

Polk County Public Schools

Edgar L. Padgett Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Edgar L. Padgett Elementary

110 LEE LON RD, Lakeland, FL 33809

<http://www.polk-fl.net/padgett>**Demographics****Principal: Joette Burse**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/20/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (47%) 2018-19: C (53%) 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Edgar L. Padgett Elementary

110 LEEELON RD, Lakeland, FL 33809

<http://www.polk-fl.net/padgett>**School Demographics**

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Padgett Elementary is a diverse learning community, strongly committed to preparing all students to become problem solvers and lifelong learners through the use of rigorous and relevant learning and in a collaborative effort with teachers, staff, families, and community volunteers to increase student achievement.

We achieve this by showing:

Respect

Effort

Attitude (Positive)

Cooperation

Honesty

Provide the school's vision statement.

Padgett Elementary is committed to providing a quality education to all students. The teachers, staff, families, and community volunteers strive to build life long learners. Padgett Elementary is continuously working on producing technologically proficient students who will make positive contributions to society. We believe all students can learn.

2022-23 GRIT to GROWTH

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
Burse, Joette	Principal	School's instructional leader. Leads all instructional practices. Monitors the effectiveness of programs.
Livingston, Shawn	Assistant Principal	School's instructional leader. Leads all instructional practices. Monitors the effectiveness of programs. Leader of student services.
Burdick, Davina	Reading Coach	Provides reading support and coaching to teachers. Assists with the implementation of programs.
Griffin, Keli	Math Coach	Provides math support and coaching to teachers. Assists with the implementation of programs.
Howard, Leah	Other	Provides ESE program support and coaching to teachers. Monitors the compliance of IEP's. Advocates student support services.
Coughlin, Patrick	School Counselor	Provides student services and facilitates MTSS.
Cloud, Meagan	Other	Provides student acceleration in math. Supports science instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/20/2022, Joette Burse

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

527

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

3

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

9

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	84	78	84	103	82	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	506
Attendance below 90 percent	40	24	43	39	27	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	208
One or more suspensions	7	3	6	13	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA	0	3	8	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	42	24	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	41	29	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	33	57	47	23	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174

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	9	25	25	43	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133

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

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

Wednesday 6/22/2022

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	83	83	98	84	78	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	519
Attendance below 90 percent	29	34	30	19	26	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	2	1	5	7	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA	4	6	10	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	3	1	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	12	17	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	18	55	44	33	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	196

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	19	26	18	28	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140

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	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	19	26	18	28	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140

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	83	84	84	103	82	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	511
Attendance below 90 percent	29	24	43	39	27	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	197
One or more suspensions	2	3	6	13	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA	0	6	10	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	3	1	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	12	17	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	33	57	47	23	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174

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	9	25	25	43	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133

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	1	2	7	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	19	26	18	28	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140

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	41%	47%	56%				54%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%						56%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						57%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	46%	42%	50%				57%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	55%						58%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						45%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	29%	49%	59%				42%	47%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	48%	12%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	41%	47%	-6%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	50%	56%	-6%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	76%	56%	20%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					
	2019	40%	51%	-11%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	40%	45%	-5%	53%	-13%
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	21	37	42	31	48	62					
ELL	31	52		30	36		6				
BLK	20	44	45	27	47	56	13				
HSP	43	59		41	49		15				
WHT	53	54	64	59	67		48				
FRL	33	45	48	36	46	50	15				

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	44	30		46	43	50	21				
ELL	42	28		49	68		31				
BLK	27	19		37	35		17				
HSP	38	28		36	46		17				
WHT	50	36		54	41		38				
FRL	33	22	36	35	33	44	15				
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	34	40	46	35	26	18	14				
ELL	49	54		57	67	64					
BLK	40	42	40	46	53	40	20				
HSP	57	69	70	57	60	45	38				
MUL	70			60							
WHT	61	57	60	64	58		53				
FRL	41	49	52	50	59	44	35				

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	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	394
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
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	42
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?

STAR Math scores show a decline in proficiency across 3-5th grade. STAR Reading scores show a decline in proficiency in 3rd and 4th grade. Overall, students with disabilities also show a decline in STAR Reading and STAR math between Winter and Spring. 5th grade science showed a steady increase on the district quarterly assessment. Third grade ELA proficiency increased by 6% from last year to this year. We did not meet ESSA subgroups for SWD, ELL, and Black/African students.

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

Based on STAR data, our greatest need for improvement is 5th grade math proficiency, learning gains, ESSA subgroups of SWD, ELL and Black/ African American students and lowest 25%.

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

Contributing factors include attendance (pandemic continuation for students and faculty), student motivation, instructions that does not fully and consistently address the standard/benchmark and the need for student autonomy. We need to schedule walkthroughs, debrief and provide feedback to teachers. We need common assessments used to progress monitor and provide acceleration based on the data. We need to participate in online collaborative planning to ensure the benchmarks are being fully and consistently taught and learned. We need a system to address attendance that includes a school-based leadership team. We need to clearly define intervention time and utilize an intervention program with fidelity. We need to implement additional reading and math supports such as Americorp, Reading Pals, RTD, and intervention groups.

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

Learning gains for ELA increased by 26%. Learning gains for L25 in ELA increased by 14%. Likewise, MATH learning gains increased by 13%. Learning gains for L25 in MATH increased by 10%.

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

Our school focused on small group instruction in ELA and MATH based on student need in order to address the benchmarks and accelerate learning.

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

Consistently utilize progress monitoring data analysis to drive instruction. Utilizing real-time checking for understanding within lessons to gauge student understanding, and then adjusting instruction as needed. Consistent collaborative planning will be in place to support instructional practices to accelerate students. Continuing small group instruction and advancing our intervention programs.

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.

Professional development will include job-embedded opportunities for analyzing data, student learning analysis, planning for instruction to include arcing the benchmarks so that students are provided the opportunity for grade level appropriate instruction. Opportunities will also include ways to remediate and accelerate student learning through small group instruction and during intervention time. Professional development opportunities will be analyzed and adjusted based on the needs of the staff and students following instruction and progress monitoring.

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

Additional services will be extended learning opportunities for students, ELL and ESE focused daily support, and utilizing paraprofessionals to support students through structured and focused support as well. The leadership team will also focus on monitoring student progress via data analysis and data chats with students and staff. Following the data analysis, consistent celebration of student progress and student autonomy will ensue in order to provide motivation for further growth. The leadership team will also work in conjunction with staff to motivate and educate students and families to attend school regularly. The leadership team will consistently observe in the classrooms and provide feedback to teachers.

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.

Based on STAR data, our greatest need for improvement is 5th grade math proficiency. Based on our 2022 FSA data, our greatest need in math is to increase our math achievement. Math proficiency is currently at 46%. Our greatest areas of focus would be 3rd grade and 5th grade because proficiency is at 40% for both grade levels.

Schoolwide, we will focus on increasing math proficiency by providing opportunities for students to utilize math manipulatives and explain reasoning/ conceptual understanding. Additionally, teachers will progress monitor and provide feedback and additional practice for students.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

Based on spring 2022 data, 5th grade math proficiency will increase by 5 percentage points. All grade levels will show growth in math proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

Walk-throughs by administration and instructional coaches will take place consistently to provide feedback and support as needed. Walkthroughs will focus on ensuring that students are given opportunities to utilize math manipulatives, explain reasoning and conceptual understanding, and practice math fluency.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based

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

Students will utilize math manipulatives and explain reasoning/ conceptual understanding. Consistent checking for understanding via daily instructional assessments (formal and informal), progress monitoring, and analysis of the data collected will enable monitoring of the desired outcome. By utilizing the real-time data, teachers will adjust instruction in order to provide remediation and acceleration for students, as well as provide specific feedback to guide students to take ownership of their learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Based on the research of Robert Marzano, providing real-time feedback to students regarding learning following progress monitoring and classroom assessments provides not only the students with beneficial information to improve learning, but provides

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

teachers with the information to gauge student learning in such a way as to adjust instruction to facilitate sustained growth and understanding. Research shows that when manipulatives in mathematics are used effectively, student understanding and engagement increases because manipulatives aid in the understanding of visual concepts through the use of visuals, scaffolding learning, and engaging students in learning (Cockett, 2015).

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.

Consistent collaborative planning via the PLC model

Person Responsible Keli Griffin (keli.griffin@polk-fl.net)

Walk-throughs conducted with fidelity
 Create a calendar for leadership team calibration walks
 Conduct calibration walks
 Review walkthrough data at weekly leadership teams

Person Responsible Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

Consistent support via the instructional coaching model

Person Responsible Keli Griffin (keli.griffin@polk-fl.net)

#2. 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.

Based on 3rd grade FSA ELA, 4th and 5th grade STAR Reading, and 3rd-5th grade STAR math, our proficiency is below 50%. Our ELA proficiency is at 40%. Our MATH proficiency is at 41%. Based on 2022 FSA data, our ELA proficiency is at 41% and our MATH proficiency is at 46%. Based on the 2022 Statewide Science Assessment, our SCIENCE proficiency is at 29%.

To address proficiency in ELA, MATH, and SCIENCE, we will ensure that students are engaged in rigorous, benchmark-based tasks and activities that are on grade level.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

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

ELA and MATH proficiency will increase by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring of student proficiency using district assessments such as STAR.

Progress monitoring using the district-created walkthrough tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

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

Monitor students engaging in equivalent experiences aligned to state expectations using the district-created walkthrough tool.

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

Rationale for**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

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

TNTP's The Opportunity Myth speaks to the relationship between academic success and ensuring that students are given opportunities to engage in grade level standards-based expectations. The study found that when given the chance to try grade level work, student meet the bar more than half of the time.

Additionally, students of color and students from low-income backgrounds were about 25% less likely to receive grade appropriate assignments.

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.

Provide professional development for the leadership team on how to use the walkthrough tool.

Person Responsible Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

Create a calendar for leadership team calibration walks.

Person Responsible Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

Conduct calibration walks using the benchmark focused walkthrough tool.

Person Responsible Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

Review walkthrough data at weekly leadership teams.

Person Responsible Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

Provide feedback to teachers regarding walkthroughs and equivalent experiences.

Person Responsible Joette Burse (joette.burse@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

Based on the data from the 2022 STAR Early Literacy/STAR Reading progress monitoring, we have determined that we have a critical need in the area of ELA intervention. STAR data shows that school-wide only 39% of our students in the lowest 25% made learning gains.

We will utilize progress monitoring to determine which students need interventions and then consistently implement teacher-led interventions based on research-based strategies (SIPPS, Reading Wonders Interventions, Making Words).

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

Based on the data from the 2022 FSA and STAR Reading progress monitoring, we have determined that we have a critical need in the area of ELA intervention. STAR data shows that school-wide only 39% of our students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Based on our 2022 FSA data, our ELA learning gains are at 26%.

We will utilize progress monitoring to determine which students need interventions and then consistently

implement teacher-led interventions based on research-based strategies (Corrective Reading, SIPPS, Reading Wonders Interventions, Making Words).

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)

Our ELA learning gains will increase by 5%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our ELA learning gains will increase 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.

Teachers will regularly provide progress monitoring assessments for students. The data will be discussed every 5-6 weeks at PLC's.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Burse, Joette, joette.burse@polk-fl.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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

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

K - letters/sounds, sight words, Making Words

1 - letters/sounds, sight words, making words, Reading Wonders Intervention for phonics/phonemic awareness, SIPPS, Reviewing and reteaching skills missed in weekly assessments

2 - Sight Words, making words, Reading Wonders Intervention for phonics/phonemic awareness, SIPPS, Reviewing and reteaching skills missed in weekly assessments
 3-5 - Sight Words (as needed), Making Words, Reading Wonders Intervention, Corrective Reading, Reviewing and reteaching skills missed in weekly assessments

These evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based, they are aligned with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence based reading plan, and they align to the B.E.S.T ELA Standards.

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 evidence-based practices/programs do address the need for more consistent intervention and are effective for the target population.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Provide professional development for 1st and 2nd on how to utilize SIPPS. Provide professional development for 3rd-5th on how to utilize Corrective Reading.	Burdick, Davina, davina.burdick@polk-fl.net
Observe teachers utilizing interventions and provide feedback to teachers.	Burse, Joette, joette.burse@polk-fl.net
Ensure progress monitoring is occurring and student needs are being addressed.	Burse, Joette, joette.burse@polk-fl.net
Provide opportunities for teachers to observe other teachers and participate in the coaching cycle in regard to interventions.	Burdick, Davina, davina.burdick@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.

At Padgett Elementary, students, staff, families, and the community all work together to ensure a positive school culture. We focus on building relationships and communication with all stakeholders. Our school vision is shared with all stakeholders and all stakeholders work together to make our school vision a reality. At our school, we have common school-wide expectations of Respect, Effort, (Positive) Attitude, Cooperation, and Honesty. These expectations are valued and taught.

Students who follow school-wide expectations have opportunities to earn rewards and even have opportunities to visit the office for positive praise and a REACH reward. Students are recognized on bulletin boards as students of the month. Students are encouraged to participate in after school clubs like chorus, drama and e team. A mentoring program is in place to support student needs. Students who show improvement in behavior are celebrated each grading period. Student ambassadors and safety patrols are selected to provide student leadership on campus. Student teaming, small group instruction, and student accountability lead to student engagement at Padgett Elementary. .

The Padgett leadership team supports staff on a regular basis. The reading coach and math coach provide modeling, coaching, and instructional plan guidance. The administrative team provides regular feedback to staff and coaches staff through the SAO process. Staff members are celebrated and recognized at different times throughout the school year. Staff members are recognized through staff of the month and staff drawings. Regular communication with staff occurs via PLC's, weekly newsletters, professional development sessions, and email. The leadership team, PBIS team, MTSS teams, threat assessment team, Community Involvement Team, grade level teams, and ESE department meet regularly to support our school programs. Padgett will be implementing a new teacher ambassador program this year.

Padgett families are an essential part of the educational program at Padgett. Families are encouraged to participate at Padgett through a back to school bash, orientation, back to school night, family involvement events, volunteering, student performances, special lunches, and SAC. Daily communication occurs between parents and teachers through use of the agenda. Face to face or phone conferences occur as needed. Some teachers communicate via online platforms such as DOJO, Microsoft Teams, and Zoom. The school-wide newsletter is used to share important information with families every month. Parents are informed about what is happening at school by following the school Facebook page, school DOJO page and checking the school website.

Padgett staff have built a strong relationship with community partners. Area churches often collaborate with the school staff and provide needed items to families. Two churches in particular host school-affiliated events on their site and/or on the school site. Area businesses support our school through donations. Community members visit our campus and provide educational programs to students during Careers on Wheels and the Great American Teach In. Police and firefighters visit the campus and collaborate with our

leadership team to ensure school safety. Padgett is working to re-establish a partnership with Lake Gibson High school where high school students in the Education Academy visit Padgett weekly to work with students and teachers in the classrooms. Padgett will be hosting Americorp and Reading Pals this school year.

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

Joette Burse- instructional leadership, PLC's, MTSS

Shawn Livingston- PBIS implementation, REACH Rewards, Mentoring Coordination, PLC's, MTSS

Davina Burdick-family and community involvement, title 1 coordinator, PLC's, collaborative planning, MTSS, coaching, Facebook and Dojo Management

Keli Griffin-volunteer coordinator, family and community involvement, PLC's, collaborative planning, coaching

Patrick Coughlin- student Recognition, students/staff/parent supports, threat assessments, MTSS, counseling

Sharilyn Peachee- staff recognition, staff appreciation, website management, technology assistance

Leah Howard- ESE services and supports

Meagan Cloud- interventions

Beth Ashmore- New Teacher Ambassador