

Polk County Public Schools

Eagle Lake 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

Eagle Lake Elementary School

400 CRYSTAL BEACH RD, Eagle Lake, FL 33839

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

Demographics

Principal: Heather Linn

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 (39%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: B (55%)
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

Eagle Lake Elementary School

400 CRYSTAL BEACH RD, Eagle Lake, FL 33839

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

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	63%

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.

We, at Eagle Lake Elementary, supported by family and community, are committed to teaching a meaningful curriculum in a safe, positive learning environment, where students will be respectful, productive, and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Eagle Lake Elementary School is to become a healthy community of learners that develops high performing students with an emphasis on collaboration, involving families, staff members, and school community.

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
Hardesty, Bradley	Principal	Mr. Hardesty will lead, facilitate and support the leadership team which will meet weekly. The roles/functions of the Leadership Team will include the collection and analysis of data, contribute to and review/revise the School Improvement Plan, plan professional development opportunities, and share overall happenings from each member of the team to continue monitoring for student achievement. Each member of the team will serve the staff in their designated area of assignments, for example, Administration and/or coaches will lead the staff during professional developments and/or PLCs.
Reimer, Dr. Ruth	Assistant Principal	Dr. Reimer will lead and support the staff in promoting a safe and secure learning environment through the continuation of the PBIS/PS-Rtl behavior implementation plan. A specific focus on discipline and parent communication is the major responsibilities of the assistant principal. Dr. Reimer will also oversee district progress monitoring and state assessment administration.
Jimenez, Maria	School Counselor	Our School Counselor will facilitate and support teacher implementation of PS-Rtl/MTSS processes. Ms. Jimenez will counsel small group, and/or individual students regarding social emotional wellness and behavioral needs. She will also oversee the utilization and implementation of the Sanford Harmony (school-wide social emotional curriculum) at Eagle Lake Elementary.
Murphy, Amy	Instructional Coach	Ms. Murphy will lead and support the implementation of the literacy curriculum and data for Kindergarten through fifth grade in conjunction with collaborative planning and professional learning communities (PLCs). She will also provide instructional supports to teachers through the utilization of the coaching cycle.
Labonte, Jenny	Other	Mrs. Labonte will work effectively within systems, understand and support decision-making processes, and ensure implementation and completion district and school initiatives. The LEA will also inspire and mobilize colleagues to achieve goals and support through implementation plans.
Bowen, Tanya	Instructional Coach	
Graske, Natasja	Parent Engagement Liaison	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/14/2022, Heather Linn

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

0

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

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

705

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

10

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

9

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	94	119	115	84	111	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	633
Attendance below 90 percent	33	52	50	26	42	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	248
One or more suspensions	5	15	15	7	19	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
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	34	48	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	29	25	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	36	69	68	31	33	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	262

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	18	26	36	15	40	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202

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	1	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
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

Thursday 7/14/2022

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	104	100	78	112	116	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	599
Attendance below 90 percent	0	35	21	31	36	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	8	4	10	16	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Course failure in ELA	0	7	4	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in Math	0	5	3	13	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	31	41	33	55	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201

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	21	17	21	37	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	104	100	78	112	116	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	599
Attendance below 90 percent	0	35	21	31	36	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	8	4	10	16	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Course failure in ELA	0	7	4	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in Math	0	5	3	13	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	31	41	33	55	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201

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	21	17	21	37	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	36%	47%	56%				42%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	35%						46%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	22%						56%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	45%	42%	50%				50%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	52%						49%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						43%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	49%	59%				46%	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	43%	52%	-9%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	35%	48%	-13%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	47%	-1%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	55%	56%	-1%	62%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	39%	56%	-17%	64%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					
	2019	50%	51%	-1%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	43%	45%	-2%	53%	-10%
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	14	26	22	22	44	38	12				
ELL	10	21	11	27	35	58	6				
BLK	29	38		39	42		7				
HSP	29	24	8	44	51	56	28				
WHT	47	43	43	50	57	53	44				
FRL	32	26	21	41	50	56	26				
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	18	23	20	9	9					
ELL	16	32	40	28	21						
BLK	49	53		38	27		23				
HSP	38	26	33	43	26		28				
WHT	41	39		58	45		41				
FRL	39	35	14	43	28	17	25				
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	7	25	20	22	36	33					
ELL	26	43		39	35		33				
BLK	27	37	73	35	46	54	23				
HSP	42	44	47	51	53	38	50				
WHT	49	54	55	58	47		55				
FRL	38	44	63	49	48	43	45				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	323
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	36
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	48
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

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

In looking at our core content areas, specifically in literacy (ELA), we notice a downward trend in proficiency over the past three years on the Florida Standards Assessment. This is also the case for learning gains and bottom 25% for literacy. Additionally, math proficiency has decreased as well during the same timeframe. In contrast, our percentage of our learning gains in mathematics and bottom 25% has increased from the prior year (2020-2021 to 2021-2022).

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

Progress monitoring and state performance data (Florida Standards Assessment) showed that our students with disabilities were displaying the largest deficit in most grades.

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

We were intentional with placement of teachers within all grade levels. We intentionally moved a previous fourth grade teacher to third grade for the 2021-2022 school year.

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

In the current school year, our first grade student performance on the progress monitoring tool showed continued improvement and also fourth grade mathematics. The state assessments indicated a larger increase in student learning gains.

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

We were intentional with placement of teachers within this grade level for literacy. We intentionally moved a previous fourth grade teacher to third grade for the 2021-2022 school year. Students in those classes received consistent, grade level instruction aligned to state standards.

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

At this time, teachers will be engaged in collaborative planning that promotes and facilitates conversations regarding differentiation of instruction and planning for student learning outcomes. Additional professional learning is necessary for diving deeper into data for planning and monitoring of learning. Training and support for the Learning Arc Framework will occur focusing on questioning strategies and tasks that provide differentiation for acceleration upon deeper grasp of the planning framework.

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.

A focus on analyzing data and differentiating instruction will provide acceleration. Targeted small group instruction along with individualized working station tasks during ELA and Mathematics will be a primary focus. Teachers and students will track progress towards the benchmark and quarterly data chats will occur with students and teachers alike. Writing will be embedded within all content areas. A shift in the mindset to "we" and "our" will be presented and promoted versus a "I" and "mine" Teachers will also engage in the Learning Arc Framework during collaborative planning, which will support student access to grade-appropriate instruction through equitable experiences.

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

To ensure that sustainability can occur, training with our interventions programs will be needed, inclusive of continued support. All parties engaged with the Learning Arc Framework will have to have a consistent understanding of its purpose and impact on student learning outcomes. Staff will need additional planning time to support the deeper dive into the benchmarks.

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 the 2022 FSA indicates a loss of seven percentage points in ELA proficiency and a loss of five percent proficiency in Mathematics proficiency.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

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

State data will show a minimum of +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.

Progress monitoring toward our goals will be monitored using the District Standardized Walkthrough Tool and will be reviewed to ensure student mastery of benchmarks taught within the classroom in alignment with common planning practices and results.

**Person responsible
for monitoring
outcome:**

Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

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

1. Monitor classroom instruction using the Standardized Classroom Walkthrough Tool . This tool will assist in identifying students' access and engagement in equitable experiences based on the state benchmarks and standards.
2. Engage teachers in standards-based (benchmarks) planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework.

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

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, assessments, and experiences.

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Standardized Walkthrough Monitoring Tool

Create calendar for leadership team members calibration walks.

Person Responsible Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

1. Standardized Walkthrough Monitoring Tool

Train leadership team on look-fors with walkthrough tool

Person Responsible Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

1. Standardized Walkthrough Monitoring Tool

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

Person Responsible Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

1. Standardized Walkthrough Monitoring Tool

Add SWT data on agenda for review during each weekly leadership team meeting.

Person Responsible Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

1. Standardized Walkthrough Monitoring Tool

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

Person Responsible Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

2. Planning with Learning Arc Framework

Create master schedule that allows for meaningful collaborative planning time.

Person Responsible Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

2. Planning with Learning Arc Framework

Assign and train instructional coaches and Assistant Principal

Person Responsible Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

2. Planning with Learning Arc Framework

Meet with and collaborate with instructional coaches to ensure consistency/fidelity of practice.

Person Responsible Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

2. Planning with Learning Arc Framework

Add planning results and findings to the leadership team meeting agenda

Person Responsible Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

2. Planning with Learning Arc Framework

Conduct planning protocol on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

2. Planning with Learning Arc Framework

Conduct correlation analysis between SWT observations and benchmarks planned through Learning Arc. (Look for alignment)

**Person
Responsible**

Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behaviors Intervention and Support

Area of Focus

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

In the 2021-2022 school year the number of office discipline referrals increased from 392 in the to 788. Of the 788 referrals, 215 resulted from bus incidents. In addition, 102 referrals from the 788 were written from incidents occurring during specials (PE, Music, and Art). The number of office discipline referrals and out-of-school suspensions increased for some. As a result, we must continue to strengthen our classroom management and behavioral supports. In addition, we need to continue to develop our integration of social emotional learning through resources, such as Drumbeat and Sanford Harmony resulting in stronger relationships with peers and adults.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

Decrease the number of office discipline referrals by 50 percent.

Monitoring:

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

Using structured, planned and unplanned classroom walkthroughs, the leadership team will review the collected data to determine an appropriate course of action through support, coaching, and reteaching.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dr. Ruth Reimer (ruth.reimer@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)
STOIC:CHAMPS
Sanford Harmony (Social Emotional Skills Development Program)
Drumbeat

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) assists in addressing behaviors that behaviors that precede or lead to suspensions and/or expulsions through the establishing of a positive social and academic culture. This structure provides a systems approach that addresses a continuum of student needs within tiered interventions.

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

STOIC:CHAMPS provides strategies to engage students in being mindful and productive through structured, guided, observable, and supported classroom management.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Sanford Harmony (Social Emotional Skills Development Program) supports the development of pro-social skills through devised lessons, morning meetings, role play, and relationship development.

Drumbeat engages students in group drumming sessions which allows students to expel negative feelings and develop connections with peers through rhythm and song.

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. Revise school-wide PBIS plan with PBIS team to share with stakeholders.

Person

Responsible

Dr. Ruth Reimer (ruth.reimer@polk-fl.net)

2. Continue monthly meetings with PBIS team.

Person

Responsible

Dr. Ruth Reimer (ruth.reimer@polk-fl.net)

3. Establish dedicated time for daily implementation of Sanford Harmony.

Person

Responsible

Dr. Ruth Reimer (ruth.reimer@polk-fl.net)

4. Revisit PBIS, through professional development, with staff at the beginning of the 2022-2023 school year.

Person

Responsible

Dr. Ruth Reimer (ruth.reimer@polk-fl.net)

5. Establish and maintain timeline for implementation of tiered interventions (MTSS): Drumbeat, Mentors, Check-in and Checkout, Sanford Harmony, small group sessions, one-on-one sessions, and administrative supports.

Person

Responsible

Dr. Ruth Reimer (ruth.reimer@polk-fl.net)

6. Provide staff and stakeholders with school-wide data.

Person

Responsible

Dr. Ruth Reimer (ruth.reimer@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 identification and implementation of appropriate and effective resources with fidelity has been an area of need for our teachers, specifically within the realm of literacy. Differentiation needs to occur within the classroom for intervention and acceleration of student learning. We will increase our K-5 reading proficiency through a focus on decoding, phonemic awareness, and phonics instruction in our primary grades (K-2). This will also be inclusive of aligned, benchmark-based instruction through the use of the Learning Arc Framework.

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

The identification and implementation of appropriate and effective resources with fidelity has been an area of need for our teachers, specifically within the realm of literacy. Differentiation needs to occur within the classroom for intervention and acceleration of student learning. We will increase our K-5 reading proficiency through an emphasis on comprehension and fluency in our intermediate grades (3-5). This will also be inclusive of aligned, benchmark-based instruction through the use of the Learning Arc Framework.

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)

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.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

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 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 toward our goals will be monitored using the District Standardized Walkthrough Tool and will be reviewed to ensure student mastery of benchmarks taught within the classroom in alignment with common planning practices and results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hardesty, Bradley, bradley.hardesty@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?

1. Monitor classroom instruction using the Standardized Classroom Walkthrough Tool. This tool will assist in identifying students' access and engagement in equitable experiences based on the state benchmarks and standards.

2. Engage teachers in standards-based (benchmarks) planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework.

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 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, assessments, and experiences.

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
1. Standardized Walkthrough Monitoring Tool Create calendar for leadership team members calibration walks.	Hardesty, Bradley, bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net
1. Standardized Walkthrough Monitoring Tool Train leadership team on look-fors with walkthrough tool	Hardesty, Bradley, bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net
1. Standardized Walkthrough Monitoring Tool Conduct calibration walks until team shows 90-100% calibrated consistency with rationale.	Hardesty, Bradley, bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net
1. Standardized Walkthrough Monitoring Tool Add SWT data on agenda for review during each weekly leadership team meeting.	Hardesty, Bradley, bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net
1. Standardized Walkthrough Monitoring Tool Monitor impact between data review from SWT and planning per content/course/grade level.	Hardesty, Bradley, bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net
2. Planning with Learning Arc Framework Create master schedule that allots for meaningful collaborative planning time.	Hardesty, Bradley, bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net
2. Planning with Learning Arc Framework Assign and train instructional coaches and Assistant Principal	Hardesty, Bradley, bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net
2. Planning with Learning Arc Framework Meet with and collaborate with instructional coaches to ensure consistency/fidelity of practice.	Hardesty, Bradley, bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net
2. Planning with Learning Arc Framework Add planning results and findings to the leadership team meeting agenda	Hardesty, Bradley, bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net
2. Planning with Learning Arc Framework Conduct planning protocol on a weekly basis.	Hardesty, Bradley, bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net
2. Planning with Learning Arc Framework Conduct correlation analysis between SWT observations and benchmarks planned through Learning Arc. (Look for alignment)	Hardesty, Bradley, bradley.hardesty@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.

Eagle Lake Elementary recruits parents and community members for school support/tasks, listens to other people's viewpoints and encourages collaborative decision-making to build a solid foundation for all school/family/community partnerships. We will be targeting every parent by sending home Title 1 newsletters informing parents of events happening in school and how parents can support students at home. Our school marquee will be updated regularly to inform parents of upcoming Title 1 events and additional school related events. We will also inform parents through the use of flyers, grade-level newsletters, and notes in student agendas/Wednesday folders. Social media, including Facebook and our school website, will also be a focal point for maintaining communication and transparency. We will work diligently to inform parents and families of student performance and methods of supports for students in Pre-kindergarten through fifth grade. Our leadership team will share important information regarding our school's programs, procedures, curriculum expectations, and use of technology at home to assist parents and families help their child(ren) succeed. We will also offer family workshops in literacy, mathematics, science (Mad Science Nights), and test-taking skills. In addition, our campus strives to provide a positive learning environment for all stakeholders through the use of PBIS strategies and the promotion and utilization of pro-social skills.

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

Eagle Lake Elementary's School Advisory Council brings together a multitude of stakeholders, such as parents, teachers, administration, and community partners. The role of SAC members is to support and provide input regarding the School Improvement Plan and review expenditures of school funds. Community partnerships include local businesses and religious organizations. The partners provide resources for students in need, plan staff appreciation activities, volunteer their time working with students, and sponsor family engagement events. Administration works to collaborate with school-based leadership teams to plan, organize, and facilitate tasks related to the school improvement plan.