing the Learning Arc during PLCs and collaborative planning. Utilizing this structure will allow us to develop a deep understanding of the BEST standards and ability to analyze appropriate instruction to align to those standards.

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.
According to John Hattie's meta-analysis the factor related to student achievement with the highest effect size is "Collective Teacher Efficacy" (1.57 effect size). The strategies we chose were based on this information. Through collaborative planning/PLCs, non-evaluative feedback, coaching, and Professional Development on we hope to build teacher efficacy. Through these strategies we feel we can incorporate other factors Hattie has documented as having a high to moderate effect such as Scaffolding (0.82 effect size), Deliberate Practice (0.79 effect size), Interventions for students with learning needs (0.77 effect size), Planning and prediction (0.76 effect size), and Evaluation and Reflection (0.75 effect size).

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. Create a common understanding of our instructional expectations and goals during pre-planning week.
2. Utilize Learning Arc to design instruction during PLCs and Collaborative Planning.
3. Provide quarterly extended planning for teachers to work through Steps 1-4 of the Learning Arc.
4. Weekly data review with teachers to monitor proficiency/mastery of weekly focus benchmarks.
5. Create and utilize a digital form aligned to SIP goals to monitor instructional trends and progress toward mastering goals.
6. Utilize district standards walk-through tools to conduct non-evaluative campus walkthroughs focused on alignment of task with the full intent of the benchmarks, release of intellectual work to students, and use of appropriate equivalent experience. Use this information to guide PLC & collaborative planning discussion/ decision making.
7. Tiering/ providing coaching support for teachers based on experience and capacity for providing benchmark aligned instruction.

Person Responsible
Elizabeth Smith (elizabeth.smith01@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Students will receive data-driven, intentional instruction to provide skills students need in order to access learning grade-level standards at their full intent. In order to address deficiencies, students will receive additional, intentional supports and teachers will closely monitor progress in order to move to proficiency. Our students with disabilities, L25 students, and students in the Black subgroup are showing insufficient levels of proficiency and gains in ELA and Math.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By Spring 2023, 41% of students overall and 41% of students in Black, Hispanic, SWD and ELL subgroups will score Level 3 or higher on state progress monitoring assessment. By Spring 2023, 47% of students will demonstrate a Learning Gain based on ELA State Progress Monitoring assessment & 45% of the Lowest 25th Percentile will demonstrate a Learning Gain based on that assessment. By Spring 2023, 54% of students overall and 54% of students in Black, Hispanic, SWD and ELL subgroups will score Level 3 or higher on the Math State Progress Monitoring assessment. By Spring 2023, 60% of students eligible for Learning Gains will demonstrate a Learning Gain based on Math State Progress Monitoring data & 60% of the Lowest 25th Percentile will demonstrate a Learning Gain based on on that assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The Area of Focus will be monitored through weekly walk-throughs from Administration and Instructional Coaches to ensure fidelity of implementation of measures outlined below. During these non-evaluative walk-throughs, feedback will be given on instruction as well as quality of center work students are completing during small group time. Additionally, we will monitor through MTSS meetings held every 6 weeks with the school counselor.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Craig Hilgenberg (craig.hilgenberg@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	In order to address the proficiency rate and % of students making learning gains we will focus on creating high-impact, small group instruction utilizing research-based interventions to be used by classroom teachers, ESE inclusion teachers, and the ESOL paraprofessional. We will increase the fidelity and effectiveness of MTSS for students struggling to master grade-level standards.

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.

These strategies have been outlined by the What Works Clearinghouse (https://ies.ed.gov/ ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/3) as effective in supporting struggling learners. LLI as a small group resource is recommended from Evidence for ESSA (evidenceforessa.org) for small group instruction. According to the National Reading Panel, systematic phonics instruction produces significant benefits for students in kindergarten through 6th grade and for children having difficulty learning to read. SIPPS provides systematic phonics instruction for K-5.

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. Administer diagnostic assessments to determine individual needs.
2. Utilize Fountas & Pinnell's LLI intervention kits for KG-3rd grade to be used during Power Hour for students falling below proficiency in Reading/ELA as well as with ESE inclusion and ELL support.
3. Utilize Corrective Reading intervention for students in grades 3-5.
4. Utilize SIPPS phonics intervention for Kg-5 to be used by the ELL paraprofessional during Power Hour for ELL support.
5. Align schedules for ESE inclusion teachers, Instruction paraprofessionals, and ESOL paraprofessional with Power Hour and instructional blocks to maximize the impact of their time on student achievement.
6. Utilize Reflex Math to assist students in building basic math skills and fluency.
7. Utilize Reading A-Z to provide quality leveled texts for center work.

Person Responsible Cheris Williams (cheris.williams@polk-fl.net)

1. Provide professional development on the MTSS process.
2. Provide teacher support on scheduling Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.
3. Provide teacher support on best interventions to utilize to address skill deficits.
4. Meet with all teachers every 6-weeks to review MTSS data and growth with teachers.
5. Streamline documentation procedures for teachers to assist with providing high-quality documentation.

Person Responsible Vanessa Cowans (leneka.cowans@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

Instructional Practice related to Reading/ELA is an Area of Focus for Dixieland based on the rate of proficiency below 50% in 2nd grade. Proficiency was measured using STAR Reading for 2nd grade. The current proficiency rate is 43%. Lack of Reading/ELA proficiency will make progressing successfully incredibly difficult. Students need a strong foundation in reading and writing skills in order to obtain and process knowledge necessary to be a successful student.

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

Instructional Practice related to Reading/ELA is an Area of Focus for Dixieland based on the rate of proficiency below 50% in 3rd-5th grade. Proficiency was measured using FSA ELA data for grades 3-5. The current proficiency rate for each of those grade levels is 30% (3rd grade), 30% (4th grade) and 23% (5th grade). Lack of Reading/ELA proficiency in these grade levels will make progressing successfully incredibly difficult. Students need a strong foundation in reading and writing skills in order to obtain and process knowledge necessary to be a successful student.

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, 60% of students in Kindergarten-2nd grade will fall within the proficient range on the state progress monitoring system. This goal was chosen because 60% of students in KG and 1st grade ended the year proficient measured with STAR Early Literacy. Our goal is to maintain that level of proficiency as they role up to the next grade level.
These measurable outcomes were chosen by increasing the cohorts Spring 2022 proficiency by 5%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By Spring of 2023, we intend to increase proficiency in grades 3-5 as follows:
3rd Grade: increase from 43%-48% proficient
4th Grade: 30%-35% proficient
5th Grade: 30%-35% proficient
These measurable outcomes were chosen by increasing the cohorts Spring 2022 proficiency by 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.

The Area of Focus will be monitored through walk-throughs from Administration and Instructional Coaches to provide feedback on use of research-based practices, release of work/thinking to students, and quality of instructional tasks. These walk-throughs will occur 3-5 days a week and will be input in a digital platform to identify instructional trends. Administration and Instructional coaches will meet with teachers weekly to provide support in creating benchmark aligned whole group lessons and tasks to ensure they meet state expectations for the standards and benchmarks. Additionally, the leadership team will monitor that groups are being pulled and program being used with fidelity by collecting weekly attendance as well as formative and summative data. Data will be collected through a digital platform.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Smith, Elizabeth, elizabeth.smith01@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. §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?

To address the proficiency rate, we will address the deficits using 2 layers of support for both gaps in foundational literacy skills as well as lack of appropriate grade-level instruction and tasks. First, we will create high-impact, small group instruction utilizing Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) Resources from Fountas and Pinnell to fill in skill gaps in reading that are impeding student progress toward ELA proficiency. Groups will be determined through diagnostic assessments. Additionally, we will focus on designing benchmark-aligned instruction in ELA, providing appropriate equivalent experiences that will empower students to be successful on statewide progress monitoring. We will accomplish this piece through the use of the Learning Arc to create a deep understanding for the state benchmarks at each grade-level. We will then use this understanding to design aligned instruction and instructional tasks/practice.

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?

These strategies have been outlined by the What Works Clearinghouse (https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/3) as effective in supporting struggling learners. LLI as a small group resource is recommended from Evidence for ESSA (evidenceforessa.org) for small group instruction. According to the National Reading Panel, systematic phonics instruction produces significant benefits for students in kindergarten through 6th grade and for children having difficulty learning to read.
Utilizing Learning Arc to ensure state benchmark aligned instruction and instructional tasks was chosen as an Evidence-based Practice/Program based on The New Teacher Project's Publication, The Opportunity Myth stating that students who start the year substantially behind can gain 7.3 months of growth by providing assignments that are aligned to grade-level standards and expectations.

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
Targeted Intervention utilizing Corrective Reading & Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) Resources from Fountas and Pinnell. Literacy Leadership- The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) consisting of the principal, assistant principal, and literacy coach will create a schedule for when Corrective Reading (CR), LLI will take place in each grade level. The LLT will also create schedules for Inclusion Teachers and Instructional Paraeducators to prioritize CR & LLI groups in their schedules. Finally, the LLT will create a plan collecting weekly data and monitor the progress of the CR & LLI groups. Literacy Coaching and Professional Learning- Provide ELA teachers, Inclusion teachers, and instructional paraprofessionals with training and continuing professional development in CR/LLI building capacity around literacy skills needed for each level of literacy development. Assessment- Diagnostic benchmark assessments will be administered to determine individual needs in reading including instructional levels and skill deficits. Additionally, Running Records are administered every 4 lessons.	Williams, Cheris , cheris.williams@polk-fl.net
Provide Grade Appropriate Assignments and Strong Instruction in Reading/ELA. Literacy Leadership- The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) consisting of the principal, assistant principal, and literacy coach will utilize the Learning Arc to facilitate PLCs and collaborative planning sessions to develop benchmark-aligned instruction in ELA, providing appropriate equivalent experiences that will develop proficiency in Reading/ELA for all students. Literacy Coaching & Professional Development- The LLT will provide PD to build capacity of research-based best practices for standards-based instruction and appropriate scaffolding instruction in order to help all students meet the expectations of grade-level standards. Assessment- The LLT will conduct weekly non-evaluative campus walkthroughs with feedback focused on alignment of task with state benchmarks and release of intellectual work to students using the standards walk-through tool to ensure follow-through of lesson planning taking place in the instructional block.	Smith, Elizabeth, elizabeth.smith01@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.

Our PBIS committee adjusts our PBIS program based on discipline data, attendance data, and staff survey data collected in May. The committee has created lesson plans for each behavior expectation that will be

taught at the beginning of the year as well as after all extended breaks. The committee is utilizing a "Behavior-Matrix" to assist teachers in problem solving behavioral issues as they arise in their classrooms. PBIS has reintegrated CHAMPS into our school-wide plan. Our Leadership Team will meet weekly with Tier 2 behavior students to conduct check-ins and both academic and behavioral data chats. Teachers will conduct weekly Social Skills lessons. Finally, the committee has created a school-wide system using Class Dojo to provide incentives for behavior and attendance.

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

Administration will monitor office referral data, assist with problem-solving, promote PBIS incentives, and participate in MTSS-B meetings.
School Counselor will monitor office referral data, assist with problem-solving, promote PBIS incentives, and participate in MTSS-B meetings, assist in developing Tier 2 & 3 behavior plans, provide resources for Social Skills lessons, and work with small groups of students on specific social skills.
Teachers will implement the school-wide PBIS plan including CHAMPS, maintain accurate records regarding behavioral incidents, develop relationships with students, communicate frequently and accurately with parents, and participate in MTSS-B problem solving meetings for Tier 2 & 3 students.
Parents will monitor their student's behavior and communicate with teachers via Class Dojo.