

Polk County Public Schools

Lake Shipp 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lake Shipp Elementary School

250 CAMELLIA DR, Winter Haven, FL 33880

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

Demographics

Principal: Kathy Raub

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: D (34%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (49%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lake Shipp Elementary School

250 CAMELLIA DR, Winter Haven, FL 33880

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

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 Lake Shipp Elementary, we will foster a learning environment that helps students understand the purpose of learning while actively engaged in student centered activities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision:

At Lake Shipp Elementary students are educated through a collaborative team consisting of parents, school staff, peers, and the community to become lifelong learners. Children take risks and become productive and innovative without fear of failure; their gifts and talents are recognized and celebrated.

MOTTO:

Be Responsible
Be Respectful
Be Safe

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
Raub, Kathryn	Principal	Ensure that academic policies and curriculum are followed, enforcing discipline when necessary, helping teachers reach their teaching potential, meeting with parents, students, and community leaders to discuss school concerns, and the daily operation of the school.
Perry, Tamara	Assistant Principal	Ensure that academic policies and curriculum are followed, enforcing discipline when necessary, helping teachers reach their teaching potential, meeting with parents and students to discuss school concerns
Mason, Malissa	Teacher, K-12	Follow the math curriculum and help all students reach their maximum potential. Be a leader and a voice for their grade level.
Spencer, Artesha	School Counselor	Provide social skills lessons to all children. Work with small groups of children based on needs. Work with teachers on the MTSS process and help children get the help they need.
Anglin, Takeria	Teacher, K-12	Follow the math curriculum and help all students reach their maximum potential. Be a leader and a voice for their grade level.
Dampier, Misty	Teacher, K-12	Follow the curriculum and help all students reach their maximum potential. Be a leader and a voice for their grade level.
Hughes, Catherine	Teacher, K-12	Follow the music curriculum and help all students reach their maximum potential. Be a leader and a voice for their grade level.
Scott, Kyria	Teacher, K-12	Follow the ELA and social studies curriculum and help all students reach their maximum potential. Be a leader and a voice for their grade level.
Sierra, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Follow the ELA and social studies curriculum and help all students reach their maximum potential. Be a leader and a voice for their grade level.
Tate, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Follow the curriculum and help all students reach their maximum potential. Be a leader and a voice for their grade level.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Kathy Raub

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

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

540

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.

7

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	106	96	102	107	92	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	589
Attendance below 90 percent	47	44	44	41	37	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	245
One or more suspensions	13	22	12	16	15	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	40	37	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	40	24	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	50	39	65	42	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	233

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	19	25	24	22	35	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180

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	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
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 7/13/2022

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	87	103	81	88	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	431
Attendance below 90 percent	0	30	28	22	27	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	4	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
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	28	56	25	44	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181

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	16	28	10	28	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	87	103	81	88	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	431
Attendance below 90 percent	0	30	28	22	27	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	4	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
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	28	56	25	44	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	181

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	16	28	10	28	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	

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	40%	47%	56%				49%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	50%						52%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						47%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	36%	42%	50%				53%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	28%						58%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	23%						68%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	17%	49%	59%				42%	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	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	47%	0%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

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	58%	56%	2%	62%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	47%	56%	-9%	64%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	51%	-3%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	40%	45%	-5%	53%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	13	21		21	10	8	8				
ELL	23	48		19	23						
BLK	35	53	29	28	22	21	11				
HSP	33	51	67	37	33	20	17				
MUL	33			7							
WHT	58	46		51	30		31				
FRL	38	50	41	30	26	25	18				
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				4	40						
ELL	30	38		26	33		31				
BLK	41	26		25	12		6				
HSP	25	28		26	41		32				
WHT	57	29		50	29		50				
FRL	37	22	10	23	24	50	17				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	26	47	45	26	67	70					
ELL	26	36		47	46						
BLK	44	57	40	42	65	75	40				
HSP	39	41	45	55	58		41				
MUL	40			40							
WHT	62	54		62	49		45				
FRL	49	51	50	50	56	65	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	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	286
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	14
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	27
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	28
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	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	20
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	43
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	35
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?

Our students in all grade levels are not reaching proficiency in reading or math. ELA- 3rd 47%, 4th-42%, 5th- 34%. Math 3rd- 44%, 4th- 45%, 5th- 12%. Learning gains are not being made and our lowest 25% are performing lower than they were the previous year. Learning gains ELA- 4th- 33%, 5th- 52% and Math 4th- 46%, 5th- 10%. Lowest 25% ELA- 4th- 39%, 5th- 42% and Math 4th- 48%, 5th- 5%.

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

ELA and Math Proficiency

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

Lack of appropriate planning to address the standards, little to no small group instruction in math, and the lesson/product does not fully address the standards. We will provide professional development in small group instruction, planning with the end product in mind, appropriate monitoring of classroom instruction. These professional development opportunities will be provided by District Coaches or administration.

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

None of our areas showed improvement from last years data. Data from FSA shows a drop of 7% or more for all grades/content areas. Although with progress monitoring, students in 3rd and 4th grade were showing an increase in proficiency throughout the year.

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

We focused on small group instruction with the classroom teachers, Title One paras, and Americorp Volunteers.

We added more support in 3rd grade for small group instruction.

Planning with the Arc Framework- focusing on BEST Standards

Walkthrough Tool for Monitoring- based on the feedback given to teachers this will help us identify the Tier1 and Tier 2 teachers and their instructional needs.

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

Planning with the Arc Framework

Walkthrough Tool for Monitoring

Small Group Instruction

Using data to drive instruction

These strategies will be used for acceleration by identifying students that are meeting or exceeding expectations and teachers will create or use more complex task based on the benchmark for these students.

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.

Training for coaches and school leaders on the Learning Arc Framework and Walkthrough Monitoring Tool.

Professional development on small group instruction and using data to drive instruction.

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

Insure that Inclusion Teachers and ELL Teachers are using research based strategies during push ins. Additional small group instruction for the lowest 25% of our students in ELA with the Title One paras and AmeriCorps volunteers. Provide after school tutoring for our students in need of additional support.

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 FSA shows a loss of 12% proficiency from 3rd to 4th grade ELA and all areas of math proficiency are +1% or staying the same.

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 +5% proficiency increase for all grades/content areas as well as a 10% of the students just below the proficiency line becoming proficient.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly walkthroughs using the District Standards Walkthrough Tool will be used to measure planning and teacher effectiveness to ensure students are mastering Benchmarks being taught after planning is properly implemented. The teacher effectiveness will be measured by the data analysis of the FAST and STAR Progress monitoring.

**Person responsible
for monitoring
outcome:**

Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

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

1. Monitor classroom instruction using the Standards Walkthrough Tool. This tool will help show whether or not students are engaged in equitable experiences based on the state standards.
2. Engage teachers in standards based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework.
3. During MOU planning, Inclusion teachers and ELL paras are provided support with understanding the BEST standards and how to support their students. Additional professional support is available based on individual needs.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

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

The Opportunity Myth speaks to the relationship between academic success and ensuring that every student should have access to grade-appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and teachers with high expectations, every day, in every class—regardless of their race, ethnicity, or any other part of their identity. It is imperative that we monitor for alignment and plan for teacher's 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.

1. Standards Walkthrough Monitoring Tool

Create calendar for leadership team calibration walks.

Person Responsible Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

1. Standards Walkthrough Monitoring Tool

Train leadership team on walkthrough tool in the first two calibration walks.

Person Responsible Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

1. Standards Walkthrough Monitoring Tool

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

Person Responsible Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

1. Standards Walkthrough Monitoring Tool

Add SWT data review to every leadership team meeting agenda.

Person Responsible Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

1. Standards Walkthrough Monitoring Tool

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

Person Responsible Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

2. Planning with the Learning Arc Framework

Create master schedule that includes intentional collaborative planning.

Person Responsible Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

2. Planning with the Learning Arc Framework

Assign and train planning facilitators

Person Responsible Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

2. Planning with the Learning Arc Framework

Add planning results findings to the leadership team meeting agenda.

Person Responsible Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

2. Planning with the Learning Arc Framework

Conduct planning protocol on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

2. Planning with the Learning Arc Framework

Conduct correlation analysis between SWT findings and Benchmarks planned for using the Learning Arc.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to attendance and discipline referrals

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Having a positive school environment continues to be an area to improve on. Discipline issues and absenteeism on the campus contributed to low student attendance and a decrease in student achievement. Time was taken from classroom instruction and redirected to classroom issues with students. The high number of days absent directly related to the time students received quality classroom instruction. In 2021-22 students missed a total of 11,524 days due to absences, 291 of those days are a result of suspensions resulting from discipline issues on campus.

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

To increase the percentage of students in attendance 90% of the time from 87% to 90% and to decrease the discipline referrals by 20% (581-465). This will increase the time students receive standards based instruction in the classroom.

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

Discipline/PBIS Team will meet monthly to monitor student discipline reports and to make adjustments to the school discipline plan and/or PBIS plan as needed. Office staff will run monthly reports of absences and share with administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tamara Perry (tamara.perry@polk-fl.net)

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

Sanford Harmony Kits- social emotional learning program
 PBIS - Monthly staff professional development (2x10, 3:1 ratio, etc.) to help build relationships between staff and students to help improve student attendance. When students have a positive culture/school experience they want to attend daily.
 MTSS

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

Sanford Harmony provides educators the tools to foster social connections among all students, and to support the social, emotional, and cognitive skills students need to successfully negotiate peer interactions, develop positive peer relationships, and thrive in school. PBIS seeks to improve school climate, reduce discipline issues, and support academic achievement. MTSS is a framework that we use to provide targeted support to struggling students, the goal is to intervene early so students can catch up with their peers.

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.

1. School Wide Discipline Plan
 Train staff on the school wide discipline plan

Person Responsible Tamara Perry (tamara.perry@polk-fl.net)

1. School Wide Discipline Plan

Add discipline data review to every Discipline/PBIS monthly meeting.

Person Responsible Tamara Perry (tamara.perry@polk-fl.net)

1. School Wide Discipline Plan

Establish protocol to review discipline data.

Person Responsible Tamara Perry (tamara.perry@polk-fl.net)

1. School Wide Discipline Plan

Monitor impact between data review of discipline and interventions for students with discipline concerns.

Person Responsible Tamara Perry (tamara.perry@polk-fl.net)

2. PBIS Framework

Create master schedule of PBIS events.

Person Responsible Tamara Perry (tamara.perry@polk-fl.net)

2. PBIS Framework

Train staff on the PBIS framework.

Person Responsible Tamara Perry (tamara.perry@polk-fl.net)

2. PBIS Framework

Add PBIS data review to every Discipline/PBIS monthly meeting

Person Responsible Tamara Perry (tamara.perry@polk-fl.net)

2. PBIS Framework

Establish protocol to review PBIS data at each meeting

Person Responsible Tamara Perry (tamara.perry@polk-fl.net)

2 PBIS Framework

Make adjustments to the PBIS framework as needed and plan interventions for those that it is not helping.

Person Responsible Tamara Perry (tamara.perry@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

Engage teachers in standards based planning utilizing the Learning Arc Framework. Based on the data collected from the end of the year screening 42% of the students in kindergarten, 23% of the students in 1st grade and 45% of the students in 2nd grade are below proficiency.

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

Engage teachers in standards based planning utilizing the Learning Arc Framework. Solicit coaching advice from the State Regional Literacy Directors on other ways to increase proficiency in 3rd-5th grade. Based on the data collected from the FSA 53% of the students in 3rd grade, 58% of the students in 4th grade and 66% of the students in 5th grade are below proficiency.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

We expect for our kindergarten students to increase 2% in ELA (58%-60%), our 1st grade to increase proficiency by 2% in ELA (77%-79%), and our 2nd grade to increase 2% in ELA (55%-57%). This will be monitored utilizing the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

We expect to for our 3rd grade students to increase 3% in ELA (47%-50%), our 4th grade to increase 8% in ELA (42%-50%), and our 5th grade to increase 16% in ELA (34%-50%). This will be documented by utilizing the new statewide assessment for ELA.

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.

Progress monitoring data will be collected using the District Standards Walkthrough Tool and will be reviewed to ensure students are mastering Benchmarks being taught after planning is properly implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Raub, Kathryn, kathryn.raub@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 Learning Arc model plans with the end in mind. Tasks and assessments are looked at to ensure that the benchmarks are taught to the full intent in each grade level.

Small group instruction will also be implemented to address the individual needs of each student. Providing additional assistance will be done by the classroom teacher, Title One paras and AmeriCorps volunteers.

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?

It is imperative that we monitor for alignment and plan for teacher's understanding of the Benchmarks and aligned tasks and assessments.

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
Create a monitoring calendar for leadership team calibration walks. Train the leadership team on the monitoring tool during the first two calibration walks. Continue to walk until the team shows 90-100% calibrated consistency with rationale.	Raub, Kathryn, kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net
Add SWT data review to every leadership team meeting agenda. Establish data review criteria to use when meeting.	
Monitor impact between data review from SWT and planning per content/course/grade level. Make adjustments to the planning process as needed.	

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 has student agendas that are used to communicate with parents/guardians on a daily basis as well as a weekly parent communication folder. The folder will be sent home every Wednesday with important information for parents as well as weekly student work. A monthly newsletter will be sent home at the beginning of each month with information about upcoming events as well as activities taking place on campus. Class Dojo is used in all classrooms to communicate with parents, instantly share messages, updates, and photos from their class. It is the easiest way to share how children are doing at school and to get in touch with teachers. Four nights are planned this year to invite parents on campus. Our Annual Title Open House will be in September to allow parents to come talk with teachers and visit their child's classroom and school environment. Three other nights are planned; reading, math, and science. At these

nights we will showcase what are children are doing in these areas and share ways for parents to help their child at home.

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

The faculty at Lake Shipp is one of the first stakeholders our parents see. We will promote a positive learning environment and establish open lines of communication in many ways. The parents and students are another important stakeholder. It is the parent's job to show how exciting and useful learning can be. We have dates set aside for them to join us on campus and see what their children are learning, how to help their child at home, and just to spend a little time with us to learn new things. Our students have ideas about what creates a learning environment that is supportive. Our community partners that serve on our SAC Committee are also very important. We meet quarterly to discuss the school happening, data, concerns, and what they can do to help support our school community. Community Members can help provide mentors, volunteers, sponsorships, and donations to help develop a positive school culture. Another great stakeholder is our Winter Haven Community Liaison. Through this position we have been able to offer many services to our school family. He has partnered with Polk Vision to offer the Know & Grow Program to our parents and students, he has helped us secure a mobile wellness and vaccine clinic to come to our school, as well as provide food for families in need and help in securing incentives for our staff and students.