

Polk County Public Schools

Elbert 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Elbert Elementary School

205 15TH ST NE, Winter Haven, FL 33881

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

Demographics

Principal: Alexandra Wise

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2022

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: F (28%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
ESSA Status	CSI

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Elbert Elementary School

205 15TH ST NE, Winter Haven, FL 33881

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">78%</p>

School Grades History

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

The mission of Elbert Elementary School is to ensure all students reach their highest academic potential through a consistent, pervasive, and rigorous teaching and learning through New BEST curriculum that meets the needs of all students. We empower students to take their learning to thoughtful and appropriate actions that affect our local community. We create an environment that instills in our students the insight to value and take responsibility for their own learning, while encouraging them to be curious inquirers as they interact with the world around them.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Elbert Elementary School is to provide a safe school culture in a nurturing environment with a stimulating curriculum that meets the needs of all learners. This will enable all students to effectively continue on the path to graduate High School to become productive citizens of our community, state, nation and world.

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
Wise, Alex	Principal	
Nelson, Stacy	Assistant Principal	
Nicks, Lucinda	Math Coach	
Hayes, Magen	Reading Coach	
Kirkland, Charlene	Other	Charlene will work as our LEA and support us with ESE services for our students.
Vera, Luciano	Dean	
Gunter, Elizabeth	School Counselor	
Thomas, Julie	Assistant Principal	Curriculum

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/1/2022, Alexandra Wise

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

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

600

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

6

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

5

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	125	111	124	129	125	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	747
Attendance below 90 percent	59	44	46	49	57	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	302
One or more suspensions	10	5	7	18	24	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
Course failure in ELA	8	9	10	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	3	6	9	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	51	52	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	73	56	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	53	54	77	50	35	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	312

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	23	21	31	29	35	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	182

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	7	4	4	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Students retained two or more times	0	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	76	105	134	112	126	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	680
Attendance below 90 percent	0	29	29	30	29	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	0	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	50	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	15	26	23	30	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153

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	15	26	23	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	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	76	105	134	112	126	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	680
Attendance below 90 percent	0	29	29	30	29	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	36	0	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	50	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	15	26	23	30	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153

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	15	26	23	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	30%	47%	56%				52%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	37%						54%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%						50%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	21%	42%	50%				52%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	30%						57%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	29%						37%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	16%	49%	59%				47%	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	45%	52%	-7%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	48%	3%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	47%	0%	56%	-9%
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	28%	56%	-28%	62%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	56%	8%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	51%	6%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

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	9	23	19	8	15	18	10				
ELL	24	32	17	15	18	15	5				
BLK	23	32	35	14	25	26	15				
HSP	35	37	13	21	30	24	10				
MUL	42	70		39							
WHT	33	38	46	28	37	45	24				
FRL	26	36	35	19	23	24	15				
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	14	19		14	35	36	18				
ELL	25	41		26	38		14				
BLK	27	33	42	25	44	42	23				
HSP	33	32		38	36		29				
WHT	59	65		53	35		69				
FRL	32	28	41	31	33	41	29				
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	29	46	31	27	47	25	28				
ELL	48	45	45	48	55	31	45				
BLK	34	51	50	37	47	20	29				
HSP	56	53	55	64	58	43	56				
MUL	33			50							
WHT	71	62	40	60	70	67	63				
FRL	45	50	47	48	54	35	39				

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	30
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	238
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	15
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	21
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	24
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	27
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	36
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	28
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

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?

All trends show a drop throughout grade levels in all curriculum levels, subgroups and core content.

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

5th Grade Mathematics has the Greatest need for Improvement. But all subjects need to move up.

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

The instructional delivery was inconsistent as was PD and Data feedback to students and teachers, Coaches have been added with Grade Level Planning, PD and monitoring as well.

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

None

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

N/A

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

Consistent monitoring of classroom instruction, Lesson development and implementation will be needed.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The new BEST Standards with emphasis on creating quality lessons will be paramount.

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

Reading Coach and Math Coach will monitor with Fidelity and quality teacher and student feedback will be implemented.

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.

Students will engage in grade level standards aligned tasks and assessments on a daily basis. Both proficiency and gain scores have declined over the last 2 state testing opportunities.

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

100% of previously proficient students will maintain their achievement level and increase their scale score at a minimum. Also, any students that were proficient in the last two years will return to a level of proficiency.

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

We will use a combination of state and district progress monitoring tools that have a defined line for both proficiency and growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

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

Strategy 1 - collaborative planning focused on ensuring all students are engaged in equivalent experiences throughout the year at a high frequency rate
 Strategy 2 - monitor classrooms to ensure students experience the intent of the standards on a daily basis

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

Research provided by TNTP shows the importance that ALL students receive grade level standards-based instruction on a daily basis.

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

Strategy 1 - collaborative planning focused on ensuring all students are engaged in equivalent experiences throughout the year at a high frequency rate

Action Step 1 - Create a master schedule that allows for grade level common planning

Person Responsible Stacy Nelson (stacy.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - collaborative planning focused on ensuring all students are engaged in equivalent experiences throughout the year at a high frequency rate

Action Step 2 - Assign and train planning facilitators

Person Responsible Julie Thomas (julie.thomas@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - collaborative planning focused on ensuring all students are engaged in equivalent experiences throughout the year at a high frequency rate

Action Step 3 - Establish and utilize a planning review protocol for weekly leadership team meetings

Person Responsible Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - collaborative planning focused on ensuring all students are engaged in equivalent experiences throughout the year at a high frequency rate

Action Step 4 - Make adjustments to planning procedures as data dictates

Person Responsible Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - collaborative planning focused on ensuring all students are engaged in equivalent experiences throughout the year at a high frequency rate

Action Step 5 - Engage teacher grade level groups in the planning procedures on a weekly basis at a minimum.

Person Responsible Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - monitor classrooms to ensure students experience the intent of the standards on a daily basis

Action Step 1 - Establish a calendar for the leadership team to engage in calibration walks

Person Responsible Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - monitor classrooms to ensure students experience the intent of the standards on a daily basis

Action Step 2 - Train leadership team on the use of the standards walkthrough tool

Person Responsible Julie Thomas (julie.thomas@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - monitor classrooms to ensure students experience the intent of the standards on a daily basis

Action Step 3 - Engage leadership team in calibration walks until the data collected is valid and reliable

Person Responsible Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - monitor classrooms to ensure students experience the intent of the standards on a daily basis

Action Step 4 - Review finding from standards walks during weekly leadership team meetings and adjust planning practices as needed

Person Responsible Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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

Both general Gains and L25 Gains have decreased over the last two state assessments. We will focus on strategic interventions for both Mathematics and ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase our Gain scores to be within 10 percentage points of the district average.

Monitoring:

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

The intervention programs will come with progress monitoring tools that will utilize as well as marked percentile growth on district wide progress monitoring tools.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Research based intervention tools will be used on a daily basis.

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

The tools being acquired for our intervention programs have success measure that have been monitored over a number of years.

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.

Ensure the master schedule allows for students to engage in prescriptive intervention instruction daily.

Person Responsible

Stacy Nelson (stacy.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Train administration, coaches, and instructional staff on proper implementation of the intervention tools.

Person Responsible

Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

Administration will conduct classroom observations no less than 2 days a week.

Person Responsible

Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

Observation data analysis and response measures protocol will be created and utilized during weekly leadership team meetings.

Person Responsible

Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Discipline

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

Our OSSP and general referral data has increased considerably over the two years. A two pronged approach will be created to ensure that a proactive system is supported by a strategic behavioral intervention system.

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

OSS and total number of referrals received will be no greater than 15% of the district average for any given category.

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

OSS and recorded referrals will decrease compared to a monthly analysis to the previous year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

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

Strategy 1 - Create and implement a well structured PBIS
 Strategy 2 - Implement a series of behavioral interventions that are focused on both the environment and the individual student(s).

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

Well established PBIS systems result in 95%+ of the student population functioning within appropriate behavior parameters. Behavioral interventions are required in any institution that supports the whole child.

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

Strategy 1 - Create and implement a well structured PBIS system
 Action Step 1 - Establish a PBIS team

Person Responsible Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Create and implement a well structured PBIS system
 Action Step 2 - Create and utilize a progress monitoring system tied to discipline metrics

Person Responsible Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Create and implement a well structured PBIS system
 Action Step 3 - Leverage business partners to acquire rewards to celebrate student success tied to the PBIS goals

Person Responsible Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1 - Create and implement a well structured PBIS system
 Action Step 4 - PBIS data will be reviewed and responded to at least every other week during leadership team meetings

Person Responsible Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - Implement a series of behavioral interventions that are focused on both the environment and the individual student(s)
 Action Step 1 - Establish and utilize a behavior based comprehensive data file

Person Responsible Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - Implement a series of behavioral interventions that are focused on both the environment and the individual student(s)

Action Step 2 - Discipline data will be reviewed every week during leadership team meetings

Person Responsible Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - Implement a series of behavioral interventions that are focused on both the environment and the individual student(s)

Action Step 3 - Administration team will meet with regional leadership on a monthly basis to review data and problem solve around any undesirable data

Person Responsible Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2 - Implement a series of behavioral interventions that are focused on both the environment and the individual student(s)

Action Step 4 - preliminary behavioral interventions will be established by school administration before the first day of school

Person Responsible Alex Wise (alex.wise@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 new BEST Standards will continue to be implemented K-2 with the emphasis of correct delivery of the Standard being taught. Assessment data will guide the process to proficiency. Teachers will be monitored and guided and parents continuously updated.

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

The new BEST Standards will continue to be implemented 3-5 with the emphasis of correct delivery of the Standard being taught. Assessment data will guide the process to proficiency. We will use the

Corrective Reading program as an intervention to close in the gap for our non-proficient readers. Students will be administered a diagnostic and grouped accordingly for differentiation, based on their results. Teachers will be monitored and guided and parents continuously updated.

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)

STAR Early Lit (ELA) Kindergarten was 61% in the Spring. First grade was 40% in the Spring and 2nd was 47%.

Star Reading First Grade was 92% in the Spring. 2nd Grade in the Spring was 57%

We want to increase scores 5% across the board.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Third Grade ELA will rise from 34% proficiency to 50%, Math from 20% to 50%

Fourth Grade ELA will rise from 33% to 50%, Math from 34% to 50%.

Fifth Grade ELA will rise from 23% to 50%, Math from 9% to 40%.Science from16% to 40%

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.

The expectation of the Superintendent is for the School Administration to be in classrooms 80% of the school day. Emphasis is on monitoring the development of the lesson plan with correct implementation of the Standard. Administration and Coaches will give feedback and support..

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Wise, Alex, alex.wise@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?

Yes; Corrective Reading is a research-based intervention program.

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?

Yes on both questions

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

Admin and Literacy Leadership will have rigorous PD and monitoring in the classrooms to see if Standards are taught with fidelity.

Wise, Alex,
alex.wise@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.

Elbert Elementary School utilizes the Positive Behavior Support program to develop a positive school culture for staff and students. Within the classroom setting, CHAMPS is being used to provide students with the expectations for each task or assignment.

Rewards and acknowledgements are given to both staff and students for them meeting school-wide expectations.

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

Our Stakeholders include two churches in our neighborhood. They have supported the school with student and staff needs. In addition, one of the churches have supplied back to school breakfast for the staff, which assists in building a family atmosphere.

We also have SAC committee meetings in which the committee learns and shares positive happenings in the school and the community.