

Polk County Public Schools

Southwest Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Southwest Elementary School

2650 SOUTHWEST AVE, Lakeland, FL 33803

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

Demographics

Principal: Julie Sloan

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2015

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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

Southwest Elementary School

2650 SOUTHWEST AVE, Lakeland, FL 33803

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

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	64%

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.

Southwest Elementary will nurture academic excellence and integrity by promoting a passion for learning in a safe environment while providing a high quality education for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Roping Success: Reaching Our Potential Everyday

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
sloan, julie	Principal	Monitor and facilitate common planning, observations with feedback. Analyze assignments and task alignment, monitor test and progress monitoring data. Data chats, Participate in MTSS meetings, PBS rewards, leadership team meetings and delegation, plan and provide professional development. Monitor, observe and provide feedback on small group instruction. Lead learning arc training and planning with teachers
Dobson, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Monitor and facilitate common planning, observations with feedback. Analyze assignments and task alignment, monitor test and progress monitoring data. Data chats, Participate in MTSS meetings, PBS rewards, leadership team meetings and delegation, plan and provide professional development. Monitor, observe and provide feedback on small group instruction. Lead Learning arc training and planning with teachers
Beardsley, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	Facilitates common planning, assist with aligning tasks to the standards, provides examples and coaching. Mentors new teachers. Models lessons, provides observations with non evaluative feedback. Monitors test and progress monitoring data. Member of Learning arc team, leadership team. Provides and plans professional development, participates in MTSS meetings, data chats, and PBS meetings. Plans and coordinates parental involvement activities.
Runnels, Lindsey	Instructional Coach	Facilitates common planning, assist with aligning tasks to the standards, provides examples and coaching. Mentors new teachers. Models lessons, provides observations with non evaluative feedback. Monitors test and progress monitoring data. Member of Learning arc team, leadership team. Provides and plans professional development, participates in MTSS meetings, data chats, and PBS meetings. Plans and coordinates parental involvement activities.
Leonard, Kelly	School Counselor	Facilitates schoolwide MTSS process, and coordinates new ESE referrals. Leads Mental health support team. Leads data chats and MTSS meetings. Conducts student observations for academic or behavioral needs. Member of leadership team and lead of PBS team.
Pickrell, Tauni	Teacher, ESE	LEA, manages the IEP and 504 status for students. Provides assistance to ESE teachers, parents and students. Monitors IEP review dates and helps to select appropriate accommodations for students. Member of leadership team and PBS team. Participates in MTSS meetings and PBS meetings.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/24/2015, Julie Sloan

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

22

Total number of students enrolled at the school

380

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

1

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

1

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	57	60	56	57	69	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	363
Attendance below 90 percent	22	13	18	11	19	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 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	21	26	29	23	11	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144

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	7	3	3	7	24	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	4	0	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	20	64	62	65	90	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	373
Attendance below 90 percent	21	23	11	20	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	3	2	2	2	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	3	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	2	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	50	64	62	65	90	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	403
Attendance below 90 percent	21	23	11	20	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	3	2	2	2	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	3	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	2	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	43%	47%	56%				51%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%						43%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						40%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	60%	42%	50%				66%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	66%						83%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						67%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	49%	59%				61%	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	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	38%	47%	-9%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

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	52%	56%	-4%	62%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	74%	56%	18%	64%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2022					
	2019	61%	51%	10%	60%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	53%	45%	8%	53%	0%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	18	48	64	44	52	45	20				
ELL	28	40		58	63						
BLK	26	52	62	30	50	46	40				
HSP	41	49		62	76		55				
WHT	48	56		71	67		80				
FRL	36	55	48	53	64	46	55				
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	23	28		26	53		20				
ELL	20	25		58	73						
BLK	13	6		23	69		23				
HSP	35	41		63	81		37				
WHT	48	54		60	54		56				
FRL	27	31	44	50	68	77	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	36	36	55	42	74		38				
ELL	50	37		67	70	50					
BLK	30	30		48	77		43				
HSP	48	38		72	82	50	73				
WHT	65	53	46	73	89	75	68				
FRL	41	38	39	56	78	65	57				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	456
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
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	44
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	60
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	64
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	53
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?

increase in learning gains and proficiency in ELA and Science
decrease in learning gains in math

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

Learning gains and learning gains for the bottom 25 in math

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

Stronger support for intentionally planning small group instruction using data sources

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

ElA learning gains

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

strong support in planning for intentional small groups, utilizing the resources available for student interventions

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

Continued use of data to drive small group instruction, utilizing the learning ARC in planning in order to align tasks to the benchmarks

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 professional development in utilizing data sources to plan instruction, continued PD on small group instruction, as well as continued PD and support in the learning arc.

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

Utilize Title 1 funds to provide additional planning time for teachers to work with the coaches to align tasks to the benchmarks.

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

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

Teachers will utilize data sources to collaboratively plan intentional differentiated lessons and tasks with literacy and math coaches for all content areas to meet the full intent of the BEST standards by addressing student learning needs. Students will be identified for differentiated instruction based on STAR scores, SIPPS data, Reflex, FAST, and formative data.

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

By May 2023, when teachers intentionally plan differentiated instruction based on data sources in our area of focus and release learning to students, then student achievement will increase as follows:
ELA proficiency: by 3% ELA Learning gains: by 3% ELA Learning Gains Bottom 25: by 3%
Math proficiency: by 2% Math Learning Gains: by 2% Math Learning Gains Bottom 25: 2%

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

Leadership team will monitor weekly progress monitoring data with teachers. Teachers will track daily/weekly formative data and send leadership team prior to collaborative planning sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Teachers track formative data to be analyzed during collaborative planning with leadership team to plan for classroom differentiation. Teachers will attend monthly data chats for progress monitoring of MTSS and interventions provided.

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

Maximize learning retention strategies and increase student proficiency on state defined measurement tools.

Stiggins and DuFour (2009) state that teachers and schools should use formative assessments to clarify what students are supposed to be learning, improve the instructional practices of individual teachers, and allow for reteaching of concepts to reach struggling students.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Create a master schedule that is conducive to collaborative planning

Person Responsible julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)

Teachers submit formative data sent electronically to leadership team to assist in planning differentiation instruction

Person Responsible Jessica Dobson (jessica.dobson@polk-fl.net)

Monthly progress monitoring to include all available data points in order to assess the effectiveness of interventions provided.

Person Responsible Kelly Leonard (kelly.leonard@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.

The 2022-2023 school year is the first year that the B.E.S.T. standards will be utilized school-wide in ELA and Mathematics. Because the standards have changed, it is necessary to do a deep dive in order to ensure that students are being exposed to the full intent of the standards and given an equivalent experience.

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

By the end of 1st quarter, tasks and assessments will be on grade level and standards-aligned in at least 8 out of 10 classrooms.
 By the end of 2nd quarter, tasks and assessments will be on grade level and standards-aligned in at least 9 out of 10 classrooms.
 By the end of 3rd quarter, tasks and assessments will be on grade level and standards-aligned in at least 10 out of 10 classrooms.

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

The leadership team will do learning walks using the standards-based walkthrough tool monthly.
 Administrators will do learning walks using the standards-based walkthrough tool weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)

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

We will be utilizing The Learning Arc Construction Framework. This is a seven step process in which teachers will select a benchmark, delineate the "do what", "to what", and "by what", establish standards-aligned objectives that are grouped accordingly, identify tasks that are aligned with the objectives, and identify assessments what are aligned with the objectives.

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 New Teacher Project, when students have "greater access to the four resources (grade-appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and teachers who hold high expectations) it can and does improve student achievement--particularly for students who start the school year behind."

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.

Leadership Team training for The Learning Arc Framework

Person Responsible julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)

Teacher training for The Learning Arc Framework

Person Responsible Jessica Dobson (jessica.dobson@polk-fl.net)

Support teachers/grade levels, in a tiered approach, to plan using The Learning Arc Framework in ELA.

Person Responsible Tiffany Beardsley (tiffany.beardsley@polk-fl.net)

Support teachers/grade levels, in a tiered approach, to plan using The Learning Arc Framework in Math.

Person Responsible Lindsey Runnels (lindsey.runnels@polk-fl.net)

Administration use the standards-based walkthrough tool weekly and provide teachers with feedback based on data collected.

Person Responsible julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)

Leadership team use the standards-based walkthrough tool monthly and determine support plans for teachers based on data collected.

Person Responsible julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)

Provide teachers/grade levels with extended (full day) planning with a focus on The Learning Arc.

Person Responsible Jessica Dobson (jessica.dobson@polk-fl.net)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

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

When reviewing data from Early Warning Systems, we recognized a concern with absences. We noticed that 103 students had an attendance rate of 90-94%, and 92 students had an attendance rate of 89% or below. this means that almost half of our students are at risk due to absences.

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

By the end of the first semester, decrease the number of students with <89% attendance rates by 10%. By the end of the first semester decrease the number of students with 90-94% attendance rates by 12%. By the end of the school year, decrease the number of students with <89% attendance rates by 15%. By the end of the school year, decrease the number of students with 90-94% attendance rates by 15%

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

Attendance data in Focus and Early Warning systems will be tracked twice a month by leadership team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Closely monitoring student attendance rates increases days that students are present, leading to greater academic success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students attendance rates directly correlate with academic progress. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, Students who attend school regularly have been shown to achieve at higher levels than students who do not have regular attendance. This relationship between attendance and achievement may appear early in a child's school career (2009).

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.

Monitor attendance data twice a month

Person Responsible julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)

Send attendance letters home at 5 and 10 days

Person Responsible Jessica Dobson (jessica.dobson@polk-fl.net)

schedule parent meetings when students reach 10 days, contact social worker

Person Responsible Kelly Leonard (kelly.leonard@polk-fl.net)

schedule home visits with social worker at 15 absences

Person Responsible Kelly Leonard (kelly.leonard@polk-fl.net)

Plan celebrations recognizing students with good attendance rates throughout the school year

Person Responsible julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)

Secure business partners to provide student incentives for high attendance rates

Person Responsible Jessica Dobson (jessica.dobson@polk-fl.net)

lunch groups with students with attendance issues

Person Responsible Jessica Dobson (jessica.dobson@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

Teachers will intentionally use multiple exposures to grade level texts with students in order to increase reading proficiency.

- 2021-2022 FSA data: ELA 3-5 not proficient
- Fall 2022 ELA STAR Progress Monitoring K-3: not proficient

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

Teachers will intentionally use multiple exposures to grade level texts with students in order to increase reading proficiency.

- 2021-2022 FSA data: ELA 3-5 not proficient
- Fall 2022 ELA STAR Progress Monitoring K-3: not proficient

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 May 2023 when teachers intentionally use multiple exposures to grade level texts with students in order to increase proficiency, then student achievement will increase as follows:

- ELA proficiency will increase 5%
- ELA learning gains will increase by 5%
- ELA learning gains for bottom 25% will increase by 5%

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By May 2023 when teachers intentionally use multiple exposures to grade level texts with students in order to increase proficiency, then student achievement will increase as follows:

- ELA proficiency will increase 5%
- ELA learning gains will increase by 5%
- ELA learning gains for bottom 25% 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.

Leadership team will monitor monthly progress monitoring data with teachers during data chats. Administration will conduct walkthrough observations and share feedback with teachers based on instructional practice supporting our area of focus. Administration and literacy coach will monitor Accelerated Reader reports, Florida Wonders unit assessments, and other student work samples.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

sloan, julie, julie.sloan@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?

Teachers will meet with the literacy coach and collaboratively plan exposure to on grade level ELA content. Teachers will monitor Accelerated Reader reports, Florida Wonders weekly and unit assessments, STAR reports, and other district provided assessment. Literacy coach teachers will monitor results and make changes as necessary.

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?

yes

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
Make use of literacy coach in providing evidence-based resources. Make use of literacy coach with modeling lessons in the classroom. Teachers will participate in planning with literacy coach as well as be provided two curriculum planning days throughout the school year.	Dobson, Jessica, jessica.dobson@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.

Southwest Elementary promotes a positive environment for all stakeholders. The staff diligently focuses on improving student academic achievement with the support of a campus wide family atmosphere. Parents feel welcomed into our Southwest family as we strive to build strong family and school partnerships. Students are the ultimate recipients of the positive environment Southwest offers. We believe every child can learn and we work together to ensure student learning is engaging, meaningful, and successful. Southwest Elementary positively impacts all who enter.

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

Southwest Elementary staff strives to promote a positive and inclusive environment for all staff, students, parents, and community members. Students are lead to support one another, and become independent life long learners. Parents are charged with becoming educated in their child's academic journey and encouraged to stay involved in school activities.