

Polk County Public Schools

North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice

410 ROBSON ST W, Lakeland, FL 33805

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

Demographics

Principal: Talley Miller

Start Date for this Principal: 1/26/2022

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 (43%) 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (53%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice

410 ROBSON ST W, Lakeland, FL 33805

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

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	77%

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.

North Lakeland Elementary - In partnership with families and the community, create a safe and engaging learning environment that provides our students with opportunities to prepare them for academic success, career readiness, life-long learning, citizenship, and global awareness.

Provide the school's vision statement.

North Lakeland Elementary—A learning community that prepares our students for success by meeting the individual needs of each and every student.

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
Miller, Talley	Principal	
Wiedenman, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Lawton, Kyle	Math Coach	
Anderson, Cassandra	Reading Coach	
Higgins, Megan	Behavior Specialist	
Wright, Caitlin	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 1/26/2022, Talley Miller

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

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

660

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

10

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	117	106	106	120	91	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	660
Attendance below 90 percent	66	41	50	43	34	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	281
One or more suspensions	9	9	15	12	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA	1	12	9	34	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Course failure in Math	1	8	5	14	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	47	3	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	46	3	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	26	26	38	29	41	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	217

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	26	26	38	29	41	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	217

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	4	8	44	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/19/2022

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	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	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	

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	37%	47%	56%				45%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						43%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						42%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	33%	42%	50%				51%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	51%						42%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						34%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	36%	49%	59%				40%	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	50%	52%	-2%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	37%	48%	-11%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					
	2019	40%	47%	-7%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

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	60%	56%	4%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	46%	56%	-10%	64%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					
	2019	43%	51%	-8%	60%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	34%	45%	-11%	53%	-19%
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	10	38	37	12	38	33	14				
ELL	26	46	30	28	40	33	22				
BLK	27	53		29	59	64	41				
HSP	35	54	38	29	46	40	29				
WHT	49	64		43	51		39				
FRL	32	56	46	27	50	50	30				
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	10	8	18	19	9	7				
ELL	27	38		27	50		36				
BLK	31	24	30	31	25	17	21				
HSP	30	30		31	45		41				
WHT	51	37		60	67		56				
FRL	28	25	33	29	40	27	31				

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	20	24	24	24	21	28	13				
ELL	45	37		47	37		33				
BLK	39	44	54	40	40	47	29				
HSP	45	42	33	49	40	14	42				
WHT	53	40		68	48		50				
FRL	39	42	41	46	42	34	34				

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	354
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	35
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	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
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	49
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	43
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?

Four out of five ESSA subgroups in our school fell below the 41% threshold during the 20-21 school year. Our ESE population continues to remain below the 41% threshold. We have had a consistent loss of proficiency in ELA and Math since the 2017-2018 school year.

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

Data components based off of progress monitoring for the 2021-22 school year demonstrate the greatest need for improvement include our African American subgroups and our Hispanic subgroups in reading and in math. Our African American subgroup had a reading proficiency of 38 in the fall and rose to 42 during the winter PM of STAR, and returned to 38 during the spring PM of STAR. In math our proficiency over the course of the three PM sessions declined. Our overall math proficiency was the only area of the 7 that we saw a decline from the projected 20-21 school year on the FSA. There was a 37% math proficiency and the 21-22 school year we had a 33% proficiency.

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 to this need for improvement include staff turnover at North Lakeland Elementary School. We had a change in math coaches at the start of the 21-22 school year. There was not consistent focus on data and small groups until mid-year.

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

Our Reading lowest 25% increased 27 points from 30 to 57 based off of the projected grade for the 2020-21 school year and our Math lowest 25% went up 16 points based off of our projected grade for the 2020-21 school year.

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

Contributing factors to improving our bottom 25% was the implementation of a focused remediation for our lowest 25%. Students were targeted and provided extra tutoring to assist in gaining the necessary skills to make a gain on the FSA. We were very focused and deliberate in initiating the tutoring.

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

Strategies that will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning include:

1. The implementation of the Learning Arc to ensure that appropriate grade level standards-based instruction is occurring with fidelity.
2. The use of SIPP, LLI, or Corrective Reading depending on grade level in order to ensure students are receiving the necessary remediation in Language Arts.
3. The implementation of Numbers World in order to ensure students are receiving remediation in Math.
4. The implementation of RTIB and revised PBIS program to support improving our school culture and climate.

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 and staff will participate in an initial Learning Arc Training that will be conducted by the Principal during Preplanning week. This will be an ongoing process that will be continual throughout the course of the school year.

Over the summer we conducted an RTIB (Response to Intervention for Behavior) and PBIS professional development to staff that wanted to participate. We will have a second opportunity to participate in this training during preplanning week. Staff will then be monitored and further 1 on 1 support will be provided to those who are in need.

Admin and coaches will be participating in Corrective Reading training, Selected teachers will be trained and Corrective Reading will be rolled out at the school level. The reading coach will provide training to all teachers teaching SIPP or LLI regardless of their experience with the program if it will be utilized in their classroom. There will then be 1 on 1 training and support provided by the school-based coach and senior coordinator of Instruction K-5 ELA for staff that are in need of further support.

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

We will be implementing Corrective Reading as an intervention for our struggling readers while continuing to use SIPP and LLI to support students. We will also be implementing the math intervention program, Numbers World, in order to support our students struggling with their math skills. We will be training our staff to utilize the Learning Arc to ensure that the proper task is being placed in front of our students to give them the best opportunity for success on their assessments.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus	Instructional practice specifically relating to standards-aligned instruction was identified as a critical need based off of our proficiency rate in math falling from a 61% proficiency rate during the 17-18 school year to 33% during the 21-22 school year. Our reading scores fell from 49% during the 17-18 school year to 37% during the 21-22 school year.
Description and Rationale:	
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Another contributing factor is the turnover of staff. During the 2019-20 and 20-21 school years, over 20 staff members left each year.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

State data will show a 7% increase in our reading data and 8% in our math data.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring toward our goals will be monitored using the District's Standardized Walkthrough Tool. We will use this data to ensure student mastery of the benchmarks and ensure that the task developed in common planning aligns with the intent of the standard.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

1. The District's Standardized Walkthrough Tool will be used to monitor instruction and instructional task to ensure students have access to and are engaged in an equitable and equivalent experience based off of the Florida BEST Standards.
2. Teachers will be trained on the Learning Arc. Once trained teachers, coaches and administration will utilize the Learning Arc to engaged in standards based planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The Opportunity Myth discusses the need to have all students have the opportunity to engaged in on grade level, meaningful work. It states that students need four things to be successful. These include consistent opportunity to work on grade appropriate assignments, strong instruction where students are doing most of the work, deep engagement, and high expectations. The Learning Arc and the District's Standardized Walk Through Tool will allow us to ensure this type of learning and engagement is taking place.

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.

Standardized Walkthrough Monitoring Tool- Create Calendar for leadership team members calibration walks.

Person Responsible Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

Standardized Walkthrough Monitoring Tool- Train leadership team on look-fors with the walk through tool.

Person Responsible Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

Standardized Walkthrough Monitoring Tool - Add Standardized WT data to leadership agenda for discussion.

Person Responsible Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

Standardized Walkthrough Monitoring Tool- Monitor the impact between the data review from SWT and planning per content/course/grade level.

Person Responsible Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

Collaborative planning with the Learning Arc Framework - Master Schedule needs created with collaborative planning.

Person Responsible Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

Collaborative planning with the Learning Arc Framework - Assign and train instructional coaches and AP

Person Responsible Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

Collaborative planning with the Learning Arc Framework - Meet and collaborate with instructional coaches to ensure fidelity of the Learning Arc practice.

Person Responsible Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

Collaborative planning with the Learning Arc Framework - Discuss outcomes of planning during leadership meeting

Person Responsible Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

Collaborative planning with the Learning Arc Framework - Conduct Learning Arc on a weekly basis starting with steps 1-3 then adding in next steps deliberately and with purpose.

Person Responsible Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

Collaborative planning with the Learning Arc Framework - Identify the correlation between the Standards Walkthrough tool data and the benchmarks planned through the Learning Arc.

Person Responsible Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Support

Area of Focus

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

During the 21-22 School Year there were 306 office referrals. 106 of those referrals resulted in an OSS. There were a total of 201 days of OSS issued. The total number of office referrals increased approximately 45% between the 20-21 school year and the 21-22 school year. 185 (60%) of the referrals generated from the total 309 were from classroom incidents. As a result we must provide stronger behavioral supports and refine our classroom management procedures. We will also continue to develop our social emotional learning through the use of designated morning meeting times and the Sanford Harmony curriculum.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

Decrease the number of referrals by at least 15%.

Monitoring:

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

Using informal and formal classroom walkthrough, data collected through the implementation of RTIB, and feedback from teachers and staff we will monitor for our desired outcome.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Wiedenman (jennifer.wiedenman@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-

based Strategy:

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

RTIB (Response to Intervention and Behavior)
Sanford Harmony (Social Emotional Skills Development)
Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports

Rationale for

Evidence-

based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific

RTIB is database that will allow us to analyze the system levels and individual issues at Tier 1, 2 and 3. We can then use this information in conjunction with our PBIS and our Sanford Harmony programming to assist in addressing behaviors that can lead to suspensions by creating a positive academic and social culture.

strategy.
Describe the
resources/
criteria used
for selecting
this strategy.

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.

Revise school-wide PBIS plan with PBIS team and other vested stakeholders.

Person Responsible Jennifer Wiedenman (jennifer.wiedenman@polk-fl.net)

Create a plan on how RTIB will be utilized in school-wide and classroom setting.

Person Responsible Jennifer Wiedenman (jennifer.wiedenman@polk-fl.net)

Provide a refresher training of PBIS and implementation training of RTIB at start of 22-23 school year.

Person Responsible Jennifer Wiedenman (jennifer.wiedenman@polk-fl.net)

Continue with monthly PBIS meetings that will be data driven.

Person Responsible Jennifer Wiedenman (jennifer.wiedenman@polk-fl.net)

Provide MTSS training and establish timeline for tracking student performance to evaluate if interventions are effective.

Person Responsible Jennifer Wiedenman (jennifer.wiedenman@polk-fl.net)

Provide staff training on how to properly implement the Sanford Harmony curriculum during established morning meeting times.

Person Responsible Jennifer Wiedenman (jennifer.wiedenman@polk-fl.net)

Monitor data and make adjustments as necessary.

Person Responsible Jennifer Wiedenman (jennifer.wiedenman@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

The implementation with fidelity and consistency of resources for remediation has been a need for our teachers. It is necessary for differentiation to occur in the classroom for student achievement to increase. We will utilize the program SIPP in order to increase students proficiency in grades K-2 using a systematic approach that focuses on phonological awareness, phonics, and sight words.

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

The implementation with fidelity and consistency of resources for remediation has been a need for our teachers. It is necessary for differentiation to occur in the classroom for student achievement to increase. We will utilize the programs, Corrective Reading, SIPP, and LLI in order to increase students proficiency in grades 3-5. This will allow for focused targeted interventions that will assist with decoding, phonemic awareness, and phonics instruction along with vocabulary and comprehension.

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)

Progress monitoring data will show cohort data achieve at least a 5% increase in proficiency from the 21-22 school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

State data will show an overall increase of at least 5% from the 21-22 school year.

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.

Through the use of consistent progress monitoring utilizing the district progress monitoring tool to assess students progress. We will also utilize the district standard walkthrough tool in order to ensure that the task that students are working on are properly aligned with the states intent of the standard.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Miller, Talley, talley.miller@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?

SIPPS is an evidence-based multi-level program that develops foundational skills through a structured literacy approach to instruction that enable students to become independent and confident readers and writers.

LLI is an intensive, small-group, supplementary literacy intervention for students who find reading and writing difficult. The goal of LLI is to lift the literacy achievement of students who are not achieving grade-level expectations in reading.

Corrective Reading was found to have potentially positive effects on alphabetic and fluency and no discernible effects on comprehension. Corrective Reading is designed to promote reading accuracy (decoding), fluency, and comprehension skills of students in grade 3 or higher who are reading below their grade level.

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?

We implemented SIPPS and LLI last school year and have had positive results from the implementation of the programs. Corrective Reading is a program being supported by our District in order to provide our students further opportunities of intentional interventions. All three programs are research based programs.

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
Identify students in need of targeted interventions.	Anderson, Cassandra, cassandra.anderson@polk-fl.net
Train Admin and coaches in Corrective Reading.	Miller, Talley, talley.miller@polk-fl.net
Have teachers utilizing Corrective Reading, SIPPS, and LLI properly trained to implement programs with fidelity.	Anderson, Cassandra, cassandra.anderson@polk-fl.net
Monitor data from students to ensure correct placement and that students are making necessary progress each month.	Anderson, Cassandra, cassandra.anderson@polk-fl.net
Provide 1:1 training to teachers in need to ensure programs are being delivered with fidelity.	Anderson, Cassandra, cassandra.anderson@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.

North Lakeland Elementary is continually working to build and improve our school culture and environment. This year we have redesigned our PBIS system in an effort to get more students involved in PBIS and allow for them to achieve more rewards throughout the course of the school year.

We also are striving to re-involve parents and the community in the school. We are welcoming volunteers back on campus this year after several years of this not occurring. We also use a multitude of different communications to reach families in order to bridge the gap between home and school. Some of the communications include phone calls, messages, e-mail, face to face conversations and social media.

In order to ensure all stakeholders have a clear understanding of their roles on campus we have implemented training for our paras on each early dismissal day. This will assist in defining their roles along with providing them skills that will assist in creating a more positive environment. Our SAC committee meets multiple times throughout the school year. We are working to grow our SAC committee by sending communications home about SAC and how to become involved. We are hopefully that with the return of volunteers to campus such as Reading Pals and AmeriCorps we can develop a strong SAC committee.

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

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

Teachers, through multiple forms of communication, build caring, supportive relationships with their students and their families.