

Polk County Public Schools

Inwood 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 |

Inwood Elementary School

2200 AVENUE G NW, Winter Haven, FL 33880

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

Demographics

Principal: Donna Camp

Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2022

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 (38%) 2018-19: D (37%) 2017-18: C (42%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | YEAR 1 |
| Support Tier | IMPLEMENTING |
| 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 |

Inwood Elementary School

2200 AVENUE G NW, Winter Haven, FL 33880

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

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 | 83% |

School Grades History

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

The mission of Inwood Elementary is to create a safe and positive learning environment that will empower students to take ownership of their learning. As a faculty and staff, we will work together to rigorously engage and challenge students to be critical thinkers and learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision at Inwood Elementary is to develop "Students Today into Leaders Tomorrow".

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 |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Camp, Donna | Principal | Instructional and Transformational Leader Oversee staff and faculty School Operations Facilitate Leadership Team meetings, SAC meetings Facilitate Professional Development and Professional Learning Communities Support collaborative planning Data analysis for next steps |
| Hunt, Ariel | Instructional Coach | Provide math support for teachers Serve on Leadership Team and school-based instructional team Implement the Coaching cycle Provide standards-aligned resources for support Facilitate professional learning communities Support collaborative planning Data Collection and analysis for next steps Monitor Freckle Participate in Instructional Walks |
| Mustafa, Salaam | Instructional Coach | Provide ELA and Writing support for teachers Serve on Leadership Team and school-based instructional team Implement the Coaching cycle Provide standards-aligned resources for support Facilitate professional learning communities Support collaborative planning Data Collection and analysis for next steps Monitor iStation and SmartyAnts Support school-wide AR process Participate in Instructional Walks |
| Nottage-Dos Santos, Lavieira | School Counselor | Serve on Leadership Team Support students and teachers in ESE process Support MTSS process Serve on SST team Oversee Sanford Harmony Administer required testing for placement |
| Williams, Kasmeyne | Teacher, ESE | Serve on Leadership Team Support ESE process Technology Teacher Leader Data Collection and analysis for next steps |
| Gipson, Azure | Assistant Principal | Instructional Leader Server on Leadership Team and School-based Instructional Team |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|---|
| | | Attend SAC meetings Oversee faculty and staff Handle Discipline and its collection of data for next steps and DOE Reporting Monitor and support the instructional process Support collaborative planning process Participate in Learning Walks. Participate and Facilitate MOU Support implementation of SIP Serve as Title One contact |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/12/2022, Donna Camp

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

15

Total number of students enrolled at the school

251

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

3

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 | 9 | 41 | 44 | 67 | 34 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 251 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 21 | 20 | 24 | 13 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 8 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 26 | 28 | 32 | 12 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |

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 | 9 | 14 | 6 | 15 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |

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 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 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

Tuesday 7/12/2022

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 | 14 | 48 | 57 | 40 | 54 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 272 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 24 | 17 | 15 | 18 | 22 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 |
| One or more suspensions | 5 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 21 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 26 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 23 | 22 | 13 | 24 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 |

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 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 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 | 14 | 48 | 57 | 40 | 54 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 272 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 24 | 17 | 15 | 18 | 22 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 |
| One or more suspensions | 5 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 21 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 26 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 23 | 22 | 13 | 24 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 |

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 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 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 | 33% | 47% | 56% | | | | 36% | 51% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 48% | | | | | | 41% | 51% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 39% | | | | | | 44% | 49% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 33% | 42% | 50% | | | | 44% | 57% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 45% | | | | | | 40% | 56% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 27% | | | | | | 23% | 47% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 44% | 49% | 59% | | | | 34% | 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 | 38% | 52% | -14% | 58% | -20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 29% | 48% | -19% | 58% | -29% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -38% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 30% | 47% | -17% | 56% | -26% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -29% | | | | |

| 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 | 55% | 56% | -1% | 62% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 37% | 56% | -19% | 64% | -27% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -55% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 30% | 51% | -21% | 60% | -30% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -37% | | | | |

| 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 | | 57 | | 6 | 36 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 30 | 57 | 50 | 27 | 43 | 38 | 30 | | | | |
| BLK | 26 | 39 | 31 | 26 | 36 | 20 | 38 | | | | |
| HSP | 26 | 63 | | 21 | 37 | | 35 | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 47 | | 70 | 69 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 46 | 37 | 29 | 44 | 28 | 38 | | | | |

| 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 | | | | 8 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 19 | 62 | | 22 | 38 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 29 | | 28 | 26 | | 32 | | | | |
| HSP | 10 | | | 14 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | | | 60 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 25 | 48 | | 26 | 33 | 40 | 20 | | | | |
| 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 | 25 | 33 | | 31 | 38 | 33 | 36 | | | | |
| ELL | 26 | 42 | 40 | 42 | 39 | 30 | 14 | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 45 | 58 | 42 | 48 | 31 | 22 | | | | |
| HSP | 36 | 39 | | 38 | 26 | | 39 | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | 37 | | 60 | 45 | | 64 | | | | |
| FRL | 33 | 38 | 42 | 43 | 40 | 23 | 33 | | | | |

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 | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 51 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 320 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 25 |
| 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 | 34 |
| 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 | 38 |
| 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 | 61 |
| 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 | 38 |
| 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?

Proficiency rates have remained below 41% in all grade levels in ELA and Math. In 22-23, proficiency was 33% in both ELA and Math. In 20-21" proficiency rates were 29% in ELA, 33% in Math, and 30% in Science. These rates are reflective of all subgroups. The most current ESSA subgroups, shows 2 out of 6 meeting the 41% proficiency requirement.

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

The Math progress monitoring and FSA data (L25% in math learning gains) and ELA and Math Proficiency all demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

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

Contributing factors:

The lack of understanding for full implementation of standards in order to provide equivalent experiences for mastery of benchmarks/standards.

New Actions:

- Weekly planning utilizing the Learning Arc Framework
- RTD implementation with targeted students
- School and district based coaches will model and provide support in all content areas
- Monitoring of effective implementation by the leadership team, with feedback
- Data checks for growth towards benchmarks/standards and set next steps
- Student readiness: before working establish clear roles and responsibilities of expectations
- Teacher monitoring: as students are working, the teacher verifies/tracks if target is being demonstrated
- Daily walkthroughs and collection of artifacts to show effectiveness of teacher instruction/tracking
- Resources: Ready Florida for ELA and Math, Words Their Way, Leveled Literacy Intervention, Corrective Reading, and Number Worlds

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

Based on progress monitoring and 2022 state assessment, the Science component showed the most improvement from 30% to 44%.

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

Contributing factors:

Teacher support from district coach, Learning Arc framework, Use of Response to Date (RTD) resources with targeted students.

New Action:

- Weekly planning utilizing the Learning Arc Framework
- RTD implementation with targeted students
- District based coaches will model and provide support in all content areas
- Monitoring of effective implementation by the leadership team, with feedback
- Data checks for growth towards benchmarks/standards and set next steps
- Student readiness: before working establish clear roles and responsibilities of expectations
- Teacher monitoring: as students are working, the teacher verifies/tracks if target is being demonstrated
- Daily walkthroughs and collection of artifacts to show effectiveness of teacher instruction/tracking

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

To accelerate learning, student accountable talk and collaborative structures will be used to increase student engagement. The gradual release model for distributive practice will support teacher-student ratio of the work to activate the right pacing in learning and frequent the student's opportunities for learning. Along with an increase in providing student with feedback at key points.

- Scaffold intentionally, build knowledge and vocabulary, prioritize the standards, increase guided reading, progress monitor for missed concepts, and the use of Text Sets.
- Corrective Reading strategies to impact reading
- Number Worlds strategies to impact math
- Facilitate sessions to show acceleration of lesson (differentiate where needed)

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.

To support teachers, professional development around instructional practices will be provided. The instructional team will use the coaching cycle and learning walks to observe and model collaborative structures and the gradual release model for best student outcomes. Through the cycles and walks, professional development will be provided. Also through weekly planning sessions feedback will be given to support learning.

- PLCs on Data collection to drive instruction for acceleration, remediation and intervention
- PD and Implementation of BEST Standards and continued unpacking through the use of the Learning Arc Framework
- PD on new Florida Wonders Series for alignment
- PD on new Math Series for alignment
- PLCs on the use of best-researched driven intervention resources
- Create an instructional calendar for Power Hour for acceleration
- Collaborative PLCs to create formatives from data collected samples

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

Additionally to promote sustainability, support staff and teacher-leaders will be used to meet with new teachers, and others to support their growth/process. All teachers will be apart of the planning processes for common goal planning for current and future improvement.

- School and District based coaches to support teachers in new reading and math series

- Teacher Ambassador to support new staff
- Teacher Technology leader to support all staff
- Extended Day Collaborative Planning sessions
- Professional Development for Paraprofessionals on support for students and staff
- School Counselor to support students and staff
- Response To Data implementation
- Extended day tutoring for students

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.

Due to low performance, in all content area this remains a critical focus area. Data from FSA continues to show more than 50% of students are performing below the proficiency level from year to year, as well as 50% or more ESSA groups performing below proficiency. Current F.A.S.T progress monitoring data shows a continuation of more than 50% of students in grades 3rd - 5th performing below proficiency.

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 +7% proficiency increase in all grades/ content as well as 10% of the students just below the proficiency line becoming proficient.
The data usage to measure these outcomes will be, district/state progress monitoring assessments and school-based formative and summative assessments. In addition to data collection, we will monitor the instructional coaching cycles in all content areas and monitor the implementation of instructional practices based on these cycles for an improved impact on student learning.

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 collaborative planning utilizing the Learning Arc Framework.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Donna Camp (donna.camp@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 benchmarks using the Standard Walkthrough Tool.
2. Engage teachers in standards-based planning protocol by continuing the use of the Learning Arc Framework.
To support and monitor alignment, student tasks will be collected and analyze to support this work.

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

Research indicates that student achievement is significantly improved when teachers use effective evidence-based instructional practices to engage students in grade level standards-based equivalent experiences.

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 calendar for Leadership Team calibration walks

Person Responsible Donna Camp (donna.camp@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 2 - Train leadership team on walkthrough tool in first three calibration walks.

Person Responsible Donna Camp (donna.camp@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 3 - Conduct calibration walks until team shows 90-100% calibrated consistency with rationale.

Person Responsible Donna Camp (donna.camp@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 4 - Add SWT data review to every leadership team meeting agenda.

Person Responsible Donna Camp (donna.camp@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 5 - Establish protocol to review data including evidence of SWT

Person Responsible Donna Camp (donna.camp@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 6 - Monitor impact between data review from SWT and planning per content/course/grade level.

Person Responsible Donna Camp (donna.camp@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 1 - Create master schedule that includes intentional collaborative planning.

Person Responsible Azure Gipson (azure.gipson@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 2 - Assign and train planning facilitators

Person Responsible Donna Camp (donna.camp@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 3 - Add planning results findings to leadership team meeting agenda

Person Responsible Donna Camp (donna.camp@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 4 - Conduct planning protocol on a "weekly basis"

Person Responsible Donna Camp (donna.camp@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 5 -Review planning findings during leadership team meetings on a routine basis

Person Responsible Donna Camp (donna.camp@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 6 - Conduct correlation analysis between SWT findings and Benchmarks planned for using Learning Arc

Person Responsible Donna Camp (donna.camp@polk-fl.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS)**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Teachers will implement PBIS strategies and utilize data that will result in positive behavioral outcomes for all students. This Area of Focus will cultivate a safe and positive learning environment where students can be successful at all times. The student tracking forms will be collected monthly to measure the implementation of the program with fidelity. The goal is 80% of students meeting PBIS goals. This form will show a increase of student positive outcomes, as well to identify areas of intervention needs.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

Through this Area of Focus, the school will see a 10% decrease in office referrals in order to increase time on task in the classroom for all students.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored weekly by reviewing Discipline Reports and monthly student PBIS forms.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Azure Gipson (azure.gipson@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Evidence based strategies will include teaching routines, setting high yet clear expectations campus wide for all students by using positive reinforcements.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The school will provide high expectations combined with high level of support that focuses on a positive teacher student relationship.

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 - Implementation of PBIS

Action Step 1 - Create PBIS Calendar of events

Person Responsible Azure Gipson (azure.gipson@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Implementation of PBIS

Action Step 2 - Create student PBIS form.

Person Responsible Azure Gipson (azure.gipson@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Implementation of PBIS

Action Step 3 - Train staff on implementation of PBIS strategies

Person Responsible Azure Gipson (azure.gipson@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Implementation of PBIS

Action Step 4 - Add PBIS data review to leadership team agenda

Person Responsible Donna Camp (donna.camp@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Implementation of PBIS

Action Step 5 - Monitor implementation usage of PBIS strategies in the classroom.

Person Responsible Azure Gipson (azure.gipson@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Implementation of PBIS

Action Step 6 - PBIS team monthly meetings

Person Responsible Azure Gipson (azure.gipson@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Implementation of PBIS

Action Step 7 - Conduct monthly student celebrations

Person Responsible Azure Gipson (azure.gipson@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

This Area of Focus was identified by 2022 progress monitoring data where 50 percent or more of students scored below 24% on the progress monitoring assessment.

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

This Area of Focus was identified by 2022 FSA ELA data where 50 percent or more of students scored below a level 3 on the state 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)

These outcomes will be measured by use of the progress monitoring system. Students scoring 24% or less will decrease by 10%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

These outcomes will be measured by use of the new coordinate system and progress monitoring system. Students making a level 3 or higher will increase by 10%.

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.

Weekly and bi-weekly formative assessments will be given to determine student progress. STAR and progress monitoring will also be used to determine progress and adjustments will be made as needed to ensure student growth. The end of year F.A.S.T assessment will determine yearly growth and impact made on student achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Camp, Donna, donna.camp@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?

Corrective Reading strategies

Activation of Background Knowledge

Make predictions and inferencing

Drawing conclusions through accountable talk

Answer and form explicit and implicit text dependent questions.

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?

These evidence based strategies will give students tools to use to increase their reading comprehension skills.

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 |
|---|--|
| Professional Development/Professional Learning (ongoing) Professional learning will provide teachers with skills and strategies for implementing authentically engaging and aligned tasks. | Camp, Donna, donna.camp@polk-fl.net |
| Literacy Coaching Literacy Coaching sessions will be provided with feedback on implementation of planned lessons to increase student comprehension skills. Coaching cycles will be conducted by site-based and district-based coaches. | |

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 will build a positive school culture and environment by establishing school-wide expectations for all stakeholders in the building on values, dignity and respect for all. As a school community we will provide parents and community partners with opportunities to connect and engage in the decision making for the school through Family Engagement events/meetings. The Winter Haven Community Liaison will be used to increase the community activities and partnerships based on school needs.

The school will communicate openly and timely with families through varied methods concerning school activities and events.

Teachers will be provided academic and behavior resources for classroom success and Professional Learning communities will be created to promote and improve teacher morale.

The school will establish celebrations and awards for students and staff to aid in building a positive school culture.

To build a positive school culture, our school uses the PBIS framework systematically to teach school-wide expectations, centered around respect, kindness, safety, responsibility, and learning. Students and teachers are rewarded for meeting these expectations monthly with incentives and school-wide activities. Also a teacher engagement ambassador on our campus works with new teachers to build sustainability. The monthly PBIS point form is monitored to track outcomes. These steps promote building positive culture and environment.

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

Administration and teachers will model and establish positive routines and expectations that's inclusive for all students. Students will be provided ample opportunities to take ownership of their learning, interact with others, and thrive in their learning to help create a positive environment. Teachers also implement Sanford Harmony to support Social and Emotional Needs of students.

Students will take ownership through the use of their PBIS point form, which is shared with parents daily via the student communication agenda, which will help increase positive school culture and establish a home - school connection.

The Community Liaison, Polk Education Partnership, School Advisory Council and others will meet to collaborate the needs of students and parents to help build the community.