

Polk County Public Schools

Kathleen 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 |

Kathleen Elementary School

3515 SHERETZ RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

Demographics

Principal: Tracie Upton

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2022

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 (37%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (45%) |
| 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 |

Kathleen Elementary School

3515 SHERETZ RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

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 | 53% |

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.

Kathleen Elementary School is committed to collaborating with teachers, staff, parents, guardians, community partners, and students to provide a rigorous, real world learning experience that results in high academic achievement and responsible citizens; within a learning environment that supports equitable opportunities for ALL students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Building Leaders Today, to Change the World Tomorrow!"

Motto: We are Cougar L.E.A.D.E.R.S.

Love Learning, Excel in All We Do, Achieve Goals Together, Do What is Right, Empower Others, Respect Yourself, Smile Every day!

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| Anthony, Adrian | Principal | |
| Upton, Tracie | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal Tracie Upton is the Assistant Principal and helps implement the vision of the instructional leader. As the Assistant Principal Mrs. Rashawn Williams takes an active role in grade level planning sessions, data meetings, and observes teachers to give immediate feedback on teaching practices. |
| Green, Priscilla | Instructional Coach | Priscilla Green serves as the school's Reading Coach. During planning sessions Ms. Ali uses her expertise to help teachers understand the full extent of the ELA standards and gives examples of tasks that will reach the full intent of the standards. In classrooms, Ms. Ali observes teachers and gives suggestions to improve student engagement and rigor. |
| Jeffers, Lindz | Instructional Coach | Instructional Coach Lindz Jeffers serves as the school's STEM Interventionist. Ms. Jeffers uses her expertise to help teachers understand the full intent of the Math and Science standards and models examples of these tasks. In classrooms, Ms. Jeffers observes teachers and gives suggestions to improve students engagement and rigor. She will also be facilitating the use of the Science lab conducting experiments with students based on the curriculum. |
| Armstrong, Nikita | School Counselor | Ms. Nikita Armstrong serves as the school's guidance counselor for all grade levels. She also analyzes academic, behavior, and attendance data to identify areas in need of improvement. With her expertise she gives the team and teachers valuable information on how to meet the social and emotional needs of students. |
| Cooper, Penny | Other | Mrs. Penny Cooper, is the LEA at our school. Mrs. Cooper is the district representative at the school level that helps create and modify student IEPs and 504s. She collaborates with staff and families to ensure students proper services and accommodations. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/14/2022, Tracie Upton

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.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

Total number of students enrolled at the school

507

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

7

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 | 39 | 78 | 76 | 84 | 75 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 420 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 39 | 39 | 30 | 31 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 170 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 15 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 1 | 7 | 22 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 3 | 23 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| 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

Monday 7/25/2022

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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| One or more suspensions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Course failure in ELA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Course failure in Math | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 39% | 47% | 56% | | | | 42% | 51% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 46% | | | | | | 46% | 51% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 32% | | | | | | 53% | 49% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 30% | 42% | 50% | | | | 49% | 57% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 41% | | | | | | 55% | 56% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 36% | | | | | | 45% | 47% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 34% | 49% | 59% | | | | 49% | 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 | 39% | 52% | -13% | 58% | -19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 31% | 48% | -17% | 58% | -27% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -39% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 47% | 4% | 56% | -5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -31% | | | | |

| 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 | 49% | 56% | -7% | 62% | -13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 40% | 56% | -16% | 64% | -24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -49% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 51% | 1% | 60% | -8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -40% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 45% | 6% | 53% | -2% |
| 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 | 21 | 56 | 36 | 9 | 38 | 31 | 8 | | | | |
| ELL | 24 | 50 | | 17 | 48 | | 5 | | | | |
| BLK | 21 | 31 | | 11 | 25 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 34 | 52 | 44 | 25 | 44 | 50 | 14 | | | | |
| WHT | 46 | 46 | 33 | 40 | 43 | 25 | 55 | | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 45 | 33 | 27 | 42 | 43 | 31 | | | | |
| 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 | 9 | 15 | | 15 | 31 | | 9 | | | | |
| ELL | 22 | 50 | | 39 | 42 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 16 | 31 | | 19 | 8 | | 18 | | | | |
| HSP | 22 | 30 | | 30 | 36 | | 24 | | | | |
| WHT | 45 | 37 | | 51 | 38 | | 45 | | | | |
| FRL | 29 | 33 | 36 | 35 | 30 | 18 | 30 | | | | |
| 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 | 20 | 54 | 73 | 22 | 62 | 54 | 9 | | | | |
| ELL | 23 | 37 | | 42 | 35 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 31 | | 31 | 46 | | 30 | | | | |
| HSP | 39 | 50 | 50 | 49 | 51 | 38 | 42 | | | | |
| MUL | 20 | | | 20 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | 48 | 67 | 57 | 63 | 71 | 62 | | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 44 | 54 | 42 | 48 | 44 | 38 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

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

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 39 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 50 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 308 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 28 |
| 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 | 32 |
| 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 | 22 |
| 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 | 39 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| White Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - White Students | 41 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 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?

***Our historical FSA trend data (based o 2018 & 2019) purports that there has been significant growth within the ELA Achievement area among Student with Disabilities (7 to 20), and for English Language Learners from 13 to 23. Additionally, there was significant growth in Math Achievement from Black students (21 to 31). Moreover, the 2019 FSA data asserts that English Language Arts the Lowest 25% was 73 among Student with Disabilities, and White with 67, and Hispanic 50. Within Mathematics learning gains there was significant increase from 12 to 62.

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

Our historical data asserts based on the FSA progress monitoring the greatest need within the area of Math Achievement and has dropped 19 percentage points since the 2018 - 2019 school year.

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

A significant contributing factor is having an Math Coach to support with the Professional Learning Communities and Progress Monitoring Tier 1 implementation and supporting teachers with systematic Tier 2 interventions that are congruent among the grade levels.

The new actions to mitigate this need is to implement a Tiered support to increase achievement in the form of Systematic Fluency and error analysis with Number World, REFLEX, FRECKLE with the new BEST Benchmarks and Progress Monitoring the fidelity of the Master Schedule.

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

The data that demonstrated the most improvement based on the 2021-2022 overall achievement proficiency within ELA and learning gains with ELA

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

A significant contributing factors for the areas of ELA improvement was implementing systematic Tier 2 interventions that are congruent among the grade levels. The new ELA actions implemented a Tiered support to increase achievement in the form of Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words (SIPPS). Providing professional development on Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and progress monitor the fidelity of support within each Tier.

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

A systematic approach to Professional Learning Communities in the form of Learning Arc. Additionally, we will use resources such as SIPPS to support phonics, phonemic awareness, and vocabulary within English Language Arts and Reflex to support Math Fluency and Number World to support mathematic proficiency.

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.

Kathleen Elementary School will have several professional development opportunities in the summer. The first training will be held to prepare teachers on Learning Arc, Reflex, and SIPPS. The second training will be a 3-day training to review the school grade including ELA proficiency, Learning Gains, and Lowest 23% learning gains, and Math proficiency, Learning Gains, and Lowest 23% learning gains, and Science. Moreover, this will include a review of Science and the connections to ELA and Math. The 3-day training interventions, and remediation through the Multi Tiered Systems of Support for students. Finally, we discussed systems for Response To Data.

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

Based on our Transformation status we are projected to have two additional days of planning. Additionally, with Unisig funding we are projecting to hire a ELA interventionist and a Math Interventionist.

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 Professional Learning Communities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on the deficit in mathematics proficiency (-9 %) and the decrease in ELA Lowest 25% learning gains (-1%) we have identified Instructional Practices within Professional Learning Communities as a Critical need.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is +1% proficiency in the Areas of mathematics and English Language Arts.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring data offered by district level assessment platforms will be used to ensure students are mastering Benchmarks being taught after planning is properly implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tracie Upton (tracie.upton@polk-fl.net)

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

1. Engage teachers in standards-based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework.
2. Monitor students engaging in equivalent experiences aligned to state expectations using SWT.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

TNTP's The Opportunity Myth speaks to the relationship between academic success and ensuring students are able to engage in grade level standards-based expectations. It is imperative we both monitor for aligned 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.

Learning Arc Training - Tier 1 during Pre-Planning, Tier 2 during Professional Learning Community, and Tier 3 1:1 with students needing support.

Weekly Learning Arc Trainings 1,2,3,4 & 4, 6, 7

Person Responsible

Adrian Anthony (adrian.anthony@polk-fl.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Staff and Student Relationships**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on the increase in student referrals (+100) we defined Positive Culture and Environment as a critical need.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to reduce the overall Behavioral referrals by (-50) by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Reorganized PBIS - Monthly
New Structure Staff Newsletters - Weekly
Principal Community Call - Weekly
Redefined Staff Committee Structure - Monthly
New PTA - Monthly
Revamp Multi Tiered Systems of Support - Weekly
Revised Duty Schedule - Daily

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adrian Anthony (adrian.anthony@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is based on rewarding students for appropriate behavior is a more positive and proactive strategy than negative, reactive approaches (Smith, 2019)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

We will implement Positive Behavior Intervention Strategies as a three-tiered, proactive approach to establishing the behavioral supports and social culture needed for all students to achieve social, emotional, and academic success (Sugai, 2003) in conjunction with the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.

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.

Creating systems around the reorganization of PBIS
Reorganizing systems of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support

Person Responsible

Tracie Upton (tracie.upton@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

Explicit instruction of phonics and phonemic awareness using Heggerty in KG and SIPPS in 1st and 2nd grades.

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

Explicit instruction of fluency and reading comprehension using SIPPS in 3rd-5th grades.

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 will increase our K-5 reading proficiency through a focus on primary grades (K-2) with phonics/ phonemic awareness and fluency.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

We will increase fluency and reading comprehension K-5 by 3%-5% in reading proficiency.

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.

Data will be reviewed in weekly or biweekly PLC meetings to ensure growth is being made towards goal. Literacy Leadership team will monitor implementation of SIPPS and Heggerty through random classroom walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Anthony, Adrian, adrian.anthony@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 strategy being implemented is to use data analysis (formative and summative) to identify instructional weaknesses and strengths using SIPPS and Heggerty. ie: SIPPS and Heggerty meet the BEST standards and are strong programs that will increase reading proficiency.

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?

The evidence-based programs including Heggerty and SIPPS have actively addressed the identified need of ELA Proficiency growth and have shown a proven record of effectiveness for the target population.

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 |
|--|--|
| <p>1. Professional Learning will address the need for literacy proficiency by providing a process for analyzing the BEST Benchmarks and task alignment.</p> <p>2. Literacy Coaching will be conducted with teachers based on a multi-tiered systems of support (Tier 1 - All Teachers through Professional Learning Communities, Tier 2 Interventions, Tier 3 Remediation of Literacy Benchmarks and Expectations.</p> | Green, Priscilla, priscilla.green@polk-fl.net |
| Literacy Coaching | Green, Priscilla, priscilla.green@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.

Kathleen Elementary School is building a positive school culture and environment that reflects student achievement by investing in hiring the best and brightest staff members. Our new collective vision and mission centers around building student and staff leaders that focus on achievement. The school is creating a theme for the year that focus on teamwork, achievement, equity and diversity in a supportive school environment. The culture will focus on consulting various stakeholder including community business leaders, community churches, colleges, universities, social agencies, and the Parent Teacher association.

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

Kathleen Elementary School has ranked low for school incidents with the ranking of #512 out of 1395 students two years ago. Additionally, the five year trend from 2014 - 2019 has been a downward slope, resulting in a decrease in property incidents and drugs/public order. However, last school year we have noticed an increase in total referrals including bus referrals resulting in Total Referrals 2020-21 (195) and Total Referrals 2021-22 (309) an increase of 114. Our primary focus is to decrease the incidents of violence and monitor drug related incidents. The school is implementing a robust Multi-Tiered Systems of support including Trauma Informed Care, CHAMPS systems, and Positive Behavior Intervention Systems. Additionally, we are creating a culture and climate that promotes healthy choices through American Sign Language, Classroom Dojo SEL, and Red Ribbon Week.