

Polk County Public Schools

Rochelle School Of The Arts



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Rochelle School Of The Arts

1501 MARTIN L KING JR AVE, Lakeland, FL 33805

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

Demographics

Principal: Carol Griffin

Start Date for this Principal: 6/2/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (59%) 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (59%)
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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Rochelle School Of The Arts

1501 MARTIN L KING JR AVE, Lakeland, FL 33805

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

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)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	92%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

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.

Rochelle School of the Arts is committed to using best practices to provide an enriched, rigorous and relevant curriculum through the arts and academics in a challenging environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Rochelle School of the Arts will ignite all students for the future by providing a rigorous academic curriculum along with the active study of the visual and performing arts.

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
Griffin, Carol	Principal	Carol Griffin - Principal - Mrs. Griffin serves the students and staff of Rochelle School of the Arts as an instructional leader by setting clear expectations and setting high goals for academic achievement. She meets weekly with teachers to review lesson plans, discuss initiatives being introduced by the school district, and solicit teacher input on ways the leadership team can assist in classrooms. Mrs. Griffin leads professional learning communities to build teacher pedagogy. She works closely with academic instructional coaches to develop schedules to assist teachers and provide support in every classroom.
Brackman, Lee	Assistant Principal	Lee Brackman - Assistant Principal - Mr. Brackman serves as an instructional leader in middle school standard assessment curriculums. He meets with teachers to review data and discusses how instruction will be modified to meet the needs of all students. Mr. Brackman provides information on school-wide discipline data, ensures that school-based team participates in implementation of intervention support and documentation, & ensures adequate professional development to support/increase knowledge and skills of staff.
Bryant, Carolyn	Assistant Principal	Carolyn Bryant - Assistant Principal - Mrs. Bryant serves as an instructional leader in elementary standard and assessment curriculums. She meets with teachers to review data from unit and weekly reading tests, math modules, and discusses how instruction will be modified from whole group to small group to meet the needs of all students. Mrs. Bryant provides information on school-wide discipline data, ensures that school-based team participates in implementation of intervention support and documentation, & ensures adequate professional development to support/increase knowledge and skills of staff.
Willoughby, Denise	School Counselor	Denise Willoughby, Middle School Counselor: Provides quality services and knowledge on issues ranging from program design to assessment and progress monitoring with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral and social success. Mrs. Willoughby works with our school's outreach team and supports the efforts of the members of the team.
Hansen, Colin	Behavior Specialist	The Behavior Interventionist is responsible for teacher-to-teacher classroom support, modeling, mentoring, and collaborating to promote better behavior management strategies for teachers and students, and will also be responsible for supporting teachers in data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based behavior strategies and programs; and school improvement.
Whiteside, Heather	Other	Heather Whiteside - Testing Coordinator - Ms. Whiteside leads all school, district and state assessment processes. She also assists teachers with analyzing data to maximize student success.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Grooms, Rochelle	Other	Mrs. Grooms provides mental health services through the implementation of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas School Safety Act by advocating for social emotional wellness and connecting students, their families, and the schools through collaboration with community providers.
Mayes, Kim	Instructional Coach	Kim Mayes - Reading Instructional Coach - Mrs. Mayes is the Reading Instructional Coach who works closely with teachers on collaborative planning each week. Collaborative planning sessions focus on how teachers will meet the depth of the benchmark, and how teachers will modify lessons to reach all student ability levels based on the data collected. She supports instructional delivery by working with teachers in the classroom to model best practices, co-teach whole group lessons, and facilitate small group or one to one instruction. Mrs. Mayes meets weekly with administration to discuss concerns, share good news, and develop plans to assist instructional staff members.
Chehaib, Hiba	School Counselor	Hiba Chehaib, Elementary School Counselor: Provides quality services and knowledge on issues ranging from program design to assessment and progress monitoring with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral and social success. Mrs. Chehaib works with our school's outreach team and supports the efforts of the members of the team.
Horvatin, Jen	Instructional Coach	Jennifer Horvatin - Math Instructional Coach - Mrs. Horvatin is the Math Instructional Coach who works closely with teachers on collaborative planning each week. Collaborative planning sessions focus on how teachers will meet the depth of the benchmark, and how teachers will modify lessons to reach all student ability levels based on the data collected. She supports instructional delivery by working with teachers in the classroom to model best practices, co-teach whole group lessons, and facilitate small group or one to one instruction. Mrs. Horvatin meets weekly with administration to discuss concerns, share good news, and develop plans to assist instructional staff members.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/2/2022, Carol Griffin

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

752

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.

11

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	67	69	82	86	85	86	102	98	104	0	0	0	0	779
Attendance below 90 percent	0	13	18	18	11	18	23	6	13	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	3	11	8	17	16	0	0	0	0	59
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	5	0	0	1	13	4	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	3	13	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	15	12	14	16	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	23	31	28	0	0	0	0	95
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	28	36	18	9	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	5	1	5	30	38	34	38	0	0	0	0	154

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	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math				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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	57	68	75	78	83	78	100	96	100	0	0	0	0	735
Attendance below 90 percent	9	16	19	13	18	23	10	14	15	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	3	11	6	21	16	9	0	0	0	0	68
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	17	31	24	4	15	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	2	2	9	0	21	14	28	24	15	0	0	0	0	115

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	58%	51%	55%				63%	61%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	49%						58%	58%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						50%	49%	54%
Math Achievement	58%	37%	42%				59%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	54%						50%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						46%	52%	52%
Science Achievement	51%	48%	54%				44%	52%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	90%	53%	59%				81%	79%	78%

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	72%	52%	20%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	48%	17%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2022					
	2019	60%	47%	13%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
06	2022					
	2019	64%	48%	16%	54%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
07	2022					
	2019	59%	42%	17%	52%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
08	2022					
	2019	63%	48%	15%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

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	68%	56%	12%	62%	6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	56%	-5%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	54%	51%	3%	60%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
06	2022					
	2019	48%	47%	1%	55%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
07	2022					
	2019	60%	39%	21%	54%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
08	2022					
	2019	38%	35%	3%	46%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	40%	45%	-5%	53%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	48%	41%	7%	48%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	81%	70%	11%	71%	10%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	98%	50%	48%	61%	37%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%

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	27	34	27	20	34	35	18				
ELL	55	55	50	61	52		50				
BLK	43	38	38	46	48	55	29	84	86		
HSP	62	59	42	60	59	33	57	92	88		
MUL	53	53		63	64						
WHT	74	55	44	69	57	41	71	93	79		
FRL	48	46	44	48	51	46	40	88	76		
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	39	38	13	39	37					
ELL	35	38		35	50						
BLK	44	50	43	39	40	34	25	72	80		
HSP	57	57		54	57	57	45	82	85		
MUL	79	67		42	47						
WHT	71	64	46	72	61	61	49	90	87		
FRL	43	47	36	40	38	35	22	66	84		
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	33	41	25	29	18					
ELL	53	64		42	27						
BLK	50	52	47	48	43	41	25	65	89		
HSP	66	59	53	61	55	57	44	85	67		
MUL	63	64		56	50						

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
WHT	81	64	54	75	57	48	68	97	92		
FRL	55	52	45	51	46	46	28	80	78		

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	59
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	527
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
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

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
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	61
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	58
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	65
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	54
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?

ELA and Math Achievement Levels increased across the majority of subgroups represented. Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% decreased across the majority of subgroups. There was an increase in the various subgroups represented for the 2021-2022 school year.

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

Math continues to be a weak area, especially for students not participating in advanced or accelerated math courses. The students receiving AL 1, 2, and 3 need scaffolded supports, stronger fact fluency, and stronger skills in reading and writing to more confidently approach the rigorous math instruction.

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

Possible contributing factors to the decline over the course of the year include:

Various teacher changes in 4th grade due to situations beyond our control. Several staff members experienced death in their families, which altered their work arrangements, thus impacting student performance.

Students continued to be quarantined throughout the first semester as a result of Covid protocols, which resulted in students missing multiple days of instruction.

A strong schoolwide focus on fact fluency at each grade level at the beginning of the year and continuing as appropriate throughout the year will support this area for students.

Teachers utilizing the data from FAST, which assesses the BEST standards, will guide instruction throughout the school year.

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

Science and Civics achievement showed the greatest improvement overall.

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

Consistent instruction in science classrooms with hands-on labs is one contributing factor. Consistent direct instruction in reading skills students were lacking also contributed to the improvement in science and civics achievement.

A stronger focus on nonfiction reading materials and informational text will occur in all grade levels.

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

Teachers use of The Learning Arc, which will allow them to focus on getting to know the new benchmarks and ensuring that the tasks are aligned.

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.

Weekly PLC's, trainings for 1:1 devices, implementation of the BEST Benchmarks.

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

A more consistent focus on behavior and PBIS to assist students preparedness to be in the classroom. A more targeted focus in Foundational Skills classes through small group instruction and cross curricular instruction.

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 Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Math was identified as a critical need as a result of multiple grade levels math FSA proficiency being below 50%. There were a significant amount of students scoring AL 1 that were below proficiency. In addition, learning gains of subgroups were below 50%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Schoolwide Math Proficiency will increase at least 3%, moving from 58% in the 2021-2022 school year to a minimum of 61% in the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will collaborate in Professional Learning Community meetings weekly to ensure that the instructional tasks students complete are aligned to the new BEST standards and the level of complexity required to fully address the benchmark. Students will be monitored through district FAST progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carol Griffin (carol.griffin@polk-fl.net)

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

Explicit instruction will be provided in math classrooms, giving students the opportunity for guided and independent practice. This instruction will improve students ability to perform operations and solve word problems. In addition, building fact fluency in all grade levels will be used to improve students progression towards the benchmark.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students need modeling and repeated practice of new skills as well as reviewing skills they have learned in the past. Math fact fluency will allow students to quickly retrieve information in order to solve problems in the classroom.

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.

K-8 Curriculum Planning for teachers to develop standards-based lessons.

Scaffolding the lessons during core instruction will assist in ensuring that all students are able to grasp concepts.

Technology will assist students understanding and development of standards-based lessons via the assessment platforms

iPads will be used for STAR assessments.

1:1 devices will allow students to work on skills at home.

Person Responsible

Lee Brackman (lee.brackman@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will pull small groups to work on mastery of BEST benchmarks.

Gen Ed and ESE teachers will meet collaboratively to work on focused lessons and tasks that meet the needs of students.

Person Responsible

Jen Horvatin (jennifer.horvatin@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

According to the results from the 2021 - 2022 FSA Assessment, the following subgroup performed below 41% overall proficiency. The subgroup was:
Students with Disabilities - 27%

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

As a result of appropriate implementation of MTSS, our Students with Disabilities will perform at a minimum of 41% proficiency overall. Student learning will be monitored through grade level summative assessments, formative assessments, district progress monitoring tools, and the new FAST progress monitoring assessment.

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

Regular data chats with teachers and coaches on the progress of the ESSA subgroup.
Evaluation of MTSS documentation. SST meetings for those students going through the MTSS process.
Nonevaluative classroom walkthroughs by administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Hiba Chehaib (hiba.chehaib@polk-fl.net)

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

Teachers will be meeting with Tier II and Tier III students daily via small groups during core instruction and power hour to provide targeted intervention. Classroom teachers will conduct weekly assessments in both ELA and Math of students that are in the ESSA subgroup. Teachers will monitor the progress of those students via data chats and meet in collaborative groups to discuss grade level progress. Grade levels will conduct bimonthly data meetings with both administration and academic coaches. Inclusion teachers will attend PLCs to facilitate an increase in the SWD ESSA subgroup. Teachers will communicate with parents through a variety of means (phone calls, email, agenda) with documentation. Administration will be monitoring parent communication every nine weeks through teacher communication logs.

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

According to the previous data, there was (1) ESSA subgroup that did not meet the 41% Federal Index.

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.

K-8 Curriculum Planning for teachers to develop standards-based lessons.
Scaffolding the lessons during core instruction will assist in ensuring that all students are able to grasp concepts.

Technology will assist students understanding and development of standards-based lessons via the assessment platforms

iPads will be used for STAR assessments.

1:1 devices will allow students to work on skills at home.

Person Responsible

Carolyn Bryant (carolyn.bryant@polk-fl.net)

Paras will work with small groups of students to assist in filling in learning gaps and reteaching when applicable based on learning gaps identified by data and the classroom teacher observations.

Small groups of students work with the paras under the direct supervision of the classroom teacher.

Media books to build content knowledge to support comprehension, and impact independent reading as measured by Accelerated Reader.

Person Responsible

Kim Mayes (kimberlee.mayes@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	<p>As a result of our learning gains and proficiency from the 2021-2022 FSA ELA Assessment decreasing from 56% to 49%, we determined that this is a critical need.</p>
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	<p>As a result of BEST Benchmarks and task alignment being taught in core content areas will yield 60% proficiency on the FAST Reading which will be an increase from 58%.</p>
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	<p>Teachers will implement daily monitoring towards student mastery of benchmarks. Leadership team will monitor teachers use of monitoring form through PLCs and non-evaluative classroom walks to include calibration walk data shared with staff.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Carol Griffin (carol.griffin@polk-fl.net)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	<p>Students are expected to meet a defined benchmark for proficiency. Teachers ensure the content taught and the teaching methods utilized enable students to learn the skills and concepts in the benchmark and to provide evidence of their learning. When planning lessons, teachers analyze the cognitive complexity of the activities (DOK) necessary to reach learning targets as well as the amount of student autonomy. Teachers will collaborate with instructional coaches during PLCs to ensure that lesson plans meet the full intent of the BEST Benchmarks, as well as include target/task alignment. Administrators and coaches will conduct weekly nonevaluative classroom walkthroughs</p>

implemented for this Area of Focus.

with the purpose of assessing that benchmarks are taught with fidelity for both accountability and coaching cycle needs. Utilization of Common Assessment Monitoring Tool that will be reviewed at PLCs to ensure daily target/task alignment and analyze student proficiency towards benchmark mastery.

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

Systems alignment is key to accelerating student's progress. Teachers collaborating with instructional coaches will ensure rigorous instruction being executed in the classrooms. With continuous rigorous instruction, students will be pushed more academically to increase student achievement. This strategy will also improve the academic performance of all teachers via direct feedback, coaching cycles and goal setting performance

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.

-Grades K 5 Teachers and Paras will work with small groups of students to assist in filling in learning gaps and reteaching when applicable.

-School based coaches will work with district coaches to ensure alignment to benchmarks and to receive feedback on the common planning session.

-Analyzing Common Assessments during PLC to continue to improve target/task alignment and work to increase student proficiency.

Person Responsible

Kim Mayes (kimberlee.mayes@polk-fl.net)

-Grades 6-8 Teachers and Paras will work with small groups of students to assist in filling in learning gaps and reteaching when applicable.

-School based coaches will work with district coaches to ensure alignment to benchmarks and to receive feedback on the common planning session.

-Analyzing Common Assessments during PLC to continue to improve target/task alignment and work to increase student proficiency.

Person Responsible

Jen Horvatin (jennifer.horvatin@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

N/A

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

N/A

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)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

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.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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**

N/A

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.

Volunteers support student success by helping to close learning gaps and influencing social emotional development. The school partners with community stakeholders to help bridge the social gaps of the students and improve students attitude towards school and building positive relationships. Through groups such as our Parent Teacher Association, Lakeland Family Church and other volunteers and other community stakeholders help with increasing the self-esteem and motivations of the students and staff. The Lakeland Family Church provided a welcome back breakfast for staff and the PTA provided a breakfast for new Kindergarten parents and to new teachers completing their Campus Induction. Stakeholders collaborated with staff in preparing for beginning of year set up and assisting with PBIS activities throughout the year. The school will continue to establish partnerships with parents/caregivers throughout the year. SAC will continue to meet monthly to review the School Improvement Plan, Title I budget, Parent Involvement Events, and other needs of the school. Sanford Harmony curriculum is utilized daily to work towards building a positive culture in each classroom.

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

PTA - providing rewards for students through the PBIS program, sponsoring Teacher Appreciation Week, sponsoring all other staff appreciation days.
 Teacher Engagement Ambassador - providing emotional support for new teachers through the district program including supplies and miscellaneous gifts to show appreciation.
 Lakeland Kiwanis - Student supplies through Stuff the Bus.
 Other local stakeholders providing support as requested - food, clothes, supplies, etc