Frostproof Ben Hill Griffin, Jr Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Frostproof Ben Hill Griffin, Jr Elementary School

501 MCLEOD RD, Frostproof, FL 33843

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

Demographics

Principal: Tina Chapman

Start Date for this Principal: 6/22/2022

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 (41%) 2018-19: D (39%) 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	CSI
* 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

Frostproof Ben Hill Griffin, Jr Elementary School

501 MCLEOD RD, Frostproof, FL 33843

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

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	56%

School Grades History

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

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.

Frostproof Ben Hill Griffin, Jr. will collaborate with all stakeholders to establish a safe and positive learning environment of excellence in which each student can achieve their personal best through mutual respect and accountability.

Core Values:
• Accountability – Responsibility for your actions and consequences.
• Respect – Acknowledge, understand, and support the rights for all.
• Excellence – Utilizing a growth mindset to put forth your best effort and take pride in your work.
• Integrity – Doing the right thing even when no one is watching.
• Collaboration – Working together to achieve high and realistic expectations.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Frostproof Ben Hill Griffin, Jr. Elementary is committed to providing students with the behavioral and academic skills necessary to reach their fullest potential becoming responsible life-long learners.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Meyers, Dart	Principal	All duties and responsibilities of operating an elementary school that includes budgets, Title I, safety/security, instruction, curriculum, resources, technology, student data, PBiS, scheduling, PLCs, collaborative planning, recruitment/hiring, community involvement, and staff duties.
Chapman, Tina	Assistant Principal	All duties and responsibilities in assisting the principal with teacher observations, evaluations, curriculum, instruction, safety/security, PBiS, threat assessments, anti-bullying, assessments, staff duties, scheduling, PLCs, collaborative planning, and student data.
Albert, Stacey	Dean	All duties and responsibilities in assisting administration with PBiS, safety patrol, anti-bullying, discipline, safety/security, staff duties, scheduling, FBA/BIPs, and threat assessments.
Baerhold, Jessica	Instructional Coach	All duties and responsibilities of a math coach, coaching cycle, curriculum, instruction, modeling, PLCs, Collaborative Planning, and resources.
Fugate, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	All duties and responsibilities of a literacy coach, coaching cycle, curriculum, instruction, modeling, PLCs, Collaborative Planning, and resources.
Loveless, Lori	Instructional Coach	All duties and responsibilities of a literacy coach, coaching cycle, curriculum, instruction, modeling, PLCs, Collaborative Planning, and resources.
Anderson, Laurncille	School Counselor	All duties and responsibilities of a school counselor, threat assessments, small group counseling, one on one counseling, MTSS, social emotional learning, and mental health.
Johnson, Alice	Instructional Technology	All duties and responsibilities of a network manager, student devices, network, technology equipment, software programs, website, and learning management system.
Wrye, Debbie	Instructional Media	All duties and responsibilities of a media specialist, student/teacher data, and library books ordering/organizing.
Babington, Pam	Teacher, ESE	All duties and responsibilities of an LEA in monitoring IEPs, reevaluations, student data, FBA/BIPs, and assisting ESE teachers with resources.
Jenkins, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	All duties and responsibilities of a 2nd grade teacher and grade chair.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Welch, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	All duties and responsibilities of a 4th grade teacher and grade chair.
Ashley, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	All duties and responsibilities of a 5th grade teacher and grade chair.
Parker, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	All duties and responsibilities of a 3rd grade teacher and grade chair.
Higginbotham, Denise	Teacher, K-12	All of the job duties and responsibilities of a 1st grade teacher and being grade chair.
Johnson, Oleda	Other	All job duties and responsibilities of a Headstart Prek Parent Liaison in registering new students, working with families, working with the CDAT Prek teachers, and various other paperwork
Mullis, Candiss	Teacher, K-12	All duties and responsibilities of a kindergarten teacher and grade chair.
Rhoden, Catalina	Teacher, K-12	All job duties and responsibilities of a 3rd grade teacher and grade chair.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/22/2022, Tina Chapman

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
64

Total number of students enrolled at the school
883

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	141	139	129	128	126	159	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	822
Attendance below 90 percent	60	51	55	31	49	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	308
One or more suspensions	8	12	4	5	13	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in ELA	37	42	61	22	48	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	260
Course failure in Math	31	16	52	19	32	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	43	44	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	34	46	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	61	81	77	75	74	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	446
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	31	33	28	21	53	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	245

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	0	1	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/30/2022

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	90	125	122	123	114	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	48	47	30	33	32	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	229
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	7	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	12	16	4	6	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	2	9	2	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	19	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	31	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	30	38	36	32	58	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	244

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	25	30	19	21	27	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145

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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	90	125	122	123	114	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	48	47	30	33	32	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	229
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	7	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	12	16	4	6	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	2	9	2	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	19	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	31	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	30	38	36	32	58	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	244

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	25	30	19	21	27	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145

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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	41%	47%	56%				43%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%						46%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						48%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	41%	42%	50%				39%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	44%						34%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	25%						31%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	49%	59%				31%	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	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	31%	48%	-17%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	43%	47%	-4%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

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	46%	56%	-10%	62%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	35%	56%	-21%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2022					
	2019	28%	51%	-23%	60%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	32%	45%	-13%	53%	-21%
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	13	42	41	20	38	27	23				
ELL	34	53	48	35	39	28	27				
BLK	18	33	27	19	21	20	8				
HSP	37	53	55	41	46	25	29				
MUL	33			27							
WHT	52	58	48	47	49	25	48				
FRL	33	50	44	35	40	28	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	18	12	7	24	28	33	25				
ELL	34	24	25	31	22	27	29				
BLK	18	28		13	17		18				
HSP	34	28	32	35	28	22	32				
MUL	27			18							
WHT	43	37		39	35		58				
FRL	30	26	23	27	25	25	33				
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	29	34	36	24	33	33	5				
ELL	32	37	60	35	33	24	12				
BLK	28	41		33	33						
HSP	36	38	52	37	33	24	27				
WHT	54	54	43	41	35	36	36				
FRL	39	42	48	37	33	25	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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	322
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	38

English Language Learners	
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	21
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	40
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	30
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	47
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

The trends were ELA and Math Learning Gains showed improvement and ELA bottom quartile showed improvement. Science proficiency was 34% proficient.

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

Fifth grade math proficiency and bottom quartile and science based on state assessment data.

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

Students lacked foundational skills in math and science needed to master the level of performance in fifth grade math/science standards.

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

ELA and Math overall proficiency improved. Learning gains in Reading and Math improved with the highest gain in ELA improving to 52% from 30% in 2020-2021. Math Learning Gains increased 15%.

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

Our school focused on small group instruction, Power Hour, and Response To Data (RTD). Teachers received Professional Development on developing formative assessments to guide small group instruction.

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

1. Monitor that students are being provided equivalent experiences aligned to the expectations of the state using SWT.
2. Provide teachers both training and time to plan utilizing the Learning Arc Framework.

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.

The Leadership Team will participate in calibration walkthroughs using the SWT. Teachers will be provided Professional Development on the Learning Arc Framework and the SWT expectations.

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

In order to ensure sustainability teachers will be supported in using high yield strategies and developing instructional tasks aligned to the full intent of the BEST Benchmarks. A monitoring tool for data will be used by the Leadership Team to track progress of the ESSA subgroups.

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.	State data shows that an increase of 13% is needed to become a "B" school. In order for FBHG to show an increase across the board, 100% of teachers need to implement standards based instruction and tasks aligned to the benchmarks being taught giving the students an equivalent experience to the progress monitoring tools being implemented.
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 in Math and ELA. State data will show a minimum of +7% increase in science for the 5th grade. 10% of the students that are just below the proficiency line become proficient in all content areas.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Progress Monitoring data provided by the district assessment platforms will be used to determine if students are mastering the benchmarks being taught after planning the proper standards based instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dart Meyers (dart.meyers@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	1. Monitor that students are being provided equivalent experiences aligned to the expectations of the state using Standards Walkthrough Tool. 2. Provide teachers both training and time to plan utilizing 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.	It is necessary for the teachers to see the connection between the planning, equivalent experiences/aligned tasks and mastery of bencharks by the students. Leadership will need to monitor teacher connections of benchmarks and aligned tasks while teachers monitor student connections between tasks and mastery of benchmarks.

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 a calendar for leadership team calibration walks. Strategy 2. Provide teachers both training and time to plan utilizing the Learning Arc Framework. Action Step 1 - Provide training to teachers on the Learning Arc Framework.	
Person Responsible	Dart Meyers (dart.meyers@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1- Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring
Action Step 2- Train leadership team on walkthrough tool in first two calibration walks.
Strategy 2. Provide teachers both training and time to plan utilizing the Learning Arc Framework.
Action Step 2 - During weekly grade level collaborative planning, utilize the Learning Arc Framework to develop lessons and equivalent tasks based on the benchmarks.

Person Responsible	Dart Meyers (dart.meyers@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1- Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring
Action Step 3- Conduct calibration walks until team shows 90-100% calibrated consistency.
Strategy 2. Provide teachers both training and time to plan utilizing the Learning Arc Framework.
Action Step 3 - During Collaborative Planning, task analysis to determine mastery of benchmark(s).

Person Responsible	Dart Meyers (dart.meyers@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1- Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring
Action Step 4 - Develop walk-through calendar for Leadership Team to ensure a cross-section for data collection and analyze the data bi-weekly to progress monitor that students are being provided equivalent experiences aligned to the expectations of the state.
Strategy 2. Provide teachers both training and time to plan utilizing the Learning Arc Framework.
Action Step 4 - During Collaborative Planning, remediation and acceleration lessons and tasks developed to meet the needs of all students.

Person Responsible	Dart Meyers (dart.meyers@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Academic Coaches
Action Step 5 - Coaching Cycle, Facilitation of Collaborative Planning, support in development of Learning Arc Framework. Data analysis.

Person Responsible	Dart Meyers (dart.meyers@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Parent and Family Engagement
Action Step 6 - Teachers will utilize student agendas to inform families of current curriculum, upcoming family workshops, and student progress to strengthen home school communication. Parent and family involvement paraprofessional to communicate and provide resources to families.

Person Responsible	Lori Loveless (lori.loveless@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Purchase of Media Center library books
Action Step 7 - Media Center collection development to meet the recommendations of the B.E.S.T. benchmarks.

Person Responsible	Debbie Wrye (deborah.wrye@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Reflex
Action Step 8 - Students will utilize Reflex to build procedural fluency in Math.

Person Responsible	Jessica Baerhold (jessica.baerhold@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Classroom supplies, instructional resources, and ink.
Action Step 9 - Provide teachers with needed supplies and resources to develop instructional tasks aligned to the intent of the BEST benchmarks.

Person Responsible	Dart Meyers (dart.meyers@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
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 state testing multiple ESSA subgroups show a need for improvement.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Students in the multiple subgroups will show a minimum of a +1% gain in each of the content areas on state testing.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	1. Monitor students to see if they are engaging in equiavlent experiences. 2. Monitor that ESE teachers are attending PLC's and grade level planning and using the Learning Arc Framework. 3. Ensure that students are receiving proper ESOL services. 4. Ensure that ESE students are in the correct placement and are receiving the appropriate services. 5. Instructional paraprofessionals will be utilized to improve academic achievement of multiple subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dart Meyers (dart.meyers@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Teachers will be using differentiated activities based on data during small group instruction to meet the needs of all ESSA subgroups.
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 reseach of John Hattie, small group instruction has an effect size of +0.49. It is necessary to ensure that ESE students are being exposed to grade level standards and benchmarks but are also being taught the necessary skills to bring them closer to the grade level they are in. At the same time it is necesary for Hispanic students to be exposed to equivalent experiences and be supported in their language as to bring their progress to the highest level.

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.

-Data Analysis
-Target task alignment
- Utilize learning arc framework to: understand the intent of the B.E.S.T benchmarks; to create objectives; and develop aligned instructional tasks

Person Responsible Dart Meyers (dart.meyers@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Classroom instructional paraprofessionals and reading interventionists.
Action Step 1 - Paraprofessionals/reading interventionists working with targeted specific students to close the achievement gap based on progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible Dart Meyers (dart.meyers@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - Extended learning.
Action Step 2 - Provide additional time beyond the school day for instructional student support. Students will be selected based on progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible Dart Meyers (dart.meyers@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

The Area of Focus for K-2 is to provide remedial and foundational skills. The absence or weakness in foundational skills can have negative effects on student learning gains. Through formative assessments and Star Early Literacy/ Star data, foundational skills was identified as a critical need for many students. 2021-2022 end of the year Star Data is as follows:
Kindergarten - 57%
1st Grade - 42%
2nd Grade - 40%

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

Our data review indicated a critical need in 3rd-5th grade based on our FSA proficiency results. 3rd Grade: 43%, 4th Grade 39%, and 5th Grade 37%. In order to provide remediation in foundational skills, we will utilize Corrective Reading (SRA), for identified students during Power Hour block in 3rd thru 5th grade ELA classrooms.

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)

On the 2021-2022 end of the year Star early Literacy/STAR Assessments, 57% of the kindergarten students were proficient, 42% of our 1st grade students were proficient, and 40% of our 2nd grade students were proficient. On the 2022-2023 Star Early Literacy/STAR 60% of Kindergarten, 50% of 1st grade, and 50% of 2nd grade will be proficient.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

On the 2022 ELA FSA, 43% of our 3rd grade students scored 3 or higher, 39% of our 4th grade students scored a 3 or higher, and 37% of our 5th grade students scored a 3 or higher. On the 2022-2023 ELA FAST. 50% of 3rd grade, 50% of 4th grade, and 50% of 5th grade will score a 3 or higher.

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.

In addition to our formative assessments, the following assessments will be used to monitor student progress: Star Early Literacy/STAR and FAST progress monitoring AP1 September 2022, AP2 December 2022, AP3 May 2023. Administration will use the standards walkthrough tool to monitor implementation of the BEST Foundational Benchmarks during Power Read and small group remediation using Wiley Blevis and SRA Corrective Reading.

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

Meyers, Dart, dart.meyers@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 order to provide remedial and foundational skills we will utilize From Phonics to Reading Wylie Blevins and LLI for identified students during Power Hour block in Kindergarten through 2nd grade ELA classrooms. In order to provide remediation in foundational skills, we will utilize Corrective Reading (SRA), for identified students during Power Hour block in 3rd thru 5th grade ELA classrooms.

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 evidence-based programs address the foundational skills that have been identified from our Star Early Literacy/STAR and FSA data. Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies presents "Phonics Instruction with a .70 effect size" and "Response to intervention with a 1.29 effect size".

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 training on implementation of both research-based programs.	Meyers, Dart, dart.meyers@polk-fl.net
Data analysis and use of programs diagnostic and placement tests to organize groups.	Meyers, Dart, dart.meyers@polk-fl.net
Monitoring of implementation of programs using the Standards Walkthrough Tool.	Meyers, Dart, dart.meyers@polk-fl.net
Based on SWT data, identified teachers will receive increased support from Literacy Coaches to improve implementation success. Support could include modeling, co-teaching, data analysis, etc.	Meyers, Dart, dart.meyers@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 completes a Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) which is available to staff and parents. This plan includes how we will be providing various parent nights and activities. Some events will also be available at various times and if feasible live stream or record the event for parents to access through our website.

We will be utilizing PBiS strategies, CHAMPS, Harmony and other positive reinforcements with students and staff. One of our goals this year is to earn PBiS Gold status. For staff, we are using "gold tickets" where any staff member can fill one out, give it to the person they want to recognize, and then that person places it in a container in the main office. Periodically, we will draw names for staff prizes. Also, we will place the "gold tickets" on a staff bulletin board. We will also recognize staff monthly for perfect and exemplar attendance. For students, this is a project the school is focused on through the PBiS team to ensure we have tier 1, 2, and 3 strategies in place. We are implementing tier 1 strategies to recognize students throughout the school day in using something like "Super Good tickets". Students would earn these tickets for following the school wide expectations, put their name on them, then turn them into a container in the classroom, and periodically have teachers pull the "Super Good tickets" for them to earn prizes. We will continue to recognize Top Dog students quarterly. We will utilize check in and check out procedures as well as behavior intervention plans to reach our tier 2 and 3 students. Students will be able to earn rewards for attendance, grades, and academic achievement. Students will be surveyed for possible reward/prizes that they would like to earn. We are exploring various club days, Chess, and possible garden opportunity for our

ACCESS students. Continue the National Elementary Honor Society program for 4th and 5th grade students and the academic competition team in 5th grade.

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

Administration - school leaders modeling the expectations of a positive school culture in promoting PBiS, CHAMPS, and Harmony.
Dean - working with challening students to correct behaviors in a positive way working with PBiS and CHAMPS strategies along with implementing restorative practices.
Teachers - promoting and implementing PBiS, CHAMPS, Harmony, and deesclation strategies.
Support teachers and staff - promoting and implemeting PBiS and deesclation strategies.
ESE teachers - promoting and implementing PBiS, CHAMPS, Harmony, deesclation, and Zones of Regulation strategies.
School psychologist - promotes PBiS and Zones of Regulation strategies.
Paras modeling and reinforcing our PBiS and BARK expectations.