# Alturas Elementary School



# 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Alturas Elementary School

420 4TH ST, Alturas, FL 33820

http://schools.polk-fl.net/alturaselementary

## Demographics

**Principal: Charles Pemberton, Jr**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2011

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: C (49%)<br><br>2018-19: B (56%)<br><br>2017-18: B (57%) |
| **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.](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

# Alturas Elementary School

## 420 4TH ST, Alturas, FL 33820

### http://schools.polk-fl.net/alturaselementary

## 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 | 46% |

## School Grades History

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

The mission of Alturas Elementary School is for all of our students to demonstrate academic achievement at or above the expected level of performance as defined by the Florida Department of Education.

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

Working collaboratively with the community to develop life long learners.

### 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 |
|------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| Pemberton Jr., Charles | Principal | |
| Drawdy, Julie | Reading Coach | Complete required action steps that include the reading coach to reach SIP goals |
| Reinacher, Shelley | Assistant Principal | Principal/Assistant Principal: The administration team leads the development of and monitors the implementation of the School Improvement Plan with fidelity. |
| Chance, Brian | Instructional Technology | Ensures and monitors that the school technology plan is implemented with fidelity. He ensures teachers have access to all technology resources. |
| Stinson, Terry | Instructional Media | Ensures and monitors that the school's reading focus is implemented with fidelity. This includes teacher access to books for instructional purposes, implementing the AR program, and access to books for students' instructional and independent levels. |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Monday 8/1/2011, Charles Pemberton, Jr

**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.*

6

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

23

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

320

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

3

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

2

**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 | 59 | 50 | 52 | 58 | 46 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 314 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 35 | 26 | 27 | 23 | 14 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 141 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Course failure in ELA | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 13 | 11 | 20 | 10 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |

**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 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 13 | 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 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| 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 7/25/2022

**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 | 44 | 50 | 62 | 51 | 64 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 330 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 12 | 23 | 29 | 9 | 24 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Course failure in ELA | 3 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 30 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |

**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 | 3 | 3 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |

**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 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 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 | 44 | 50 | 62 | 51 | 64 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 330 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 12 | 23 | 29 | 9 | 24 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Course failure in ELA | 3 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 30 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |

**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 | 3 | 3 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |

**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 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 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 | 45% | 47% | 56% | | | | 48% | 51% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 48% | | | | | | 47% | 51% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 35% | | | | | | 63% | 49% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 54% | 42% | 50% | | | | 64% | 57% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 64% | | | | | | 69% | 56% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 55% | | | | | | 52% | 47% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 39% | 49% | 59% | | | | 50% | 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 | 55% | 52% | 3% | 58% | -3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 48% | -1% | 58% | -11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -55% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 33% | 47% | -14% | 56% | -23% |
| 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 | 58% | 56% | 2% | 62% | -4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 56% | 6% | 64% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -58% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 51% | 12% | 60% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 45% | 4% | 53% | -4% |
| 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 | 25 | 33 | | 20 | 33 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 22 | 38 | | 32 | 43 | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | 60 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 37 | 50 | | 45 | 55 | | 31 | | | | |
| WHT | 51 | 47 | 30 | 58 | 71 | 70 | 45 | | | | |
| FRL | 40 | 47 | 44 | 50 | 66 | 61 | 26 | | | | |

| 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 | | | 19 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 50 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 55 | | 50 | 55 | | 50 | | | | |
| WHT | 52 | 41 | | 61 | 56 | 60 | 60 | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 44 | | 49 | 44 | | 57 | | | | |

| 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 | 43 | | | 36 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 12 | 35 | | 64 | 82 | | 27 | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | | | 63 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 29 | 38 | 64 | 67 | 78 | | 50 | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 53 | 64 | 61 | 63 | 40 | 47 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 46 | 65 | 68 | 71 | 56 | 48 | | | | |

## 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 | 48 |
| 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 | 43 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 383 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 28 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 36 |
| 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 | 60 |
| 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 | 44 |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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 | 49 |
| 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?**

Based on state assessment data and progress monitoring data, we are seeing a downward trend in 3rd grade ELA proficiency the past years.. We also saw a downward trend in 5th grade math from the past 3 years. Our students with disabilities and ESOL students continue to have low proficiency levels in both ELA and math.

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

The data components showing the greatest need for improvement is 5th grade ELA proficiency as well as proficiency levels for all our students with disabilities and ESOL students.

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

Building upon the adjustments we made to increase time in text and motivate students to read (last year's contributing factors), we need to continue this improvement by having students take a deeper dive into thinking strategies while reading. This would include independent reading time along with individual student conferences.

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

Based on state assessment data, we increased proficiency in grade 4 ELA and math.

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

The contributing factor was having a highly effective teacher in ELA and math. We focused on rigorous planning and engaging instructions.

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

To accelerate learning, we need to continue our ELA structure in providing more time for students to engage in reading text. This includes increasing fidelity in whole group mini lessons, independent reading time, individual student conferences base on what they are reading, small group instruction, and reading/writing journals. Mini lessons would continue to be challenging instruction on thinking strategies and skills, in depth discussions about grade level or higher text, and writing about text. In addition, our K-2 teachers will continue to provide daily systematic phonemic awareness instruction as it facilitates growth in printed word recognition and predicts later outcomes in reading and spelling.

**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.**

We will continue to provide professional development on the Daily 5 structure and Heggerty Phonemic Awareness to support teachers including the teachers who work directly with our students with disabilities and ESOL students. We will also provide professional development on the Learning Arc to deepen the understanding of standards.

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

Our reading coach will continue to provide support through modeling, planning, and the coaching cycle.

**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 ELA** |
|---|

| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | The focus is student motivation and achievement in K-5 ELA. We observed school-wide a lack of motivation and desire to read. Teachers have been focused more on students completing tasks instead of actual time reading text and having in depth discussions about their reading. We want to continue to implement an ELA framework/structure focused on independent reading with deeper discussions and writing about text. This will include the Learning Arc process to provide alignment of benchmarks with tasks and assessments. |
|---|---|
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | A 3-5% increase in ELA proficiency, learning gains, and bottom 25% including students with disabilities and ESOL students (ESSA). |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | The area of focus will be monitored by administration and our reading coach. We will provide training and support as we continue the implementation process. When doing classroom walkthroughs, the standards based walkthrough tool will help with monitoring instruction and alignment of tasks. Feedback will be given to support teachers. Our Reading Coach will also provide modeling when needed. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Charles Pemberton Jr. (charles.pembertonjr@polk-fl.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | We will continue with the implementation of the Daily 5 framework/structure and incorporate The Comprehension Toolkit (thinking strategies while reading). |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | The Comprehension Toolkit provides strategies that work to help students understand, respond to, learn from nonfiction text, and build background knowledge across the curriculum. The toolkit offers robust instruction to encourage students to think and respond while reading. |

**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.

The first few weeks of school, the leadership team will revisit the Daily 5 framework/structure with teachers during the pre-planning week. This will include reviewing strategies that help student build stamina during independent reading and the responsibilities of the teachers during conferencing/small groups.

**Person Responsible**  Shelley Reinacher (shelley.reinacher@polk-fl.net)

In beginning to implement The Comprehension Toolkit, the reading coach will plan, model, debrief, and then support the teachers as they implement the modeled in their classrooms.

**Person Responsible**  Julie Drawdy (julie.drawdy@polk-fl.net)

Administration and the Reading Coach will meet monthly with teachers to monitor progress of The Comprehension Toolkit lessons by analyzing work samples, formative and summative assessments, data including STAR and district assessments, and classroom walkthroughs.

**Person Responsible**  Charles Pemberton Jr. (charles.pembertonjr@polk-fl.net)

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | We observed very low proficiency levels in phonemic awareness. This data was based on Star Early Literacy scores. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | A 3-5% increase in Star Early Literacy in phonemic awareness, including students with disabilities and ESOL students (ESSA). |
| **Monitoring:** **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | This area of focus will be monitored by administration and our reading coach. We will provide training and support during implementation. When doing classroom walkthroughs, feedback will be given to support teachers. Our Reading Coach will also provide modeling when needed. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Shelley Reinacher (shelley.reinacher@polk-fl.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | The Heggerty Phonemic Awareness curriculum will be used in all K-2 classrooms. This curriculum focuses on daily instruction in phonemic awareness. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | Studies have shown that phonemic awareness is a foundational skill, essential for learning to read. As students learn to identify sounds through oral and auditory activities, they become phonemically aware. Engaging in phonemic awareness instruction develops students' understanding of sounds, and that knowledge directly impacts their spelling and writing. |

### 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.

Review the Heggerty curriculum with teachers already familiar with the curriculum and provide training for new teachers not familiar with the curriculum.

| **Person Responsible** | Shelley Reinacher (shelley.reinacher@polk-fl.net) |
|---|---|

Administration and the Reading Coach will monitor the implementation and provide feedback to ensure the fidelity of the curriculum. Administration and the Reading Coach will meet with teachers throughout the school year to analyze the data.

| **Person Responsible** | Charles Pemberton Jr. (charles.pembertonjr@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**

In grades K-2, the focus will be on increasing proficiency in phonemic awareness and explicit phonics instruction.

In addition, school-wide focus will continue to be on student motivation and achievement in K-2 ELA. We observed school-wide a lack of motivation and desire to read. Teachers have been focused more on students completing tasks instead of actual time reading text and having in depth discussions about their reading. We want to continue to implement an ELA framework/structure focused on independent reading with deeper discussions and writing about text.

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

In grades 3-5, the focus will be increasing proficiency through comprehension strategies.

In addition, we will continue to focus on student motivation and achievement in 3-5 ELA. We observed school-wide a lack of motivation and desire to read. Teachers have been focused more on students completing tasks instead of actual time reading text and having in depth discussions about their reading. We want to continue to implement an ELA framework/structure focused on independent reading with deeper discussions and writing about text.

**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)

A 3-5% increase in Star Early Literacy in phonemic awareness, including students with disabilities and ESOL students (ESSA).

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

A 3-5% increase in ELA proficiency, learning gains, and bottom 25% including students with disabilities and ESOL students (ESSA).

**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.

K-5: These areas of focus will be monitored by administration and our reading coach. We will provide training and support during implementation. When doing classroom walkthroughs, feedback will be given to support teachers. Our Reading Coach will also provide modeling when needed.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Pemberton Jr., Charles, charles.pembertonjr@polk-fl.net

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

K-2 - We will continue to implement Heggerty daily phonemic awareness practice as well as explicitly teach the phonics lesson in Florida Wonders that align with the benchmarks.

3-5 - We will continue with the implementation of the Daily 5 framework/structure and incorporate The Comprehension Toolkit (thinking strategies while reading).

**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?

K-2 - Studies have shown that phonemic awareness is a foundational skill, essential for learning to read. As students learn to identify sounds through oral and auditory activities, they become phonemically aware. Engaging in phonemic awareness instruction develops students' understanding of sounds, and that knowledge directly impacts their spelling and writing.

3-5 - The Comprehension Toolkit provides strategies that work to help students understand, respond to, learn from nonfiction text, and build background knowledge across the curriculum. The toolkit offers robust instruction to encourage students to think and respond while reading.

**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 |
|---|---|
| The first few weeks of school, the leadership team will revisit the Daily 5 framework/structure(K-5), Heggerty phonemic awareness (K-2) and phonics (K-2). This will include reviewing strategies that help students build stamina during independent reading and the responsibilities of the teachers during conferencing and small groups. | Reinacher, Shelley, shelley.reinacher@polk-fl.net |
| In beginning to implement The Comprehension Toolkit (K-5), the reading coach will plan, model, debrief, and then support the teachers as they implement the modeled strategies in their classrooms. | Drawdy, Julie, julie.drawdy@polk-fl.net |
| Administration and the Reading Coach will meet monthly with teachers to monitor progress of The Comprehension Toolkit lessons by analyzing work samples, formative and summative assessments, data including STAR and district assessments, and classroom walkthroughs. | Pemberton Jr., Charles, charles.pembertonjr@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.

Alturas Elementary works to build a positive culture by communicating and providing training on the importance of positive relationships. We celebrate student achievement base on student ability throughout the school year. We create a school environment that is welcoming to students, parents, staff, and the community. Passion and love for our students is our priority as it transcends into motivation and achievement.

Alturas Elementary words to build positive relationships with families by offering a variety of school events including many academic nights. The mission of Alturas Elementary School is for all of our students to demonstrate academic achievement at or above the expected level of performance as defined by the Florida Department of Education. This is communicated through high expectations for students and staff, effective communication with families, and engaging students in rigorous lessons designed by highly effective teachers.

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

Alturas Elementary is continuing to promote a positive culture and environment by reaching out to various stakeholders within the area, even though we are in a remote area away from businesses. We are adding spirit nights to partner with area businesses as well as communicating and working with area churches to foster a partnership in helping our families. We have helped to develop a stronger PTO so parents and families know they are welcome at Alturas Elementary. We want parents to be involved in their child's learning and we want them to feel a part of the Alturas family. In addition, we have added social media outlets so that we are continually communicating with families and the community.