Polk County Public Schools

Lewis Anna Woodbury Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lewis Anna Woodbury Elementary School

610 CHARLESTON AVE S, Fort Meade, FL 33841

http://www.lawallstarlions.com/

Demographics

Principal: Alexander Mcluckey

Start Date for this Principal: 8/3/2022

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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (41%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: D (40%)
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

Lewis Anna Woodbury Elementary School

610 CHARLESTON AVE S, Fort Meade, FL 33841

http://www.lawallstarlions.com/

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	68%

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.

Committed to EXCELLENCE by providing a high quality education for everyone.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lewis Anna Woodbury Elementary prepares students with the academic skills, habits of mind, and character traits necessary to perform on or above grade level and be prepared for success in college, career, and as productive citizens in the local and global community.

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
mcluckey, alexander	Principal	
Wilkin, Beth	Assistant Principal	
Gargus, Amy	Other	
Roberts, Adam	Math Coach	
Barber, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	
DeVane, Brooke	Other	
Harrison, Christine	Assistant Principal	
	Instructional Media	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 8/3/2022, Alexander Mcluckey

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.*
2

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.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
41

Total number of students enrolled at the school
560

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
4

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	78	94	77	110	83	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523
Attendance below 90 percent	16	33	16	33	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	11	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	13	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	17	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	8	3	6	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	10	5	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 8/24/2022

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	108	115	109	106	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	626
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	27	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	42	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	0	0	0	24	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	90	108	115	109	106	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	626
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	27	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	42	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	0	0	0	24	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	47%	56%				45%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	43%						49%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						55%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	39%	42%	50%				52%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	42%						59%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						56%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	26%	49%	59%				38%	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	42%	48%	-6%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	41%	47%	-6%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

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	40%	56%	-16%	62%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	55%	56%	-1%	64%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	51%	2%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	34%	45%	-11%	53%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	18	38	52	15	34	35	15				
ELL	33	38	44	36	48	53	21				
BLK	32	46		32	33		19				
HSP	40	40	46	38	46	50	14				
WHT	48	48		44	38	40	47				
FRL	38	45	51	36	42	47	25				

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	11	40		18	33		8				
ELL	29	25	42	30	28	9	25				
BLK	19	20		26	20						
HSP	35	31	41	32	28	17	31				
WHT	49	43		41	29		50				
FRL	37	34	50	30	23	5	31				
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	15	30	43	34	61	56	18				
ELL	32	39	56	56	73	76	30				
BLK	43	55	64	44	47	31	26				
HSP	43	45	50	55	69	65	33				
WHT	49	49	60	53	50	56	47				
FRL	41	46	57	49	59	59	29				

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	344
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
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	44
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?

As students progress through grade levels, the percentage of proficient students decreases in both ELA and Math. The 21-22 School year saw 5th grade score 33% proficient in ELA and 26% proficient in Math.

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

The area that demonstrates the greatest need for improvement is Math as the proficiency decreases by 30% between 3rd and 5th grade. This data comes from different cohorts of students, but each year, proficiency drops by nearly 15%. Also, students with disabilities and Black students both scored below the 41% expected for ESSA subgroups.

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

Quality of standards-based instruction decreases and equivalent experience opportunities need to be increased.

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

The area of most improvement was Math Learning Gains for the bottom 25%. They increased 34% from the previous year, 20-21. Another area of strong growth was overall Math Learning Gains with an increase of 15% from the previous year, 20-21.

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

Planning sessions were donated to authentic center work and data analysis. Another area focused on was collaboration between students.

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

Intentional differentiation to meet the needs of all students will allow for acceleration to occur. Student work must be on grade level with center work supporting the benchmark being taught. Remediation in a teacher small group will occur after teachers have actively tracked student understanding so they can remediate based on individual daily learning gaps.

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:
Teachers will be tiered and supported through visiting other teachers' classrooms who are seen as exemplars for different classroom procedures or instructional styles. The reading coach will be implementing "Speedy PD's" for teachers after school, based on teacher requests and needs determined by leadership.

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

School-based decisions will be made through data analysis. Student trends will be identified and cohorts will be tracked to determine academic growth. Teacher placements will be based on data analysis and professional development opportunities will be created based on school needs.

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.	ELA proficiency scores are averaging 46% for 3rd grade since 16-17 school year. However, ELA proficiency for 5th grade is averaging at 35% over the same period. The primary drop of percent is seen from 3rd to 4th with 4th grade averaging 36.8% proficient, with roughly a 9% drop occurring between the two grade levels. Math Proficiency scores are similar to ELA with 3rd grade scores being significantly higher post COVID shutdown. 3rd grade Math proficiency has averaged in 52% with 4th grade averaging at 27% proficient and 5th grade averaging at 26% since the 20-21 school year. Our school is focusing on overcoming the over 20% difference of 4th and 5th grade to 3rd grade.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	To combat the drop in proficiency, school-wide grade level goals of 3% proficiency growth will be implemented. Once initial data is received on the new kindergarten cohort, we will be able to establish a baseline for our youngest students. This baseline will allow leadership to see if the cohort grew 3% over the coarse of their time at Lewis Anna Woodbury. Each grade level will grow a minimum of 18% from their baseline kindergarten score. All other grade levels will be required to grow their grade-level proficiency by 3% over the course of the school year from their fall baseline data.
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:	alexander mcluckey (alexander.mcluckey@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teaching grade-level benchmarks and providing on-grade-level work. Using the Learning Arc during planning to effectively plan lessons and appropriate tasks. Focus on active tracking during instruction to determine daily learning gaps. Provide students with rubrics and criteria when completing work and interacting during centers so they understand expected outcomes. Create universal expectations for teachers so that all students receive a similar experience and all students receive the same level of preparedness.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the	Active tracking allows for in-the-moment understanding of student knowledge. Universal expectations provides students a similar experience. On-grade-level work guarantees students are exposed to an equivalent experience to what they will see when tested

**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.

Assigning grade-level goals of 3% and monitoring their success.

Person Responsible	alexander mcluckey (alexander.mcluckey@polk-fl.net)

Planning on-grade-level material and exposing students to benchmark based work

Person Responsible	Kimberly Barber (kimberly.barber@polk-fl.net)

Creating universal norms and expectations for centers. All teachers should have the same expectations
when it comes to grading student work and examining student understanding

Person Responsible	Christine Harrison (christine.harrison@polk-fl.net)

#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.**	SWD's scored 18% proficient in ELA and 15% proficient in Math during the 2021-2022 school year. Over the last two tested years, Math proficiency for SWD's fell 3% from 18% in the 2021-2022 school year.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	SWD student proficiency will grow by at least 3% from the fall progress monitoring assessment in all grade levels, especially 3-5.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Math instruction will be monitored to guarantee all student work is on grade level and related to the standard.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	alexander mcluckey (alexander.mcluckey@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Grade level work supplied during whole group and small group Teacher led small groups to remediate Manipulatives will be used to assist with various styles of learners Universal expectations set
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Grade-level work supplied during whole group and small group. This provides an equivalent experience Teacher-led small groups to remediate. These meet students at their instructional level Manipulatives will be used to assist with various styles of learners. Students have various learning styles and they need to be exposed to a multitude of learning strategies Universal expectations set. These allow students to have an understanding of the expectations and all students receive an equivalent experience.

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.

Common planning to promote on-grade-level student work samples.

Person Responsible	Adam Roberts (adam.roberts@polk-fl.net)

Data analysis to determine what students need support and remediation based on their assessments and work samples. Data chats will be conducted to promote accountability for teachers.

Person Responsible	alexander mcluckey (alexander.mcluckey@polk-fl.net)

Universal expectations set among the grade levels to promote equivalent experiences for all students.

Person Responsible	Beth Wilkin (beth.wilkin@polk-fl.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	African American students scored below the 41% threshold for ESSA monitoring. Student proficiency in ELA was 32% with learning gains being 46%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The federal index had African American students score a 32%, 9% away from the 41% needed. The expectation is that our African American student population will score a minimum of 41% on the Federal Index.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The leadership team will focus on three specific areas to guarantee student growth occurs. Teacher Planning (Learning Arc)/on-grade-level work Uniform expectations for students for all grade level classes Student engagement/meeting student needs
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	alexander mcluckey (alexander.mcluckey@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teacher Planning (Learning Arc)/grade level work- Student work must be on grade level to support an equivalent experience for all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Students cannot be expected to be successful at the end of the year if they are not adequately prepared for their assessment.

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.	

Collaborative planning will be attended by leadership to support teachers with their creation of lessons/ tasks that are on grade level.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Barber (kimberly.barber@polk-fl.net)

Universal expectations will be established to promote all students have the same opportunity and requirement to learn material. Students need an equivalent experience.

Person Responsible	Beth Wilkin (beth.wilkin@polk-fl.net)

Student engagement levels will be monitored when entering classrooms and teachers need to have activities/conversations that allow students to interact with the material. Students should not be passively learning. They should always have a task to complete in front of them.

Person Responsible	Christine Harrison (christine.harrison@polk-fl.net)

Student data will be tracked and conversations will occur with teachers to verify they are monitoring their data and creating engaging lessons based on student need.

Person Responsible	alexander mcluckey (alexander.mcluckey@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

Grade-level planning is monitored to support grade-level student work. All centers should have work that ties back to the benchmark and supports whole-group learning. Also, grade level expectations are expected to provide students with an equivalent experience and support student learning.

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

In 4th grade, 60% of students scored below proficiency level. To support these students, we have incorporated WriteScore lessons to promote/incorporate writing in our instruction for grades 3-5. These will increase writing comprehension. Similarly, grade-level planning is monitored to support grade-level student work. All centers should have work that ties back to the benchmark and supports whole-group learning. Also, grade-level expectations are expected to provide students with an equivalent experience and support student learning.

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)

Each grade level is expected to increase student proficiency by 3% from the beginning of the year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Each grade level is expected to increase student proficiency by 3% from the beginning of the year.

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.

Teachers will pull student trend data for all students in their class to determine if students are trending either up or down based on previous STAR scores.
Monthly data chats will occur with grade levels. Student data will be pulled and students will be tracked to determine if more supports are needed.

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

mcluckey, alexander, alexander.mcluckey@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?

Small-group remediation based on student-specific needs.
Student centers
Leveled Readers
WriteScore for 3-5

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?

Small-group remediation based on student-specific needs.- supports students at their level of need and helps create a safe atmosphere to ask questions.
Student centers- allow for grade-level work to be completed by students in an environment conducive to productive struggle.
Leveled Readers- Allows students to access content from a text more appropriate for their level of

comprehension. These allow students to build confidence and practice reading comprehension skills. WriteScore for 3-5- Comprehension and writing can be linked. Writing is a method for students to express comprehension.

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
Plan grade-level appropriate lessons with student work, reflective of the expectation of the benchmark.	Barber, Kimberly, kimberly.barber@polk-fl.net
Student centers will be uniform in expectations for all students to know what is expected of them across the grade level. The purpose is to promote an equivalent experience for all students, no matter whose class they are in.	Wilkin, Beth, beth.wilkin@polk-fl.net
Data chats with teachers to monitor their assessment of student needs. Teachers must know the need of their students to fill learning gaps created during instruction.	mcluckey, alexander, alexander.mcluckey@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.

Our teachers work hard to be accepting, kind, and encouraging to our students all day, every day. Teachers use a 7-point clip chart to encourage and reward positive student behavior. When students follow the PAWS expectations in class, they clip up. All students start every day on a 4 and can clip up all the way to a 7 throughout the day. Teachers turn the clip chart system into punches on a punch card. 60 punches each month earns students admission to a PBS event. The event changes every month. Support personnel are in hallways at specific duty locations each morning and each afternoon to ensure student safety, but also to continue to offer a smiling face and a warm greeting.

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

While teachers are the primary stakeholders because they spend so many hours a day with their students, all support personnel from admin to paras to bus drivers also promote a positive school culture simply by being present each morning, afternoon, and lunch time to encourage positive behavior and curtail negative behavior. Our PTO is full of stakeholders as well. They help serve at PBS events, they give money to make PBS events fun, and they help promote upcoming PBS events on their social media pages.