Wendell Watson Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Wendell Watson Elementary School

6800 WALT WILLIAMS RD, Lakeland, FL 33809

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

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Burgess

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2016

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)	84%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (48%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Wendell Watson Elementary School

6800 WALT WILLIAMS RD, Lakeland, FL 33809

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

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	84%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

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

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.

Wendell Watson Elementary school in partnership with family and community will provide rigorous instruction for ALL students as we prepare them for a successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students will become life longlearners through rigorous learning experiences at Wendell Watson Elementary.

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
Burgess, Kelly	Principal	Principal Kelly Burgess leads instruction, school improvement, school safety, and provides management of all school functions. She leads observations, evaluations, professional development and data reviews. Mrs. Burgess works with PTA and SAC. Student data is monitored and analyzed through data chats and collaborative planning.
Poe-Liburd, Tanya	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Tanya Liburd serves as textbook manager, testing coordinator, and leads discipline. She works closely with the school PBIS team to analyze school data. She provides teachers with classroom management support. She monitors instruction through daily walkthroughs and provides frequent forms of feedback.
Long, Megan	Reading Coach	Megan Long, Reading Coach, provides professional development on effective instructional strategies and the implementation of rigorous reading instruction as it pertains to Florida Standards. She provides daily support to teachers, models lessons as needed and assists teachers with standards-based lesson planning.
Oglesby, Melanie	Math Coach	Melanie Oglesby, Math Coach, provides professional development on effective instructional strategies and the implementation of rigorous math instruction as it pertains to Florida Standards. She provides daily support to teachers, models lessons as needed and assists teachers with standards-based lesson planning.
Alexander, Melissa	Reading Coach	Melissa Alexander, Reading Coach, provides professional development on effective instructional strategies and the implementation of rigorous reading instruction as it pertains to Florida Standards. She provides daily support to teachers, models lessons as needed and assists teachers with standards-based lesson planning.
Martin, Nicole	Other	Nicole Martin, Interventionist, provides intensive remediation through small group instruction. She analyzes data with the classroom teachers to scaffold instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.
Vandersteen, Michelle	School Counselor	Michelle Vandersteen analyzes and monitors Tier 2 and Tier 3 data and assists with parent conferences. She provides support for students that need social and emotional support.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/1/2016, Kelly Burgess

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

Total number of students enrolled at the school

870

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

8

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

11

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	134	139	167	138	128	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	858
Attendance below 90 percent	47	53	35	36	35	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242
One or more suspensions	6	6	5	6	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	8	8	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	4	4	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	27	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	27	26	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	8	10	12	21	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	3	12	25	18	15	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

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	6	11	17	25	20	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/20/2022

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	117	148	142	122	131	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	800
Attendance below 90 percent	15	28	30	19	31	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
One or more suspensions	1	4	3	8	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	1	8	9	7	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in Math	1	3	0	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	25	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	25	32	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	23	57	32	45	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	212

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	1	13	20	16	21	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123

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	12	12	11	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
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	117	148	142	122	131	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	800
Attendance below 90 percent	15	28	30	19	31	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
One or more suspensions	1	4	3	8	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	1	8	9	7	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in Math	1	3	0	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	25	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	25	32	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	23	57	32	45	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	212

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	1	13	20	16	21	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123

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	12	12	11	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
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	51%	47%	56%				59%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%						60%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	27%						54%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	50%	42%	50%				58%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	56%						63%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						47%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	49%	59%				67%	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	59%	52%	7%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	48%	3%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					
	2019	60%	47%	13%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

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	47%	56%	-9%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	50%	56%	-6%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2022					
	2019	64%	51%	13%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	65%	45%	20%	53%	12%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

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
2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	16	32	22	15	36	43	18				
ELL	33	32	20	39	48	46					
BLK	33	35	9	25	52	60	18				
HSP	45	51	27	49	49	40	36				
MUL	50			50							
WHT	60	59	37	57	61	57	63				
FRL	45	49	21	40	52	50	39				

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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	19	38	30	20	44		24				
ELL	27	29	20	29	41		7				
BLK	39	27		23	36		31				
HSP	47	52	33	49	52	55	50				
MUL	54			62							
WHT	60	59		56	71	79	61				
FRL	48	51	37	41	56	65	47				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	16	30	32	20	35	34	28				
ELL	33	47	46	33	50	50	29				
BLK	34	49	47	46	47	29	43				
HSP	53	49	44	51	57	44	53				
MUL	57	40		50	70						
WHT	69	69	61	65	70	56	82				
FRL	47	55	52	48	58	49	51				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
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	33
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	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	56
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	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

When comparing the ELA FSA scores from 2022 to 2021, the number of third and fourth grade students that scored at or above proficiency increased. The number of fifth grade students scoring at or above proficiency had a fifteen percentage drop. Therefore, the overall number of students scoring proficient in ELA went down. In math, both third and fourth grade students scoring at or above proficiency also went up. Again, the students in fifth grade had a fifteen percentage drop. Fifth grade also had the greatest number of ESE students. These students are not closing the gap.

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

The greatest need for improvement is in fifth grade. These students had the largest decline in the number of students scoring at or above the proficient level. Fifth grade students declined in both ELA and Math. This grade level also had low STAR scores during the mid-year and spring progress monitoring. They scored about three percentage point lower on the FSA than on the STAR progress monitoring in the spring. The ESE subgroup had the lowest number of students scoring at or above 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?

This grade level had two beginning teachers, one teacher that transferred from out of state, and two the moved from another grade level. There was only one teacher that had taught fifth grade the prior year. The teachers all remained in fifth grade. They are now departmentalized. The ESE teachers working with fifth grade have changed. The teachers are planning with the fifth grade teachers in order to have a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T. Standards. They are focusing on using fifth grade materials while supporting students learning through scaffolding and using high yield instructional strategies. The

teachers are participating in deconstructing the standards to focus on the full intent of the standard and the state expectations for what students should be able to do.

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

The number of third grade students scoring at or above proficiency increased in both ELA and Math. This grade level showed an increase in the number of students scoring proficient at each of the progress monitoring points.

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

This grade level collaboratively planned twice a week. They worked with the Reading and Math coach when developing rigorous tasks. They also used formative assessments in ELA and Math. The teachers used this data to create small groups. This data was also tracked by the reading and math coach during monthly data chats. Instructional adjustments were made quicker last year.

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

To accelerate learning, teachers will need to provide grade appropriate assignments to all students. Teachers will need to provide scaffolding throughout the lesson while maintaining a level of productive struggle. Teachers will need to provide small group instruction based on the students individual needs. Student tasks will need to align to the B.E.S.T. standard.

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.

Teachers are going to participate in professional development focused on deconstructing the standards. Teachers will discuss the B.E.S.T. standards during planning. They will create learning targets based on the standards. They will then create tasks aligned to those targets.

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

The math and reading coach will assist new teachers. Depending on the level of support, the coaches will use the coaching cycle to assist teachers with classroom management and instructional strategies. Collaborative planning will take place on a weekly basis to ensure student tasks are rigorous and aligned to the B.E.S.T. Standard. Leadership team and administration will conduct weekly Standards Based Walk throughs. These walks will focus on Standards Based instruction.

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.	The area of focus is utilizing the Learning Arc for planning and student task creation. This focus is important as the student tasks need to be aligned to the B.E.S.T. Standards. This focus has a direct impact on student success. Teachers need to plan using the Learning Arc Framework in order to deconstruct the standards. This will lead to targets and objectives that are aligned to the full intent of the standard. The teachers will then match the materials and tasks in order to create rigorous tasks for students that are fully aligned to the standards.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The measurable outcome is to increase the students score proficient in math and ELA by five percentage points.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Administration will meet with teachers on a weekly basis in order to lead planning and the utilization of the Learning Arc. The administrators will conduct weekly walks utilizing the Standards Based Instruction tool. Students will participate in FAST Progress Monitoring throughout the year. Data chats will be held throughout the year to monitor student progress. Reading and Math coach and School counselor will meet with teachers to review progress and change interventions as needed. Teachers will use formative and summative assessments to monitor student learning. The use of Freckle, iStation and AR will be utilized also.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Burgess (kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The evidence-based strategy includes deconstruction of the new B.E.S.T. Standards. The utilization of the Learning Arc for planning. The use of formative and summative assessments to guide instruction. Targeted small group instruction in math and ELA. Tasks aligned to the standards. Nicole Martin, Reading Interventionist will provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 support for students identified with needs from the formative and summative assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the	Increasing student engagement has a direct impact on students success. By providing opportunities for students to complete engaging tasks that are directly aligned to the standard will increase student engagement. The Learning Arc will give teachers an opportunity to deconstruct the standards and determine how to create tasks that are aligned. Teachers will progress monitor using formative and summative assessments in

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

order to provide targeted instruction. That will close the learning gap between subgroups.

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.

Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions led by the administration. The instructional coaches, Melanie Oglesby, Melissa Alexander and Megan Long will provide resources for the teachers to utilize for student tasks. Teachers will also review formative assessments to drive whole group and small group instruction.

Person Responsible   Kelly Burgess (kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net)

Leadership team will participate in weekly Standards Based Instruction walks. The administration will train the leadership team on how to use the tool. The team will then conduct correlation analysis between the SBI findings and benchmarks planned for using Arc.

Person Responsible   Kelly Burgess (kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The instructional practice for K-2 grade is implementation of foundational skills. The teachers will use the Learning Arc to deconstruct the foundational skills in Reading/ELA. This focus is important as students that have been identified by the STAR assessment as needing Intervention or Urgent intervention lack strong foundational skills. This focus has a direct impact on student success. Students need to be able to decode words in order to read grade level text and comprehend.

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

Teachers will use close reading and writing strategies to assist students with understanding the text. Students will engage in daily tasks that require them to read, write and explain their answers. Teachers will also teach academic vocabulary. Students need lots of opportunities to respond to text in a variety of ways.

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)

Last year, there were 54% of the first grade students still in STAR Early Literacy in the spring assessment. This year the students still in STAR Early at the end of first grade will decrease by 20%. Second grade will have 40% of the students scoring below proficient on the new FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Fifth grade will increase the number of students scoring proficient by 10%. Last year the number of students scoring proficient in fifth grade was 39%.

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.

Administration will meet with teachers on a weekly basis for collaborative planning. Teachers will use formative and summative assessments to monitor student learning which will be reviewed during collaborative plannign.
Students will participate in FAST Progress Monitoring throughout the year. Data chats will be held throughout the year to monitor student progress. Reading and Math coach and School counselor will meet with teachers to review progress and change interventions as needed. The use of Freckle, iStation and AR will be utilized also.

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

Burgess, Kelly, kelly.burgess@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. §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?

Teachers kindergarten through second grade will use Florida Wonders Phonics to teach foundational B.E.S.T. Standards. Teachers will use STAR Targeted interventions to create lessons for students to practice their foundational skills. Third through fifth grade teachers will use Florida Wonders and the B.E.S.T. Standards to use the close reading strategy.

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?

Florida Wonders is the district reading program that is aligned to the B.E.S.T. Standards. This resource is used by all teachers. It provides a systematic approach for foundational skills. The text in Florida Wonders is on the Lexile level for each grade.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Teachers will participate in collaborative planning with Literacy coaches and administration.	Burgess, Kelly, kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net
Teachers will use formative and summative assessments to monitor progress. Monthly data chats will be held to discuss students progress and identify targeted interventions. Literacy teachers will meet with new teachers to provide coaching support through modeling and reviewing data.	Poe-Liburd, Tanya, tanya.poe-liburd@polk-fl.net
Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative Professional Learning Committees. Teachers will work with Literacy Coaches and administration to deconstruct B.E.S.T. standards.	Burgess, Kelly, kelly.burgess@polk-fl.net

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Our school motto is Soar to 8. Our PBIS Committee meets monthly to discuss what is going well and ways in which we can improve our school culture and environment. The PBIS committee also develops our monthly rewards for those students who SOAR on a daily basis. The committee is comprised of teachers and members of the leadership team. Everyday students work to earn 8 points and at the end of the month if the student has earned 80% of his/her monthly points, they are rewarded. This SOAR reward is highly promoted by the staff. Parents are also involved because they check their child's agenda daily to see how many points their child earned. Families and teachers are working together to help their children exude positive behaviors in school. In addition to monthly SOAR rewards, we recognize an "Eagle of the Month" from each classroom. Teachers nominate one student from their class who has been a positive role model for their classmates and showed SOAR throughout the month. These students are then recognized during their lunch period at the end of the month and eat lunch with a member of the leadership team. Their pictures are also posted in the cafeteria for the entire month. Staff members and administrators also pass out "high 5's" to classes who are walking in a quiet, straight line throughout the campus. This has a positive impact on our school culture because students have to work together as a team to earn this reward. They begin to build each other up and remind one another to follow the expectations so they can all be rewarded.

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

Parents serve on the school SAC Committee. They are active participants in the school PTA. Our stakeholders assist with writing and reviewing the Parent Family and Engagement Plan.