

Polk County Public Schools

# Polk City Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Polk City Elementary School

125 BOUGAINVILLEA AVE S, Polk City, FL 33868

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Jennifer Erb Hancock**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (47%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (43%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

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

**SIP Authority**

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

**Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

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

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Polk City Elementary School

125 BOUGAINVILLEA AVE S, Polk City, FL 33868

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

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	34%

## 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.**

Polk City Elementary will demonstrate high expectations by collaborating and communicating with the community, parents, staff and students to foster a safe, respectful and diverse learning environment that provides differentiated opportunities for all to think critically and participate in student centered, rigorous, standards based, high quality instruction.

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

Polk City Elementary School students will be independent thinkers and problem solvers who work cooperatively to meet high expectations in order to become lifelong learners.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Erb-hancock, Jennifer	Principal	To provide the vision and leadership necessary to develop and administer educational programs that optimize the human and material resources available. These programs will ensure implementation of learning processes for all students leading to enhanced student achievement within the context and providing a safe successful school for students, staff, parents and community in support of enhanced student learning.
Menetre, Ashley	Assistant Principal	Assists the school principal in sharing the vision and leadership necessary to develop and administer educational programs that optimize the human and material resources available. These programs will ensure implementation of learning processes for all students leading to enhanced student achievement within the context of providing a safe and successful school for students, staff, parents and community in support of enhanced student learning.
Miller, Jessica	Instructional Coach	The school based coach is responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. The coach is also responsible for professional development, coaching teachers about data collection, analysis, interpretation, and usage; research based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools.

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Sunday 7/1/2012, Jennifer Erb Hancock

**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**

37

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

591

**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.**

14

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	91	84	103	92	98	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	544
Attendance below 90 percent	43	35	35	20	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	3	5	3	8	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	20	24	27	17	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Course failure in Math	11	18	24	26	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	37	23	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	37	21	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	20	46	96	87	35	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	294

**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	7	18	23	20	38	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	4	10	8	18	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	0	93	77	92	84	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	422
Attendance below 90 percent	0	19	17	17	17	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	2	5	4	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	20	37	32	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132

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	5	13	13	11	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	4	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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



Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	93	77	92	84	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	422
Attendance below 90 percent	0	19	17	17	17	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	2	5	4	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	20	37	32	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132

**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	5	13	13	11	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

**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	4	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	43%	47%	56%				52%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%						46%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						48%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	43%	42%	50%				53%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	53%						53%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						50%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	49%	59%				47%	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	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	48%	-5%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					
	2019	39%	47%	-8%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

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	54%	56%	-2%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2022					
	2019	42%	51%	-9%	60%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

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	39	53	22	34	27	25				
ELL	38	67		22	60						
HSP	47	66		38	62	58	29				
WHT	40	54	43	41	48	41	37				
FRL	37	54	47	37	50	44	30				
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			18	50		40				
ELL	59			35							
HSP	47	33		39	46		46				
WHT	37	35	45	41	36	55	46				
FRL	33	35	50	35	34	50	42				
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	26	25	27	41	52	70					
ELL	52	57		32	60						
HSP	53	55		43	42		37				
WHT	52	44	48	56	55	52	54				
FRL	46	46	44	41	44	42	30				

**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	47
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	379
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31

Students With Disabilities	
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	47
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	43
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	43
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?**

Progress monitoring data indicates a foundational skill deficiency among 1st and 2nd grade students. Proficiency and learning gains for SWD's lag behind other subgroups' performance levels.

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

ELA and Math lowest 25% demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. Based on progress monitoring, 1st and 2nd grade students moving from Star Early Lit to Star Reading demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

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

Lack of effective support for students with disabilities and knowledge of foundational skills in the primary grades. Poor student and teacher attendance also contributed to the need for improvement. Restructuring of support for students with disabilities. A stronger understanding of MTSS and consistency with implementation of MTSS plans for all students. Teacher professional development in MTSS and foundational skills.

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

Based on state assessments, overall learning gains for ELA and Math showed the most improvement.

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

The contributing factors include small group instruction/intervention in ELA and Math as well as guided reading in ELA.

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

Greater alignment in small group instruction to meet the needs of ALL learners.

**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.**

Use of appropriate materials to meet the needs of high performing learners. Learning Arc planning, guided reading, literature circles and research based learning.

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

Corrective Reading by McGraw Hill.

### **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.**

The area of focus is to strengthen Tier 1, standards aligned instruction to increase student achievement in literacy and mathematics.  
 Rationale: Our current proficiency levels in ELA and math are below 50% overall as measured by STAR and FSA.

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

ELA proficiency will be determined by STAR Early literacy (K), STAR reading (1st & 2nd) and F.A.S.T (3rd-5th).  
 80% of kindergarten students will score at or above level on STAR Early Literacy.  
 50% of first grade students will score a level 3, 4, or 5 on STAR Reading.  
 50% of second grade students will score a level 3, 4, or 5 on STAR Reading.  
 50% of third grade students will score a level 3, 4, or 5 on F.A.S.T.  
 50% of fourth grade students will score a level 3, 4, or 5 on F.A.S.T.  
 50% of fifth grade students will score a level, 3, 4, or 5 on F.A.S.T.  
 All goals are based on the results of PM 3.

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

The leadership team will use the standards walk through tool to monitor alignment of Tier 1 instruction in ELA and Math. Progress monitoring data from periods 1 and 2 will be used to monitor the need for instructional changes.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

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

Implement the use of the learning arc to plan for Tier 1 instruction and tasks aligned to the ELA and Math BEST benchmarks. Academic Coach will provide professional development, utilize PLC processes and engage in coaching cycles to strengthen Tier 1 instruction.

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

Planning for instruction and tasks directly aligned to the benchmarks will increase opportunities for all students to receive appropriate Tier 1 instruction.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Academic coach and administration will provide professional development in the following areas:  
 The learning arc and BEST standards, data collection, and use of formative and summative assessments.

**Person Responsible**

Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

Utilize PLC processes including the learning arc to collaboratively plan instruction and tasks, develop common formative assessments, analyze assessment data and act on assessment results.

**Person Responsible**

Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

Academic coach will engage in coaching cycles with teachers to support instruction aligned to benchmarks and objectives.

**Person Responsible**

Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

Inclusion teachers will support classroom teachers and students with disabilities with Tier 1 instruction. Inclusion teachers will utilize IEP goals and benchmarks to drive their instruction. Inclusion teachers will provide students with disabilities support through the use of scaffolding skills so students have the tools necessary to master the grade level benchmarks. LEA will support inclusion teachers by coaching and identifying areas of need for professional development.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

Utilize ELP and RTD to increase student proficiency to close the achievement gap as well as provide acceleration in ELA and Math.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]



**#2. 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.  
 Based on STAR progress monitoring and state assessment data, students with disabilities are underperforming compared to their general education peers in both ELA and Math. Overall student data shows students who are not proficient with Tier 1 instruction will require Tier 2 and/or 3 interventions to close the achievement gap. Teachers will use data to diagnose student deficiencies, intentionally plan targeted intervention and acceleration lessons, consistently deliver targeted intervention and acceleration lessons, monitor student progress and adjust instruction based on the response to intervention and acceleration.

**Measurable Outcome:** State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.  
 Increase ELA and Math proficiency levels for students with disabilities by 10%. 50% of students with disabilities will show an increase in scale score between progress monitoring 1-2 and 2-3.

**Monitoring:** Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.  
 Teachers and leadership team will monitor student MTSS data and progress monitoring results. Leadership team will conduct walkthroughs with feedback and coaching during intervention time.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**  
 Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.  
 Use the MTSS process during intervention time for targeted Tier 2 and 3 instruction as well as targeted small group instruction within Tier 1 to close achievement gaps.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.  
 Research supports that guided reading and small group instruction increases proficiency and closes the achievement gap by scaffolding instruction and differentiating tasks to meet the student at their current instructional level. Monitoring student response to intervention and making instructional adjustments to meet the need of diverse learners will increase student achievement.

**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.

Academic coach will provide professional development on the MTSS process, guided reading and foundational skills as needed throughout the year.

**Person Responsible**      Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will administer diagnostic and progress monitoring assessments. Teachers will analyze data to plan for and form/adjust groups. Teachers will monitor student progress and adjust instruction accordingly. Teachers will conference with parents to keep them informed. Teachers will use research based materials.

**Person Responsible**      Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

The leadership team will monitor small group instruction data and Tier 2 and 3 instructional plans. The leadership team will provide feedback and coaching. The leadership team will conduct regular RtI analysis meetings with all teachers, including inclusion and self contained teachers.

**Person Responsible**      Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

The reading and math interventionists will analyze data and utilize small group instruction to support students.

**Person Responsible**      Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

Inclusion and self contained (ESE) teachers will support students with disabilities with meeting their IEP goals by analyzing data to plan for instruction. Inclusion and self contained (ESE) teachers will monitor student progress and adjust instruction accordingly. Inclusion and self contained (ESE) teachers will conference with parents and collaborate with general education teachers.

**Person Responsible**      Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Support**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Effectively implement PBIS to increase positive student behavior and improve student attendance rates. Students who are present daily and authentically engaged exhibit less disruptive behaviors.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

We will reduce school based ODRs by 50% and decrease violent instances specifically bullying and harassment by 50%. We will decrease the number of students with less than 90% attendance rate by 50%.

**Monitoring:**

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

The amount of ODRs and bullying/harassment reports in FOCUS will be monitored weekly and monthly. Attendance will be tracked by attendance manager weekly and monthly.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ashley Menetre (ashley.menetre@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Social skills and Sanford Harmony lessons will be taught daily in all classrooms. All staff will implement the school-wide PBIS program. The school counselor will support specific groups of students to address targeted needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Due to the high percentage of low SES students it is necessary to teach social skills and implement PBIS to decrease unwanted behaviors.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will contact families after 2 consecutive absences. Teachers will use class dojo, agendas, and phone calls to consistently communicate class behavior concerns with families. Teachers will utilize assistant principal and school counselor to assist with creating Tier 2 behavior plans. Teachers will use tracking forms to collect data on specific students and behaviors. Teachers will use provided social skills lessons.

**Person Responsible**

Ashley Menetre (ashley.menetre@polk-fl.net)

The PBIS team will provided professional development to support implementation of the program. The PBIS team will analyze data to monitor implementation and determine needs for additional professional development.

**Person Responsible**

Ashley Menetre (ashley.menetre@polk-fl.net)

Assistant principal and school counselor will provide support and guidance to teachers with PBIS Tier 2 behavior plans/interventions and necessary documentation. Assistant principal and school counselor will support new teachers or struggling teachers with implementation of school-wide PBIS.

**Person Responsible**

Ashley Menetre (ashley.menetre@polk-fl.net)

The school counselor will communicate with families about attendance concerns. The school counselor will schedule attendance meetings with teachers and families as necessary. The school counselor will work with the school social worker and/or school district to provide additional resources/services as

needed. The school counselor will write Tier 2 attendance plans for all students with attendance rates lower than 90%. The school counselor will promote and celebrate good attendance regularly.

**Person Responsible**

Ashley Menetre (ashley.menetre@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**

Less than 50% of 1st and 2nd grade students scored into STAR Reading and/or scored proficient in STAR Reading. Students in 1st and 2nd grade will receive instruction and remediation in foundational literacy skills.

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

57% of 3rd-5th students scored below a level 3 on the 21-22 state assessment. Corrective Reading will be used to support students in grades 3-5 falling below 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)**

80% of students in Kinder will score at or above proficiency on STAR Early Lit in PM3.  
50% of students in 1st and 2nd will score a level 3 on STAR Reading in PM3.

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

50% of students in 3rd-5th grade will score a level 3 or higher on the FAST PM 3 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.

STAR and FAST progress monitoring data will be analyzed and reviewed each testing period. Corrective reading assessment data, guided reading data, and MTSS progress monitoring data will be analyzed monthly to make instructional decisions.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Miller, Jessica, [jessica.miller@polk-fl.net](mailto:jessica.miller@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?

The evidence-based practices and programs include guided reading, Corrective Reading, and Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

**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?

The practices and programs selected diagnose student need and have proven effectiveness based on state assessment learning gains.

**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
Teachers will receive professional development in Corrective Reading, guided reading, foundational literacy skill instruction and MTSS.	Miller, Jessica, jessica.miller@polk-fl.net
The literacy leadership team will provide feedback, coaching and support in implementing Corrective Reading, guided reading, foundational literacy instruction and MTSS.	Miller, Jessica, jessica.miller@polk-fl.net
Teachers will consistently use diagnose student need, implement Corrective Reading, guided reading, foundational literacy skills and MTSS, monitor student progress and make data based adjustments to instruction.	Miller, Jessica, jessica.miller@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.**

At Polk City Elementary school, we address building a positive school culture and environment through ensuring all stakeholders are involved. We involve families in the education of our students through engaging and purposeful family events that provide them with ways to assist their child. We also engage the School Advisory Council toward guiding the school toward continuous improvement. Additionally we build partnerships with businesses and community members to enhance the academic and social-emotional learning of our students.

For new teachers we have the Campus Induction Program, Teacher Ambassador Program, and on the job mentorship provided by Academic Coach. Additionally, new teachers have the opportunity to attend social and professional learning events on campus. There is also a Social Committee that plans regular events to

build and sustain staff relationships.

The leadership team will recognize and celebrate teachers and staff that show initiative, take risks, are team players, problem-solvers and/or consistently put students first.

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

Direct stakeholders include teachers, students, families, volunteers, community members, school board members and district staff. Others stakeholders included early-childhood providers, social services, and local business partners. All stakeholders will support the implementation of the school's mission and vision.

Community members, families, volunteers, and local businesses provide services or resources to enhance the learning environment. Local social service agencies provide a variety of resources and services to support the social emotional well-being of students and families.