

Polk County Public Schools

Lena Vista 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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lena Vista Elementary School

925 BERKLEY RD, Auburndale, FL 33823

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

Demographics

Principal: Diameshia Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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: C (45%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (42%)
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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lena Vista Elementary School

925 BERKLEY RD, Auburndale, FL 33823

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

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	60%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We, at Lena Vista Elementary, strive to empower students in an engaging environment with rigorous instruction that promotes academic excellence in all subgroups.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lena Vista creates a learning environment that will provide 100% Student Success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sharp, Deneece	Principal	As the leader of the School Based Leadership Team I set the mission and vision within the school. I work with the leadership in the development of strategies, academic data, social/emotional data, and data for Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets. I develop clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, and Relationship). I provide information on how to understand and break barriers, determine the effectiveness of the strategies and determine the next steps needed to move the school forward.
Gainey, Dru	Assistant Principal	As the support leader of the School Based Leadership Team I support the principal in the mission and vision within the school. I work with the leadership in the support of development of strategies, academic data, social/emotional data, and data for Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets. I support clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, and Relationship). I provide information on how to understand and break barriers, determine the effectiveness of the strategies and determine the next steps needed to move the school forward.
Mullenix, Kayle	Math Coach	Instructional Math and Science Coach as well as interventionist for the bottom 25%. They will work as a colleague with classroom teachers to support student learning in all content areas. The Instructional Coach will focus on individual and group professional development that will expand and refine the understanding of research-based effective instruction.
Williams, Hunter	Dean	As the Dean of Students, I support the principal in the mission and vision within the school. I work with the leadership in the support of development of strategies, academic data, social/emotional data, and data for Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets. I support clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, and Relationship). I provide information on how to understand and break barriers, determine the effectiveness of the strategies and determine the next steps needed to move the school forward.
Cameron, Taylor	Reading Coach	Reading Coach as well as interventionist for the bottom 25%. They will work as a colleague with classroom teachers to support student learning in all content areas. The Reading Coach will focus on individual and group professional development that will expand and refine the understanding of research-based effective instruction.
James, Krystal	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach as well as interventionist for the bottom 25%. They will work as a colleague with classroom teachers to support student learning in all content areas. The Instructional Coach will focus on individual and group professional development that will expand and refine the understanding of research-based effective instruction.
Hallam, Teresa	School Counselor	The primary duty of an elementary school counselor is to ensure that students have access to the resources necessary for academic and social development. They also ensure that curricula and programs address the

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		developmental and educational needs of students. They also work with the school social worker to address students in need both emotional, social and financially.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Diameshia Williams

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

960

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

12

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

18

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	152	134	159	160	118	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	870
Attendance below 90 percent	44	39	35	34	41	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	239
One or more suspensions	5	5	12	9	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 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	88	104	118	59	27	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	415

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	32	30	27	37	38	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	239

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	123	135	158	152	142	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	840
Attendance below 90 percent	47	48	53	47	58	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	296
One or more suspensions	3	6	9	7	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	89	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	2	3	4	3	11	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	1	6	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	123	135	158	152	142	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	840
Attendance below 90 percent	47	48	53	47	58	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	296
One or more suspensions	3	6	9	7	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	89	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	2	3	4	3	11	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	1	6	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	42%	47%	56%				45%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%						48%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						48%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	39%	42%	50%				43%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	46%						41%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						38%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	35%	49%	59%				40%	47%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	48%	52%	-4%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	35%	48%	-13%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	40%	47%	-7%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

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	52%	56%	-4%	62%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	39%	56%	-17%	64%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2022					
	2019	25%	51%	-26%	60%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	38%	45%	-7%	53%	-15%
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	17	41	44	20	29	23	23				
ELL	25	49	50	23	43	38	23				
BLK	30	69	67	29	53	70	26				
HSP	36	48	40	30	42	40	28				
MUL	33	43		52	50						
WHT	53	59	61	49	46	43	44				
FRL	38	56	47	35	44	45	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	12	19	17	20	8	8	16				
ELL	31	38		31	25		26				
BLK	37	33		39	36		29				
HSP	33	36	38	36	24	13	22				
MUL	44			47							
WHT	48	37	42	44	28	27	46				
FRL	38	41	38	40	31	19	35				
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	31	44	45	31	47	40	32				
ELL	25	43	58	30	40	33	25				
BLK	29	37	31	28	25						
HSP	36	39	50	36	43	33	45				
MUL	50			60							
WHT	53	56	56	49	43	48	43				
FRL	43	48	52	41	38	34	38				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	360
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	37
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	49
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	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	45
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 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	51
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	42
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?

Trends: According to FSA, 5th grade math learning gains (including lowest 25%) was the lowest performing data component. This is a trend from previous years with this cohort.

ESE, ELL and Hispanic showed a trend of insufficient learning gains with less than 41% proficient in ELA.

Contributing Factors: 5th grade teachers inability to effectively communicate and work with school initiatives. One 5th grade teacher was brand new with 1 teacher coming from middle school. This created a gap of learning in state standards and expectations of standards. Attendance and Behavior rates were high of both grade levels and subgroups. Also, 5th grade had a high ESE count with low performing scores.

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

Need for Improvement Data: 5th grade ELA and math had the biggest gap when compared to the state average. 5th grade math had a 28% gap and 4th grade ELA had a 27% gap. 21-22 District Assessment Data: 5th grade reading and math had the biggest gap on achievement from prior year. This includes for subgroups as related to ELL, SWD and Hispanic.

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

Contributing Factors: 5th grade teachers inability to effectively communicate and work with school initiatives. This created a gap of learning in state standards and expectations of standards. Attendance and Behavior rates were high of both grade levels and subgroups.

Actions: Professional Development with all new teachers including coaching cycles for support with coaches weekly. Professional learning opportunities monthly to increase knowledge and expectations of classroom instruction. As well as diagnosing essential missed learning that may have occurred to teachers lack of knowledge weekly during Professional Learning Communities. Intervention block with SRA and planning to understand the state benchmark with the Learning Arc will need to be taken.

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

Data: 4th grade had improvement in ELA and Math proficiency gains. Math proficiency has the largest gains. This includes all subgroups.

21-22 District Assessment Data: 4th grade continued to show proficiency gains and 5th grade showed learning gains.

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

Contributing Factors: (1)3rd and 5th grade teachers developed target-task alignment activities weekly in planning. (2)Teachers worked as teams to diagnosis student work samples to see if they met standards weekly.

Actions: Teachers were provided weekly professional learning that enabled instruction on the intent of the standard with a focus on cognitive complexity and student autonomy. Student engagement and target task alignment were major focuses daily during instruction. Monitoring of standards and target expectations were done daily to inspect what you expect. Behavior and attendance rate of students was monitored and supported through Positive Behavior classrooms weekly with school support monthly.

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

Strategies to be implemented daily:

1. Scaffolding intentionally to build understanding and confidence through the learning arc.
2. Response To Data
3. Utilizing Collaborative Student Teams for engagement and student ownership daily

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.

Professional Learning: (1)Using the district provided walk through tool leadership team will be calibrated to use to align task and benchmark. Professional development will refocus our instruction on benchmark/ task alignment. This PD will also support teacher and student monitoring of standard progress. (2) Using district provided Learning ARC framework to give understanding during common planning to understand and connect learning of Benchmarks.

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

Additional Services: Attendance monitoring and positive behavior support to build intrinsic motivation to attend and do well in school. Attendance will be monitored weekly by attendance manager and discussed with administration and dean of all students to maximize the learning potential; with a focus on tardies and early check-outs. Teachers will create an environment that supports an understanding of cultural differences and use of strategies that impacts the learning of these cultures differences. Harmony and character education will be used daily for 15 minutes a day to create this understanding. Also, teachers and administration will monitor student work samples weekly to ensure the full intent of the standard is visible in all subgroups. RTD will also be offered to grades 3-5 to enhance learning potential. Students will be identified by the RTD process.

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.

Data from School LSI Walkthrough shows 70% tasks were aligned to the State Standard
Data from 2022 FSA shows a trend of less than 41% proficiency in ELA in ELL, Hispanic, and SWD students.
Data from 2022 FSA both in Math and ELA show a trend less than 50% proficient in meeting state benchmarks.

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 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:

Deneece Sharp (deneece.sharp@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based

Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being

1. Monitor students engaging in equivalent experiences aligned to state expectations using the district walkthrough tool.
2. Engage teachers in standards-based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework.

**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.**

The evidence-based strategy being used is the practical instructional model ensuring that students are able to engage in grade level standards-based expectations. This will provide staff with professional learning on developing purposeful tasks that meet the intent and rigor of the benchmarks when teachers have a full understanding and implementation of these standards. Through the understanding of taxonomy levels, teachers will create tasks that align to benchmarks, and/or clarifications. This will create benchmark task alignment through the development of a purposeful task. As well as, implementation of student-led teams. There will also be a focus on daily instructional strategies for accelerating learning. This training and job-embedded coaching ensures that standards-based benchmarks and objectives are the focus of student learning and teachers success of planning competency-based instruction through the Learning Arc framework.

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 (SWT)

Action Step 1 - Create calendar for leadership team to calibrate walks using paper copy of district walkthrough.

Person

Responsible

Deneece Sharp (deneece.sharp@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

Deneece Sharp (deneece.sharp@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

Deneece Sharp (deneece.sharp@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 4 - Conduct Benchmark walkthroughs with the SWT weekly; share and use data collection of walkthroughs to plan next steps.

Person

Responsible

Deneece Sharp (deneece.sharp@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 1 - Create master schedule that includes intentional collaborative planning using the Learning Arc Framework.

Person

Responsible

Deneece Sharp (deneece.sharp@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 2 - Assign and train planning facilitators with Leadership team for Steps 1-7 of the Learning Arc

Person Responsible Dru Gainey (dru.gainey@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 3 - Work with grade levels on planning with the Learning Arc Framework

Person Responsible Deneece Sharp (deneece.sharp@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 4 - Review data from facilitators gained during planning to increase understanding of the Learning Arc Framework.

Person Responsible Dru Gainey (dru.gainey@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 5 - Monitor implementation of Learning Arc through classroom walkthroughs using the SWT tool; share and use data collection of walkthroughs to plan next steps.

Person Responsible Deneece Sharp (deneece.sharp@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 STAR Early Literacy 56% proficient in K and 1st grade and 54% proficient 1st through 2nd graders were proficient on the STAR ELA assessment. Students data shows areas of improvement are needed in Phonics, Vocabulary, and Comprehension.

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

42% of our 3rd through 5th grade were proficient on the state ELA FSA 21-22 school year. FSA results and STAR progress monitoring shows a deficiency in reading as stated by the State of Florida Department of Education (RAISE).

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)

By the end of the 22-23 school year using the new screening and progress monitoring system 50% of our K-2 student will be on level to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By the end of the 2022-23 school year, 50% of students will demonstrate proficiency , as measured by the 2023 ELA FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Student learning will be monitored by Teacher, Coaches, and Administration through grade level formative assessments and district progress monitoring tools such as STAR, IStation, Freckle, Writing Quarterlies (Write Score), plus the new state progress monitoring system, FAST . As well as, teacher daily monitored student standard progress reports using standard tracking tools such as the Student Evidence Tracker. Students not showing adequate growth will be monitored weekly using benchmark based tasks and assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Sharp, Deneece, deneece.sharp@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?

In grades K-2 Systemic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight words(SIPPS). In grades 3-5 SRA Corrective Reading will be used to instruct students below level (Level 1 and 2) . Teachers, Coaches, and Interventionist will use SRA in small group instruction to focus on building the framework of reading using SRA Corrective Reading. As well as, ability grouping with guided leveled readers to increase readability by providing a focus on the Fab 5 (phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension) in small group instruction. This will allow all instructors to differentiate and scaffold as needed Intervention material SIPPS and SRA are aligned with state and district evidence-based reading plan.

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?

Flexible grouping will allow instructors to focus on targeted benchmarks to increase students understanding. Flexible groups will be created using STAR, IStation, Freckle Reading, and ELA APM as well as teacher monitored tracking tool.

Ability grouping using SIPPS and SRA Corrective Reading will allow instructors to focus on the development of the reading process to establish fundamental skills necessary for proficient 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
Literacy Leadership team and Administration will meet with teachers during PLC's to break down the understanding of the benchmark using the Learning Arc, analysis data, work samples, and reviewing progress monitoring data . From there, students will be identified that need additional reinforcement on specific standards, targets and/or success criteria ad placed either in SRA Corrective Reading, SIPPS or RTD small group intensive instruction. District will provide training for SRA Corrective Reading with follow-up on implementation. The school will work with SIPPS virtual trainer to provide professional learning at the school site.	Sharp, Deneece, deneece.sharp@polk-fl.net
Literacy Leadership team will work with district team and teachers to establish diagnostic testing of all Level 1 and 2 student to determine placement in the SRA Corrective Reading Class grades 3-5 and SIPPS grades K-2 for remediation.	Cameron, Taylor, taylor.cameron@polk-fl.net
Literacy Leadership team and Teachers will then use data from SIPPS and SRA to create both flexible and ability groups within the ELA and MTSS blocks. Instructors will focus on both scripted programs as well as leveled text, graphic organizers, and questioning techniques (questions that align to the standard) to increase students comprehension.	Cameron, Taylor, taylor.cameron@polk-fl.net
Literacy Leadership team, teachers and administration will also work in PLC's to review work samples and ELA assessments for progress and rigor of standard. Progress monitoring diagnostics will also be administered for the SRA and SIPPS programs for growth.	Sharp, Deneece, deneece.sharp@polk-fl.net
Administration will monitor instruction in all classrooms weekly using the district walkthrough tool to ensure that instruction is being implemented at rigor and compliance. Plus, conduct data chats with teachers to discuss student progress and intervention steps, actions, and progress monitoring. Walkthroughs will also be done during the Intervention block to make sure implementation of SRA and SIPPS is done correctly.	Sharp, Deneece, deneece.sharp@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 school addresses school culture by analyzing, understand and observing the attitudes of teachers in the classroom and in staff meetings, and understanding the general feeling of students towards the school and the staff. Being able to identify which aspects are toxic and which are positive so you can reinforce positive elements and take action to reinforce those positive qualities and create a positive school culture. Ways we do this at Lena Vista is by:

*Involve parents in your school culture, give them a platform for feedback on classroom activities or school

programs.

- *Complimenting staff and students so they feel that they are cared for individually.

- *Create school norms that focus on building positive values in the school and classrooms.

- *Discipline is presented consistently across the school. When all students are treated equally and bad behavior is disciplined in the same way in different classrooms, this helps remove feelings of mistrust among students.

- *Modeled behaviors that are seen around school both for staff and students.

- *Engage students in social skill lessons through a variety of techniques.

- *Encouraging innovation in our school and classrooms.

- *Maintaining physical environment of the school. Impact in learning can come from light, temperature, and air quality and the environment.

Finally, monitor these strategies by listening to feedback from both teachers and students in order to understand the experience that they are having in school. Understanding the attitudes and atmosphere that permeate the hallways and classrooms is important to developing a positive culture in your school.

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

School Administration and Leadership team communicate and/or support the school district's mission, training priorities, and promotional activities; such activities play a part in encouraging change. This team plays a central role in providing leadership, articulating goals and behavioral expectations of teachers, and supporting staff in developing an effective and positive school climate. Administration believes that when teachers and staff are supported, students are supported.

Teachers and Support staff will create a culturally responsive classroom to understand the differences among the cultures in the classroom, while still recognizing and valuing individual student needs. Teachers and Support staff will understand the diverse needs of students and create relationships with students that are built upon collaboration. In turn, students will feel more empowered to speak out, ask questions, and give input to classroom procedures.