

Polk County Public Schools

Chain Of Lakes Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Chain Of Lakes Elementary School

7001 STATE HIGHWAY 653, Winter Haven, FL 33884

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

Demographics

Principal: Suzie Nelson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2021

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)	89%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (63%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Chain Of Lakes Elementary School

7001 STATE HIGHWAY 653, Winter Haven, FL 33884

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

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	89%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

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

We believe each child is unique and has potential. We believe it is our responsibility to instill in each child the ability to think critically, work cooperatively, pursue knowledge, respect others, and make responsible healthy choices.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Chain of Lakes Elementary is a family partnership committed to excellence. We expect everyone to cooperatively acquire the skills and knowledge necessary to become successful lifelong learners and productive citizens with respect for themselves, others, and the world around them.

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
Nelson, Suzie	Principal	Chief Instructional Leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with staff about data and instructional planning.
Linn, Heather	Assistant Principal	Collaborates with staff about data and instructional planning in the content area of Math.
Klupp, Stephen	Assistant Principal	Collaborates with staff about data and instructional planning in the content area of ELA.
Thomas, Brittany	Teacher, ESE	Coordinates with ESE teachers, administration, students, and families to ensure students receive instruction based upon their up-to-date individualized education plans.
Drehmer, Melissa	ELL Compliance Specialist	Coordinates with teachers, administration, families, and students to ensure English Language Learners receive needed ESOL support.
Wilson, Kristi	Instructional Coach	Induction Coordinator. Coaches teachers in the content areas of math and science. Collaborates with teachers about math/science data and instruction.
McGorry, Gerylyn	Instructional Coach	Induction Coordinator. Coaches teachers in the content area of ELA K-2. Collaborates with teachers about ELA data and instruction.
Pearn, Brittny	Instructional Coach	Induction Coordinator. Coaches teachers in the content area of ELA 3-5. Collaborates with teachers about ELA data and instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/20/2021, Suzie Nelson

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.*

5

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

87

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,001

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.

19

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	172	171	176	182	159	151	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1011
Attendance below 90 percent	64	38	57	39	42	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	277
One or more suspensions	8	3	7	11	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
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	17	32	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	20	26	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	61	74	89	28	21	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	290

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	27	12	25	17	32	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165

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	9	8	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
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	133	156	167	158	144	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	910
Attendance below 90 percent	19	28	27	21	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	3	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	29	15	54	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

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	13	16	13	20	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

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	3	6	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	4	0	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	133	156	167	158	144	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	910
Attendance below 90 percent	19	28	27	21	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	3	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	29	15	54	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

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	13	16	13	20	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

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	3	6	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	4	0	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	58%	47%	56%				68%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%						69%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						65%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	62%	42%	50%				75%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	61%						74%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						61%	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	72%	52%	20%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	68%	48%	20%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2022					
	2019	59%	47%	12%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

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	76%	56%	20%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	56%	15%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2022					
	2019	74%	51%	23%	60%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

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	16	25	23	25	41	46	6				
ELL	47	47	36	47	60	64	29				
ASN	72	72		83	83						
BLK	39	39	29	45	54	52	23				
HSP	52	49	35	57	61	60	29				
MUL	53	17		88	83						
WHT	69	61	50	67	59	60	51				
FRL	49	46	33	54	58	55	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	20	41	43	32	44	47	22				
ELL	47	50		59	70		44				
ASN	75			96							
BLK	49	58		45	42		38				
HSP	47	47	43	53	53	38	34				
MUL	72			83							
WHT	70	68	38	73	55	29	66				
FRL	54	56	52	56	48	39	40				
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	32	55	55	49	66	59	27				
ELL	51	73	62	63	55	45	43				
ASN	94	92		100	92						
BLK	67	67	58	66	67	58	39				
HSP	51	68	65	66	65	54	36				
MUL	73			87							
WHT	76	69	66	82	80	70	68				
FRL	62	68	65	71	74	65	46				

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	54
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	434

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
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	77
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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

Multiracial Students	
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	60
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?

Fifth grade proficiency at 47% for both Math and ELA is significantly lower than our other grade levels. Black students and students with disabilities both scored below the 41% state expectation. ELA learning gains at 52% and learning gains of the bottom 25% at 37% are lower than seen at COLE historically. 5th grade science dropped to 39% from 52%.

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

A drop in student proficiency in ELA, Math, and Science for fifth grade demonstrates a need to focus on core instruction to improve students' access to equivalent experiences.

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

Stability with instructional assignments, an increase in student misbehaviors, and larger class sizes contributed to low proficiency in 5th grade. We prioritized staffing fifth grade for the current school year and will address teacher retention with revamping our school's PBIS plan and improving our school's culture through providing consistent supports for staff.

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

4th grade ELA and Math showed the most improvement in the 2022 school year. 4th grade ELA proficiency increased from 50% to 57%, and Math proficiency increased from 54% to 63%.

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

The culture of the 4th grade instructional team was strong and cohesive. Planning was an efficient use of time that transferred over to instruction.

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

Stability of the the 4th grade team was a focus with the addition of effective new members. In addition, adding an additional instructional coach in ELA to further work upon the progressing with planning in this grade level using the Learning Arc will ensure consistency of instruction.

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.

School leadership will focus on calibrating our observations of classroom walks. Using collaborative planning, we will focus on utilizing the Learning Arc to ensure we more effectively providing students equivalent experiences with state benchmarks.

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

We will delegate specific grade levels for our leadership team to monitor and support. We will meet weekly with leadership teams to share data, track progress, identify barriers, and strategize solutions as needed. We will establish a behavior support team and improve our PBIS plan.

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

Planning and delivering core instruction that is aligned to the BEST standards. Data from STAR shows student proficiency in the area of ELA and Mathematics dropped up to 14% throughout the school year per grade level.
 Data from FSA shows a trend of 3% proficiency loss in both ELA and Math from 2021-2022 FSA and an 18% proficiency loss in Science from 2021-2022 Statewide Science Assessment.

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

State data will show a minimum of +1% proficiency increase for all grades/ content as well as 10% of the students just below the proficiency line becoming proficient.

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

Progress monitoring data offered by district level assessment platforms will be used to ensure students are mastering Benchmarks being taught after planning is properly implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

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

Monitor students engaging in equivalent experiences aligned to state expectations using SWT.
 Engage teachers in standards-based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework.

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

TNTP's The Opportunity Myth speaks to the relationship between academic success and ensuring students are able to engage in grade level standards-based expectations. It is imperative we both monitor for aligned instruction and plan for teacher's understanding of the Benchmarks and aligned tasks and assessments.

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.

Strategy 1 – Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 1 – Create calendar for leadership team calibration walks

Person Responsible

Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 – Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 2 – Train leadership team on walkthrough tool in first two calibration walks

Person Responsible

Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 – Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 3 – Conduct calibration walks until team shows 90-100% calibrated consistency with rationale

Person Responsible

Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 – Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 4 – Add SWT data review to every leadership team meeting agenda

Person Responsible

Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 – Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 5 – Establish protocol to review data including evidence in SWT

Person Responsible Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 – Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 6 – Monitor impact between data review from SWT and planning per content/course/grade level

Person Responsible Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 – Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 1 – Create master schedule that includes intentional collaborative planning

Person Responsible Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 – Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 2 – Assign and train planning facilitators

Person Responsible Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 – Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 3 – Add planning results findings to leadership team meeting agenda

Person Responsible Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 – Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 4 – Conduct planning protocol on a “weekly” basis

Person Responsible Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 – Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 5 – Review planning findings during leadership team meetings on a routine basis

Person Responsible Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 – Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 6 – Conduct correlation analysis between SWT findings and Benchmarks planned for using Arc

Person Responsible Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Improving classroom cultures to increase student autonomy and engagement.

Area of Focus Description

and Rationale:

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

The number of referrals processed in the 2022 school year was more than four times the number of referrals in the previous year. Additionally, the number of students receiving more than two suspensions in 2022 was seven times greater than the previous year.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific

measurable outcome the school plans to achieve.

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Referral data will show a 25% decrease for the first semester and 50% overall decrease in referrals for the 2023 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will meet monthly to report progress towards this strategy, review data trends, discuss barriers, and revise as needed. Each member of the leadership team will have a specific grade level to monitor for fidelity in PBIS and lesson implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephen Klupp (stephen.klupp@polk-fl.net)

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

Empower students to develop personal leadership habits through school wide Leader in Me mini lessons and book study.

Ongoing PLCs to focus on rolling out PBIS initiatives and supporting handling classroom managed behaviors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Leader in Me is an evidence-based, social emotional learning process—developed in partnership with educators—that empowers students with the leadership and life skills they need to thrive in the 21st century. It is based on secular principles and practices of personal, interpersonal, and organizational effectiveness.

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.

Prepare books and lessons for teachers to use.

Person Responsible

Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Meet as a leadership team to update school wide PBIS plan and review discipline data.

Person Responsible

Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Create a classroom managed behavior tracking form and restorative practice flow chart.

Person Responsible

Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Provide teachers with training on managing classroom discipline and updated PBIS implementation and school wide expectations.

Person Responsible

Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Pull data and meet with leadership team to review progress of the PBIS plan.

Person Responsible

Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@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

- Prioritizing Teacher Assignment in Reading
- Intentionality in Creating Master Schedule
- Prioritizing Subgroups of Students for Reading Schedules
- Common Beginning of the Year Diagnostics
- School Year Cycles for MTSS-Common Intervention Tools and Assessments
- Scheduled Data Chat Cycles on Student Performance
- Learning Arc to Deepen Understanding of Benchmarks
- Common Planning with Support of Instructional Team

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

- Prioritizing Teacher Assignment in Reading
- Intentionality in Creating Master Schedule
- Prioritizing Subgroups of Students for Reading Schedules
- Common Beginning of the Year Diagnostics
- School Year Cycles for MTSS-Common Intervention Tools and Assessments
- Scheduled Data Chat Cycles on Student Performance
- Learning Arc to Deepen Understanding of Benchmarks
- Common Planning with Support of Instructional Team

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)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The fifth-grade cohort of 21-22, scoring below a 50% has proceeded to middle school.
Our goal for our current fifth-grade cohort is that they will score at 52%.

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.

- Integrating technology for reading assessments will allow for timely feedback and remedial opportunities.
- School Year Cycles for MTSS-Common Intervention Tools and Assessments
- Scheduled Data Chat Cycles on Student Performance
- Intentional Weekly Conversation with the Leadership Team About Specific Student Behavior and Academics

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Nelson, Suzie, suzie.nelson@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?

-Renaissance

-Reading Wonders

-iStation

-Phonics for All: Curriculum Associates

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?

-Each component above has a data collection and analysis component providing information on skill/benchmarks to remediate.

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
Create a master schedule that includes intentional collaborative planning.	Nelson, Suzie, suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net
Assign and train instructional leaders in the learning arc.	Nelson, Suzie, suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net
Create a calendar for leadership team calibration walks.	Nelson, Suzie, suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net
Train leadership team on walkthrough tool in first two calibration walks.	Nelson, Suzie, suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net
Conduct calibration walks until team until team shows 90-100% calibrated consistency with rationale.	Nelson, Suzie, suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net
Monitor impact between data review from SWT and planning per content/course/grade level.	Nelson, Suzie, suzie.nelson@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.

Chain of Lakes Elementary addresses building positive school culture and environment involving all stakeholders by building relationships with school families and community members in an ongoing, welcoming environment. This is a constant, flexible process with multiple avenues including monthly grade chair meetings, weekly grade-level meetings, and family involvement activities. We participate actively in community and college events and support our community colleges by hosting interns, promoting summer activities on campus, and hosting a summer showcase. We plan with our PTO to provide fun incentives for our students and gestures of appreciation towards the staff.

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

Our school has many community stakeholders ranging from students, parents, teachers, retired educators, and community members. These various stakeholders fill the ranks of our school's PTO, volunteers, staff, and School Advisory Council. We actively seek input on Chain of Lakes Elementary's mission, protocols, and input on school plans for decision-making through our stakeholder meetings, surveys, family involvement surveys after each family activity, and a comprehensive SAC committee that includes a sampling of all stakeholders. Our PTO helps to promote our school spirit by hosting family and school events throughout the year. Our volunteers support instruction and contribute to the improved morale of our

staff. Our families attend school events and provide us with valuable feedback. Our staff is dedicated, friendly, and hardworking. Everyone on campus works diligently to make our campus a safe environment focused on providing students with a quality education.