

Polk County Public Schools

Auburndale Central Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Auburndale Central Elementary School

320 LEMON ST, Auburndale, FL 33823

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

Demographics

Principal: Octavia May

Start Date for this Principal: 6/29/2022

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: D (35%) 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Auburndale Central Elementary School

320 LEMON ST, Auburndale, FL 33823

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

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	74%

School Grades History

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

At Auburndale Central Elementary we are a community of leaders who recognize, honor, and celebrate the leaders within us. Our goal is to provide an equitable educational experience that challenges students to reach academic excellence in preparation for college or career.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a nurturing environment committed to achieving academic excellence through the use of high yield strategies in preparation for college or career.

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
May, Octavia	Principal	<p>Principal- The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, models the problem solving process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure for implementation of MTSS, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures and participates in adequate professional learning to support MTSS implementation, develops a culture of expectation with the school staff for the implementation of MTSS school-wide, ensures resources are assigned to those areas in most need, and communicates with parents regarding school based MTSS plans and activities. Provides technology necessary to manage and display data, provides professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and graphic display. Ensures safe environment for all stakeholders.</p>
Palmer, Heather	Assistant Principal	<p>Assistant Principal- Assists the principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of MTSS, further assists the principal in the assessment of MTSS skills, implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures and participates in professional learning, and communicates with parents concerning MTSS plans and activities. Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data, facilitates development of intervention plans, provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation, assists with professional development for behavior concerns, assist in facilitation of data-based decision making activities. Ensures safe environment for all stakeholders.</p>
Thomas, Renard	Instructional Coach	<p>Literacy Coach- Develops, leads and evaluates school core content standards/programs, identifies and analysis existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches, identifies patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence based intervention strategies, assists with whole school screening programs that provides early intervention services for children to be considered "at risk", assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development, provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring, and models/coaches teachers in areas that</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		need development (coaching cycle) in order to better meet the students educational needs.
Gonzalez, Nikki	Instructional Coach	Develops, leads and evaluates school core content standards/programs, identifies and analysis existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches, identifies patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies, assists with whole school screening programs that provides early intervention services for children to be considered "at risk", assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development, provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring, and models/coaches teachers in areas that need development (coaching cycle) in order to better meet the students educational needs.
Butler, Todd	Other	Reading Interventionist- Analyzes ELA data in order to identify students in need of extra support; uses supplemental resources to increase achievement; meet daily with targeted students; meet with teachers to determine additional needs/improvements of students, and provide small group instruction daily to students in the lowest quartile.
Lott, Sandria	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor- Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment, guides and provides intervention with individual students, in small groups and in whole classroom settings, communicates with child serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/29/2022, Octavia May

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Total number of students enrolled at the school

322

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

1

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

1

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	52	55	55	58	48	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	322
Attendance below 90 percent	24	25	25	15	15	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	3	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	9	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	14	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	21	19	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	6	9	20	19	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

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	2	11	3	12	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/15/2022

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	53	49	49	65	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	276
Attendance below 90 percent	0	9	11	12	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	15	20	20	25	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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	7	8	6	17	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	53	49	49	65	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	276
Attendance below 90 percent	0	9	11	12	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	15	20	20	25	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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	7	8	6	17	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	1	3	15	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	39%	47%	56%				35%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	39%						46%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						61%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	33%	42%	50%				39%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	40%						40%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%						21%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	22%	49%	59%				43%	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	35%	52%	-17%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	32%	48%	-16%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2022					
	2019	38%	47%	-9%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

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	43%	56%	-13%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	35%	56%	-21%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	51%	-17%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	41%	45%	-4%	53%	-12%
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	23	19		12	35		18				
ELL	34	26		33	42		15				
BLK	25	35	50	24	29	20	20				
HSP	37	36	27	30	42	33	15				
WHT	47	46		40	42		31				
FRL	37	36	33	33	40	25	19				
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	14	10		17							
ELL	39	64		28	38		30				
BLK	32	40		21	27		33				
HSP	36	47		34	22		38				
WHT	29	16		24	16		20				
FRL	33	36	38	26	18	21	29				
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	16	50	46	28	29	17	10				
ELL	31	46		35	51		38				
BLK	32	57		38	52	40	40				
HSP	35	39		41	45		56				
WHT	38	49	53	39	33	8	35				
FRL	34	47	64	36	45	24	44				

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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	311
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
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	29
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	36
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	
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	41
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?

- ELA Proficiency rates from Fall to the Spring STAR test in 3rd: 52% to 43% , 4th: 47% to 47% and 5th : 26% to 28%
- 3rd Grade FSA scores shown our proficiency increased from 47% (2020-21) to 46 %(2021-22). A decrease of 1%.
- Math Proficiency rates from Fall to Spring STAR test decreased in 3rd: 62% to 48%, 4th: 31% to 23% and 5th: 33% to 17%.
- The trend is a decrease in proficiency rates in both ELA and Math for grades 3-5 according to STAR.
- Our Economically Disadvantaged students increased slightly in proficiency in ELA in 4th and 5th grade but decreased by 14% in 3rd grade. In Math, our Economically Disadvantaged students decreased in proficiency in grades 3-5.
- FSA Our ELL students decreased in proficiency in math in grades 3-5.

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

- Proficiency in Math grades 3-5 (based on STAR) and Proficiency in ELA in 5th grade.

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

- Increasing proficiency will also contribute to overall learning gains and gains for our bottom 25%.
- Monitor/accountability for core instruction and planning and ensure targeted lessons and aligned tasks provide students an equivalent experience.
- Ensuring that teachers are using data to drive their small group instruction in Power Hour and ELA/ Math small groups.

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

Based on 2021-22 FSA, 3-5 Math learning gains increased from 20% to 40%.

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

- Targeted small group instruction, instructional support in classrooms to help provide additional instruction to students during small group time.

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

- Accountability/Monitoring of implementation of instruction and student progress.
- Instructional coaches working with tier teachers to provide coaching cycle/modeling.
- Collaborative planning with a focus on the student tasks (ARC framework), what it should look like in instruction, student work samples to show mastery and reteach based on student needs and data.

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.

- New B.E.S.T. Standards training (3-5)
- Using data to provide differentiation, remediation, and acceleration.

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

- New teacher mentors
- Purposeful scheduling of instructional support staff
- Instructional coach providing coaching cycle/modeling
- Professional development weekly/Learning Arc framework in planning.
- Accountability and monitoring of instruction/remediation and acceleration.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

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

Data from 2022 FSA ELA shows an increase of 5% and 2022 FSA Math shows an increase of 5% for grades 3-5. Although progress was made, we didn't reach our intended goal of 44% in either core area.

**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 plus 1% proficiency increase for all core content as well as 10% of students just below the proficiency line becoming proficient.

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

Progress monitoring data offered by district/state level platforms will be used to ensure students are mastering benchmarks, being taught after collaborative planning is properly implemented. This data will be used to inform small group instruction.

Evidence of classroom instructional climate and monitored through Journey observations, school and district walkthrough tool, student data from progress monitoring assessments as well as classrooms assessments (formatives, summatives, MTSS, benchmark checklist). Coaches will be monitored through evidence of modeling, collaborative planning, professional learning facilitation, and coaching cycles.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)

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

1. Monitor students engaging in equivalent experiences aligned to state expectations using SWT.
2. Engage teachers in standards based collaborative planning protocols using the learning ARC framework.

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

TNTP Opportunity Myth speaks to the relationship between academic success and ensuring students are able to engage in grade level standards based expectations. It is imperative we all monitor for alignment and plan for teachers understanding of the benchmarks and aligned tasks and assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

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

ELA instructional coach will use the ARC framework to facilitate collaborative planning with all ELA teachers during a common planning period on Tuesdays focusing on improving target/task alignment.

Person Responsible Renard Thomas (renard.thomas@polk-fl.net)

Math instructional coach will use the ARC framework to facilitate collaborative planning with all Math teachers during a common planning period on Thursdays focusing on improving target/task alignment.

Person Responsible Nikki Gonzalez (nikki.gonzalez@polk-fl.net)

During daily scheduled walk throughs, SLT will measure target task alignment using a research based classroom walk through tool.

Person Responsible Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)

The principal will visit all ELA and Math classes during their instructional block time on day 5 and 10. In 4 out of 5 classrooms the observed learning target and task will be aligned at the appropriate taxonomy or higher as measured by the walk through tool.

Person Responsible Octavia May (octavia.may@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.

Based on the 2021-22 ESSA data, our students with disabilities fell below the 41% federal index consecutively for 3 years.

The effectiveness of the school leadership team will be measured utilizing walkthrough tool data. From walkthrough data an action plan will be established to address instructional priorities that enhance instructional delivery that will positively impact student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2022-23 school year, 50% of students with disabilities will show a half years growth or learning gains as measured by the F.A.S.T.

Monitoring:

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

SLT conducts weekly focused meetings with ESE staff to differentiate lesson plans designed to meet the specific instructional needs of those targeted students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)

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

SLT provides ESE teachers with additional instructional planning support (focused on differentiation) to close the learning gaps of students with disabilities. ESE teachers will provide daily push in instructional support for our tier 3 students in the general education classroom, focusing on our students with disabilities subgroup.

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

This strategy would provide ESE teachers instructional support to ensure target/task alignment and equivalent experiences for our ESE students. Our tier 3 students will have multiple small group learning opportunities with a variety of instructional approaches. Daily push in support could clarify misconceptions, deepen understanding of the standard to increase overall student proficiency while closing learning gaps.

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.

ESE teachers will attend and participate in weekly PLC's, focusing on target task alignment.

Person Responsible

Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)

Scheduling ESE teachers and paras for daily push in support for students with disabilities.

Person Responsible

Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)

SLT will conduct focused classroom walk throughs on differentiated target task alignment.

Person Responsible

Octavia May (octavia.may@polk-fl.net)

SLT provides timely feedback on target/task alignment to ESE teachers/paras based on the focused walk through data.

Person Responsible

Octavia May (octavia.may@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

According to the 2021-22 STAR Early Lit/STAR ELA data, 77% of our students in K-2 grade were proficient.

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

According to the 2021-22 FSA ELA data, more than 50% of our students in third-fifth grade scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide ELA assessment.

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)

Based on the 2022-23 F.A.S.T. ELA data, students in K-2 grade will increase by 5% in overall ELA proficiency.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on the 2022-23 F.A.S.T. ELA data, students in 3-5 grade will increase in overall ELA proficiency to 50%.

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.

Monitoring: Standard/benchmark mastery check list and classroom walk through tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

May, Octavia, octavia.may@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 use of research based intervention materials for our Tier 3 and Tier 2 students during targeted ELA small group instruction. Support will be provided by the SLT during collaborative planning using the ARC framework to ensure target/task alignment during small group instruction is being utilized. All tasks will be monitored for alignment to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.

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?

This strategy would provide students with targeted intensive support through small group learning opportunities which includes a variety of instructional approaches (foundational skills, fluency, comprehension, technology integration, gradual release model), based on their specific real-time data. Analyzing weekly data would clarify misconceptions, deepen understanding of the standard to increase overall student proficiency while closing learning gaps.

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
Engaging PLC's focused on analyzing student ELA data from summative and formative assessments.	Thomas, Renard, renard.thomas@polk-fl.net
After analyzing summative and formative data, small group instructional lesson plans will be created.	Thomas, Renard, renard.thomas@polk-fl.net
To do, doing and done meetings with SLT (daily focus-DF)	May, Octavia, octavia.may@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.

Auburndale Central Elementary School builds a positive school culture and environment in a variety of ways. Diversity is encouraged and celebrated through various extra curricular events. High expectations are encouraged school-wide for both students and staff by holding all members accountable through individualized goal setting. Positive behavior support systems (PBIS) are modeled and implemented daily. We encourage and demonstrate respect for others. All stakeholders are expected to share the same values and beliefs of our school culture to help maintain cohesiveness. We celebrate small victories to encourage positive momentum and growth for both students and staff. Our mission and vision statements are clearly presented and included in motivational daily school wide announcements.

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

Auburndale Central Elementary builds positive relationships with families to increase involvement by conducting a minimum of three face to face conferences between teachers and parents in order to keep

parents informed of their child's progress. Report cards and interims are sent home every 9 weeks. A monthly newsletter is sent home stating the curriculum each grade level is teaching and other important school-wide information. The mission and vision is stated in the newsletter. We build positive relationships with our families by having a "Family Friendly" office staff. Throughout the year we have family nights to encourage parent involvement. Teachers use student agendas, Class Dojo, Google Voice and Schoology to communicate with parents. Teachers frequently communicate and document parent phone conferences on a conference log that is submitted to administration.