

Polk County Public Schools

# Sandhill Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Sandhill Elementary School

1801 TYNER RD, Haines City, FL 33844

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Kathy Conely**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (41%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (47%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Sandhill Elementary School

1801 TYNER RD, Haines City, FL 33844

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">84%</p>

## School Grades History

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

Sandhill Elementary - a family of teachers and students learning in an encouraging environment where high expectations result in productive citizens.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Sandhill Elementary staff will create a safe community of collaborative leaders where students persevere through a productive struggle while engaging in rigorous tasks to meet learning goals.

CRANES believe that ....

Caring about the learning environment is important so we can grow as a community of learners.

Respect of self and others is important.

ALL students can be leaders in a positive way.

Nurturing staff and families lead to successful students.

Every student can and will learn in an encouraging environment.

Safety is important for success.

### 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
Conely, Kathy	Principal	
Renesca, Lindsay	Assistant Principal	
Glasgow, Jennifer	Reading Coach	
Pelletier, Matthew	Math Coach	
Glasgow, Jeff	Instructional Technology	
Lewis, Sarah	School Counselor	
Santos, Antonio	Dean	
Chapman, Jaxon	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Singleton, Tiffany	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Lloyd, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Saturday 7/1/2017, Kathy Conely

**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.*

0

**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.*

4

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

46

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

986

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

14

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

14

**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	0	131	166	172	157	171	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	797
Attendance below 90 percent	0	58	81	81	66	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	353
One or more suspensions	0	2	9	7	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
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	0	62	108	67	32	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	301

**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	20	36	34	63	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	232

**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	0	5	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
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	0	147	153	150	161	192	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	803
Attendance below 90 percent	0	50	41	47	59	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	274
One or more suspensions	0	6	10	9	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
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	38	77	50	66	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	315

**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	23	34	27	39	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213

**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	0	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

**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	147	153	150	161	192	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	803
Attendance below 90 percent	0	50	41	47	59	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	274
One or more suspensions	0	6	10	9	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
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	38	77	50	66	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	315

**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	23	34	27	39	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213

**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	0	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

**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%				42%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	47%						44%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						50%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	33%	42%	50%				45%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	56%						40%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						45%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	32%	49%	59%				36%	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	52%	52%	0%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	30%	48%	-18%	58%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2022					
	2019	36%	47%	-11%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	53%	56%	-3%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	38%	56%	-18%	64%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	51%	-17%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

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	15	24	19	20	28	19	15				
ELL	22	36	41	22	53	65	13				
BLK	33	42	24	31	52	32	26				
HSP	35	42	40	32	56	53	31				
WHT	48	71		36	59		44				
FRL	36	45	35	33	57	49	31				
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	14	8	9	14	13	10	8				
ELL	30	29	20	17	11	26	16				
BLK	33	26		16	9		19				
HSP	39	30	19	17	11	21	23				
WHT	49	24		46	25		38				
FRL	38	27	16	19	12	21	19				
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	9	40	45	21	47	50	5				
ELL	28	34	52	35	43	50	13				
BLK	38	56	56	38	29	50	42				
HSP	41	41	50	43	42	46	32				
MUL	45			45							
WHT	45	45	45	54	41	43	41				
FRL	39	41	44	43	42	43	31				

**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	45
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	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	359
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
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
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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	52
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	45
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?**

Reading - SWD have decreased from 18% to 15% on STAR. ELL student increased from 26% in the fall to 32% in the spring (6% increase). Overall, Reading STAR scores were projected on average to be at 39%. 3rd and 4th grade class averages were at 45% and 44%. 5th grade scores decreased by 1%. The ESSA subgroup of ELL increased from 30% to 40%. It is still an area of concern, but we are making progress.

Math - SWD have decreased from 18% to 16% on STAR. ELL students decreased from 34% to 30% in the spring. In the winter, ELL students increased to 36%. Overall Math STAR scores increased from 22% to 39% (17% increase). 3rd grade increased from 14% to 40%, 4th grade increased from 28% to 28% to 40% and 5th grade increased from 17% to 36%.

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

According to progress monitoring data, the areas of greatest need are SWD for both Math and Reading and 5th grade students in ELA. In addition, black students have now been identified as an ESSA subgroup with 34% achievement.

**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 are a lack of instruction over the past two years due to online learning due to Covid. 4th and 5th grade students were not retained in 3rd grade which means they lack some basic reading foundational skills. In addition to these, teacher attendance has gone down. We also have a lack of collaboration between teachers during planning and inconsistent implementation of differentiation of instruction. Because of this, we have a lack of knowledge of small group instructional strategies.

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

1st grade grade Early Literacy increased 4%. Kindergarten STAR Early Literacy increased 28%. 2nd grade STAR Early Literacy increased by 17%. More 2nd grade students moved into STAR Reading than the previous year. ELL students increased from 26% to 32% in Star Reading from Fall to Spring.

Based on the 2022 state assessments, our students in the lowest 25% in both reading and math made progress in both 4th and 5th grade.

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

The Leadership Team held teachers accountable for quality instruction in the fall. Utilizing Leveled Literacy Intervention materials and instruction to target the bottom 25%. Teachers in K-2 have more teaching experience than teachers in grades 3-5. ESOL Teacher focused on NES students with small group language acquisition instruction on foundational skills. Students in the lowest 25% made progress due to targeted instruction on the skills needed in both reading and math.

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

Consistent standards and benchmark based instruction needs to occur in all classrooms. Data driven instruction with timely interventions and acceleration will be key to making sure all students achieve. Teachers will be observed more often and provided with feedback for improvement.

**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.**

PD on Reading foundational skills, strategies for teaching high achieving students, planning for quality instruction (Learning Arc), BEST standards for Reading and Math, Data Analysis, MTSS, Leveled Literacy Interventions and Response to Data (targeted interventions).

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

The following strategies will continue in years to come to sustain progress: observation and feedback with coaching sessions, analyzing student learning, Power Hour, New Teacher PD (monthly), continued focus on data driven instruction, LLI, collaborative planning

**Areas of Focus**

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

:

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

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** We will have new standards/benchmarks for teachers in grades 3-5. We need to refocus on the basics of instruction including focusing on the standards. We have 22 teachers who are within their first 3 years of teaching. 46% of the students attended school less than 90% of the time and therefore had excessive absences during the past 3 years due to Covid and other circumstances. These students have gaps because of missing core instruction.  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

**Measurable Outcome:** ELA - % of students scoring level 3 and above 2021 = 39%  
 ELA - % of students scoring level 3 and above 2022 = 37%  
 ELA - goal for % of students scoring level 3 and above 2023 = 45%  
**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** Math - % of students scoring level 3 and above 2021 = 22%  
 Math - % of students scoring level 3 and above 2022 = 33%  
 Math - goal for % of students scoring level 3 and above 2023 = 45%

**Monitoring:** Each teacher will be observed weekly by a member of the leadership team. After the observation, the teacher will receive coaching using the "say it, see it, do it" model. In addition, formative assessment data will be reviewed bi-weekly by the teacher and administration. Instruction will be adjusted accordingly. Teachers will also analyze student learning as a part of their regular planning routine.  
**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kathy Conely (kathy.conely@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Knowledge and understanding of the standards and instructional strategies for teaching the standards.  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Last year, we had new state standards for grades K-2. This year, we will have new state standards for teachers in grades 3-5. Professional development and discussions need to occur that will be centered around the standards. Teachers will need instructional strategies to meet the needs of all students.  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

Teacher knowledge of the Florida BEST standards/benchmarks in both reading and math will be assessed using a teacher survey and pre-assessment.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Glasgow (jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net)



Professional Development will be held on a variety of topics including BEST standards, Science of Reading, Routines for Instruction, Effective Instructional Strategies, AR, Assessment, Data Driven Instruction, etc.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Glasgow (jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net)

The Learning Arc will be utilized during instructional planning to ensure that all teachers understand the benchmarks are able to break the benchmarks into objectives and determine effective instructional strategies to meet those objectives.

**Person Responsible** Kathy Conely (kathy.conely@polk-fl.net)

All teachers will be observed weekly by a member of the leadership team and will be provided feedback on standards based instruction, target task alignment, and instructional strategies using the “say it, see it do it” framework.

**Person Responsible** Kathy Conely (kathy.conely@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will be provided three full day planning times with a substitute covering their classroom in order to plan curriculum. This time will be used to implement the Learning Arc, analyze data and plan instruction to meet the needs of students.

**Person Responsible** Kathy Conely (kathy.conely@polk-fl.net)

**#2. 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.** Once we focus on core instruction, we will need to fill in the gaps. Many students have skill gaps because of lack of instruction due to Covid and excessive absences. Targeted instruction based on area of need will fill in these gaps.

ELA - % of students scoring level 3 and above 2021 = 39%  
 ELA - % of students scoring level 3 and above 2022 = 37%  
 ELA - goal for % of students scoring level 3 and above 2023 = 45%

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

Math - % of students scoring level 3 and above 2021 = 22%  
 Math - % of students scoring level 3 and above 2022 = 33%  
 Math - goal for % of students scoring level 3 and above 2023 = 45%

ELA - % of students making a learning gain 2021 = 28%  
 ELA - % of students making a learning gain 2022 = 47%  
 ELA - goal for % of students making progress from fall to spring progress monitoring 2023 = 55%

Math - % of students making a learning gain 2021 = 13%  
 Math - % of students making a learning gain 2022 = 56%  
 Math - goal for % of students making progress from fall to spring progress monitoring 2023 = 55%

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

Each teacher will be observed weekly by a member of the leadership team After the observation, the teacher will receive coaching using the "see it, say it, do it" model. In addition, formative assessment data will be reviewed bi-weekly by the teacher. Instruction will be adjusted accordingly. Teachers will also analyze student learning as a part of their regular planning routine.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kathy Conely (kathy.conely@polk-fl.net)

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

Teachers will analyze data to determine specific student needs and differentiate instruction based on those targeted needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:  
Explain the rationale for selecting this**

Teachers need to know where they are going (BEST standards) and where they are starting (assessments) before they can begin teaching. Acadience Reading (formerly DIBELS) will provide information for teachers to determine a starting point for teachers on targeted skills. Teachers who are using Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) will also be giving running records to students to determine

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

student progress. These assessments will provide information on skills for teachers to target for instruction.

**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.

Teachers will assess students using Acadience Reading assessment (formerly DIBELS), running records from Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) and Renaissance STAR for both Reading and Math.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Glasgow (jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will be provide professional learning on how to analyze data using the assessments given. During this professional learning, teachers will identify students who need targeted interventions and acceleration and their specific areas of need.

**Person Responsible** Kathy Conely (kathy.conely@polk-fl.net)

Professional Development will be held on a variety of topics related to intervention, remediation and acceleration including but not limited to LLI, Power Hour, MTSS, Intervention Strategies for ELL and ESE students and strategies for students who are accelerating.

**Person Responsible** Kathy Conely (kathy.conely@polk-fl.net)

Identified students will receive intensive reading instruction for 30 minutes daily from two Reading Interventionist Teachers and two Reading Interventionist para professionals. This instruction will be provided on the student's instructional reading level. Formative assessments will be given once per week to determine student progress. Adjustments to curriculum will be made accordingly.

**Person Responsible** Sally Chapman (sally.chapman01@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will be observed weekly by a member of the leadership team and provided feedback on target task alignment as it relates to intervention, remediation and acceleration.

**Person Responsible** Kathy Conely (kathy.conely@polk-fl.net)

Data will be analyzed by leadership to determine specific targeted interventions needed for reading and math (RTD or response the data). These targeted interventions will be provided by the Reading and Math Interventionists. Formative assessments will be given and instruction will be adjusted throughout.

**Person Responsible** Lindsay Renesca (lindsay.renesca@polk-fl.net)

Power Hour - One hour each day will be used for targeted skill instruction. Students will be homogeneously grouped according to data analysis. Students will receive direct instruction in small from the teacher for at least 30 minutes every other day targeting the needed skills. When not working with the teacher, students will be engaged in activities that reinforce learned skills.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

Students in grades 2-5 will be provided the opportunity for extended learning after school in the area of Reading based on the students' individual needs. Extended learning will be offered according to Reading level.

**Person Responsible** Lindsay Renesca (lindsay.renesca@polk-fl.net)

MTSS – Specific procedures will be outlined for each teacher including use of assessments, data tracking and interventions. Professional development on these procedures will be provided both individually and whole group.

**Person Responsible** Sarah Lewis (sarah.lewis@polk-fl.net)

**#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

**Monitoring:**

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

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

**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.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**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**

% of students in K-2 based on end of year screening and progress monitoring who are not on track to score a level 3 or above on statewide ELA assessment = Kindergarten - 48%, First grade - 54%, Second grade - 57%

Scores for students in K-2 are decreasing rather than increasing. Students are lacking foundational skills such as phonemic awareness, phonics and fluency. Teachers need more strategies for teaching these foundational skills and need to be scaffolding instruction. Consistent routines should be incorporated into the daily teaching schedules.

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

% of students below level 3 on 2022 statewide assessment in grades 3-5 = Third grade - 61%, Fourth grade - 61%, Fifth grade - 67%.

% of students in grades 3-5 on end of year screening and progress monitoring who are not on track to score a level 3 or above on statewide ELA assessment = Third grade - 55%, Fourth grade - 66%, Fifth grade - 70%

Scores for students in 3-5 are decreasing rather than increasing. This is due to lack of foundational skills and lack of teacher knowledge of teaching those foundational skills. Student data should be analyzed and targeted skills identified in order for students to receive targeted instruction on needed skills.

**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)**

Kindergarten - (currently at 48% not on track, 52% are on track) Goal = 60% will be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment  
First grade - (currently at 54% not on track, 46% are on track) Goal = 60% will be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment  
Second grade - (currently at 57% not on track, 43% are on track) Goal = 60% will be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Third grade - (currently at 61% not on track, 39% on track) Goal = 45% will be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment  
Fourth grade - (currently 61% not on track, 39% on track) Goal = 45% will be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment  
Fifth grade - (currently 67% not on track, 33% on track) Goal = 45% will be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

**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.

Summative Assessments - Students will be given the STAR (grades 2-5) and/or STAR Early Literacy (grades PreK-1) at the beginning, middle and end of the year. These assessments will guide instruction by providing specific benchmarks for further instruction and small group intervention. Students (grades 3-5) will also be given the Write Score assessment 3 times per year, in addition to the FAST assessment 3 times per year (beginning, middle and end of year).

For formative assessments, students will be given a variety of assessments to determine individual progress. Students who are receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will be assessed using Acadience Reading assessments such as the Maze and fluency assessments (depending on grade level). Students who are receiving LLI interventions will be assessed weekly using running records. LLI intervention materials will be adjusted according to results of the running records.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Conely, Kathy, kathy.conely@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?

Data Driven Instruction - Assessing students using Acadience Reading and Running Records, then utilizing the data to determine specific needs of students and using targeted instructional strategies in the area of ELA.

Write Score - Students in grades 3, 4, 5 will receive instruction using the strategies provided by Write Score. These strategies are based on data that is analyzed from the beginning and middle of the year assessments. Teachers will be provided with specific interventions and targeted lessons that emphasize skills that students need based on their assessments.

Corrective Reading - students in grades 3, 4, 5 will receive targeted instruction using the Corrective Reading Program which will target the skills that students lack. Corrective Reading will be direct instruction to fill in the gaps of phonics, word attack and fluency.

**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?

Acadience Reading Assessment is research based and recommended by FCRR. Running records are timely progress monitoring tools used for each individual student to determine if the student is making progress on his/her reading level. It covers phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Both of these assessments are used to target areas of reading difficulty and are used to guide specific instructional needs.

Write Score is also an evidenced based program that will address identified needs based on the the beginning of the year writing assessment.

Corrective Reading will target specific students who lack basic reading skills necessary to read text fluently in order to comprehend. Because this program provides direct instruction, the students will gain much needed skills that are lacking since the identified students are 2 years behind in reading. Students are assessed and entered at the level that fits their individual needs.

**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
<p>Assessment - Teachers will use Acadience Reading to assess students every other week to determine student needs in the area of Reading. Student progress will be graphed. Teachers will also use Running Records for students who are in the Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) Program to determine instructional needs and progress. 3, 4, and 5 grade students will also be assessed using Write Score (3 times per year), Corrective Reading (ongoing), STAR and FAST (3 times per year).</p>	<p>Lewis, Sarah, sarah.lewis@polk-fl.net</p>
<p>Power Hour - One hour each day will be used for targeted skill instruction. Students will be homogeneously grouped according to data analysis. Students will receive direct instruction in small groups from the teacher for at least 30 minutes every other day targeting the needed skills. When not working with the teacher, students will be engaged in activities that reinforce learned skills.</p>	<p>Glasgow, Jennifer, jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net</p>
<p>BEST Standards Professional Learning – All teachers will be engaged in professional learning centered around the BEST standards – making sure assessments are an accurate measure of the benchmarks. Teachers will also be involved in planning using the BEST standards through the use of the Learning Arc.</p>	<p>Conely, Kathy, kathy.conely@polk-fl.net</p>
<p>Instructional Strategies – Professional Learning will be held to ensure that all teachers utilize effective instructional strategies such as: Teaching strategies using Teach Like a Champion, FCRR Reading instructional strategies, Florida Inclusion Network, Guided Reading, The Science of Reading, Write Score, Corrective Reading, etc.</p>	<p>Renescia, Lindsay, lindsay.renescia@polk-fl.net</p>
<p>Literacy Leadership - A Literacy Leadership Team will collaborate to plan, develop, create, and sustain literacy initiatives within the school. They will conduct needs assessments and guide further strategies necessary in the area of Literacy. They will oversee the implementation and fidelity of the Accelerated Reader (AR) program at the school. They will analyze data to ensure that all student needs are being met through the intervention programs implemented at the school (LLI, Write Score, Corrective Reading).</p>	<p>Glasgow, Jennifer, jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net</p>
<p>Literacy Coaching - The Literacy Coach will model, observe, coach, provide feedback and provide professional learning in the area of literacy. She will also provide resources for teachers as needed. These teacher interventions will be provided according to teacher need - some whole group, some small group and some individual.</p>	
<p>Corrective Reading - targeted students (level 1s and 2s) in grades 3, 4 and 5 will receive direct instruction using Corrective Reading strategies during Power Hour. Students will be homogeneously grouped according to level and will receive intensive remediation in decoding skills, phonemic awareness skills, and fluency.</p>	<p>Glasgow, Jennifer, jennifer.glasgow@polk-fl.net</p>



## 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.

Staff - We will build a positive school culture with staff by implementing a variety of strategies during the 2022-2023 school year including staff recognition, birthday celebrations, new teacher support and mentoring, staff events, PTO monthly recognitions, individual teacher and para continuous feedback and conversations and a general positive atmosphere. We are creating a "relaxation room" for our staff for them to use for downtime throughout the day.

Parents - We will create a family friendly and welcoming environment in the school through the following strategies including revamping the front office to make it more inviting, communicating with families more often on the school website, agenda planners, communication folders, school messenger and class dojo, and use positive family friendly language in all communications.

Family events - We will have the following events during the school year: Open House, Reading Bingo Night, Math Carnival, Science Night, FSA Night, Multi-Cultural Night, Student Led Conference Night, Family Movie Night. Families will also be involved in One School, One Book family engagement activity to pull the school community together as learners.

Community - We will engage community stakeholders in our school through School Advisory Council, PTO and other events at the school. We will invite them to school events and recognize them on our school website and marquee.

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

Business partners are used throughout the year for donations to assist with staff appreciation. In return, we provide the business partners with reciprocal appreciation through social media and website recognition.

Parent volunteers will be used more during the 2022-2023 school year as volunteers in the classrooms. We will be training volunteers to help with reading with students and helping with math facts. This will be a "win win" for the staff and will create the community feeling for the families.

We will be training students this year in the Leadership Habits. Through this, our students will be taking on leadership roles throughout the school such as tour guides, student council, leading parent nights and assemblies, leading parent conferences, etc. As this becomes a part of our culture, students will be able to incorporate these leadership skills into their home lives, thus creating a home and school connection.

We will have a career day in February where we will bring in community businesses to talk with students and share their careers. Students will lead classes through the rotation of guest speakers.