

Polk County Public Schools

Lake Alfred Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Lake Alfred Elementary School

550 CUMMINGS ST E, Lake Alfred, FL 33850

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

Demographics

Principal: Matt Burkett

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lake Alfred Elementary School

550 CUMMINGS ST E, Lake Alfred, FL 33850

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

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	78%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The staff at Lake Alfred Elementary is dedicated to helping all students reach their full potential and achieve excellence while preparing them to be college and career ready,

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision:

Lake Alfred Elementary will provide highly effective instruction using best practices to increase student achievement.

Motto: "Learners Achieving Excellence" (LAE)

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
Burkett, Matt	Principal	Facilitate and monitor all aspects of the school and ensure all expectations, goals, and visions are implemented with fidelity.
Wilson, Faye	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal with facilitating and monitoring all aspects of the school and ensure all goals are implemented with fidelity.
Crowley, Jennifer	Dean	Ensure the campus is safe, they behavior expectations are followed, and assist administration in all school-wide expectations.
Snapko, Rachel	Math Coach	Provide coaching to teachers, assist with lesson planning, professional development, and assisting with struggling students.
Hadsock, Jennifer	Reading Coach	Provide coaching to teachers, assist with lesson planning, professional development, and assisting with struggling students.
Nutter, Remy	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Small group instruction for retained 3rd graders, 4th and 5th graders to increase proficiency

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/30/2012, Matt Burkett

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

780

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.

13

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	120	116	104	122	117	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	49	44	29	38	28	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	235
One or more suspensions	1	5	10	2	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
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	38	54	65	33	36	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	250

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	12	19	23	16	42	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174

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	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/21/2022

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	106	101	94	114	123	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	657
Attendance below 90 percent	28	25	19	25	33	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	0	4	9	13	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Course failure in ELA	0	3	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	37	11	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	21	43	41	48	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	198

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	4	4	18	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	106	101	94	114	123	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	657
Attendance below 90 percent	28	25	19	25	33	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	0	4	9	13	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Course failure in ELA	0	3	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	37	11	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	21	43	41	48	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	198

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	4	4	18	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	47%	47%	56%				46%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	58%						52%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%						46%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	54%	42%	50%				60%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	71%						64%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%						58%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	49%	59%				54%	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	37%	52%	-15%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	48%	1%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2022					
	2019	42%	47%	-5%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

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	55%	56%	-1%	62%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	56%	56%	0%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					
	2019	59%	51%	8%	60%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	18	34	25	21	42	45	17				
ELL	43	55	40	48	71	68	38				
BLK	35	52	38	37	58	63	22				
HSP	48	60	46	56	76	68	43				
MUL	64			55							
WHT	56	57		64	75		51				
FRL	39	57	47	47	65	64	32				
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	10	31	36	13	12	9	7				
ELL	42	29		40	27		40				
BLK	33	45		33	33		35				
HSP	43	32		46	34		45				
MUL	40			50							
WHT	51	62	55	52	33		56				
FRL	39	38	35	39	28	33	39				
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	18	25	18	29	31						
ELL	36	45	22	56	69	65	26				
BLK	37	42	50	54	62	58	50				
HSP	43	46	28	58	66	60	35				
WHT	61	69	62	69	63		71				
FRL	39	50	50	53	60	55	44				

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	444
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
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	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	61
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	51
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?

Though students had continued to make improvements in reading and math, many are still performing below proficiency in both ELA and Math content areas.

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

Though learning gains in ELA grew by 12% on state assessments last year, the lowest 25% did not achieve growth therefore this will be an area where improvement is necessary. Math achievement grew by 9 % but in comparison to prior years is still below the our goal.

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

On going contributing factors included lack of attendance and the need for more intense small group intervention. In order to improve in this area the school will need to refocus on small group instruction and planning paying specific attention to necessary foundation strands in ELA in order to close achievement gaps and increase reading proficiency for those performing in the lowest quartile. In order to increase math proficiency, students need to be given opportunities for productive struggle and authentic engagement while working on grade-level standards.

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

Based on our progress monitoring data and statewide assessments our most improved area occurred in learning gains and lowest quartile for math content with a growth of over 30% in each area.

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

Contributing factors included small group intensive instruction in math knowledge and number sense. Our school also differentiated small group instructional time to include differentiated learning centers. In addition students in the lowest quartile were given an opportunity to participate in morning and afternoon math tutoring.

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

In order to accelerate learning leadership will need to facilitate ARC professional learning communities in order to help teachers understand the full intent of the state benchmarks in order to provide students with an equivalent experience to state assessments.

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.

Bi-weekly instructional coaches and administration will facilitate PLCs for each grade level to ensure planning of the benchmarks and development of lessons. Coaches will also facilitate professional development with paraeducators and teachers to target skills necessary to improve student small group instruction and achievement.

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

Extended day tutoring will be provided.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:****Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

The ESSA data shows that our targeted area of support are students with disabilities due to achievement levels of 32% which is 8% below the goal of 40% set by the state of Florida.

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

Students with disabilities will increase their achievement level by 8%.

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

We will monitor this achievement by working with general education and ESE teachers on meeting students' individual education plan goals. In addition, teachers will monitor SWD achievement by continuing to meet with them during small group instruction and keeping progress monitoring data on students. The MTSS team will meet monthly to discuss students with disabilities and their interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matt Burkett (matt.burkett@polk-fl.net)

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

ESE teachers and general education teachers use the core curriculum, Florida Wonders tier interventions for both phonics and comprehension. In addition general education teachers use DIBELS daze for fluency intervention. For foundational skills the intervention teachers are using SIPS while the ESE teachers are using SRA. For mathematics teachers use the CRA method, which includes concrete instruction using manipulatives, then representational instruction using visual models, and ending with abstract numerical instruction.

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

We use these strategies in order to meet students needs. SRA and SIPPS focus on increasing phonics proficiency while Florida Wonders and DIBELS are used to increase fluency and comprehension for students. CRA is a proven research based strategy to move students through mathematical thinking and understanding of the concepts.

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 identify and understand their students' IEP goals.

Person**Responsible**

Elizabeth Smith (elizabeth.smith@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will identify students with disabilities and their needs through initial progress monitoring and use of the IEP to determine small group instruction and interventions. Teacher will meet monthly to review data with the MTSS team.

Person**Responsible**

Matt Burkett (matt.burkett@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

Data shows that less than 50% of students in grades K-2 are performing on grade level, therefore our area of focus will specifically involve looking at the individual foundational benchmarks and their intent. Doing this will propel our planning sessions into providing students with foundational lessons, instruction, and interventions that meet the needs of students and grow their reading proficiency.

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

In grades 3-5 our ELA proficiency is 47% therefore ELA proficiency is an area of focus. In addition our bottom quartile scored 43% therefore this subgroup of students will also be a focus area for the 2022-2023 school year. In grade levels 3-5 our students lack reading fluency which inhibits their ability to read on grade level text and comprehend. By focusing on fluency interventions and breaking down of the reading benchmarks students will grow their proficiency.

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)

While using the new coordinated screening and monitoring system students in grades K-2 will grow on average of one or more years in the four strands of the Florida BEST standards. In addition, the school's proficiency will increase by 5% over the course of one school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

53% of students in grades 3-5 scored below proficiency(level 3) therefore it is imperative that our students grow their proficiency by 5% or more on the end of year state assessment. Monitoring on-going assessments where growth is evident in the middle of the year will help to provide insight into meeting this goal.

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.

After progress monitoring assessments, data chats will be conducted with teachers to review their data and proficiency. In addition the leadership team will meet monthly with teachers to review their individual student RTI data to analyze any additional areas of focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Burkett, Matt, matt.burkett@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?

Our school will use the district adopted curriculum and interventions from Florida Wonders in order to align instruction with the BEST standards. Teachers will utilize "Being a Writer" to enhance students writing skills.

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?

After district analysis, McGraw-Hill met all areas of need per district committees and therefore is our provided curriculum to target students needs. Writing is a critical component to enhance ELA skills.

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
Literacy Coaching will take place weekly to dissect the benchmarks and align instructional task in order to create an equivalent experience to assessments.	Burkett, Matt, matt.burkett@polk-fl.net
Professional Learning will be provided to sharpen teachers skills in all areas of ELA instructional practices with an emphasis in small group and writing instruction.	Wilson, Faye, faye.wilson@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.

The implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) to encourage teachers to interact with students in a positive manner and allow for students to feel success from a program that promotes positive behavior instead of focusing on the negative. Incentives for teachers throughout the year to promote school climate. Student of the month recognitions monthly towards a character trait chosen that was exhibited. The use of Class Dojo to keep a consistent and positive communication with parents and staff. Weekly newsletters are sent out to all staff to keep communication in place.

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

School Staff- promotes and implements PBIS school wide

Parents- supports the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO), Student Advisory Council (SAC), ensures student attendance and school readiness

Students-upholding the compact form and their student responsibilities, exhibiting behaviors that align with the school wide expectations, portraying monthly character traits school wide towards becoming student of the month

Community-involvement in school wide events and donations towards the success of a positive school climate, participation in the Student Advisory Council