

Polk County Public Schools

Cleveland Court Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Cleveland Court Elementary School

328 EDGEWOOD DR E, Lakeland, FL 33803

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Every CCE student will be prepared academically and socially through rigorous learning experiences to become successful lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

CCE, in partnership with family and community, will provide a safe and supportive learning environment where students strive for excellence in all they do.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fite, Emily	Principal	The administration sets clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships). They share past and current data from many different sources with team members. As a team they discuss barriers and instructional strategies to decrease gaps and increase proficiency. They seek input from teacher leaders in all areas of school improvement. School leaders, in turn, provide teachers on their grade level information to help them understand barriers, determine the effectiveness of instructional strategies, and next steps needed to move the students forward. School Leaders suggest professional develop needs for the staff. The literacy coach facilitates collaborative planning and provides coaching to the teachers. The guidance counselor provides teachers with social/emotional data and strategies for Tier 1, 2, and 3 students.
Kranek, Lee	Assistant Principal	The administration sets clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships). They share past and current data from many different sources with team members. As a team they discuss barriers and instructional strategies to decrease gaps and increase proficiency. They seek input from teacher leaders in all areas of school improvement. School leaders, in turn, provide teachers on their grade level information to help them understand barriers, determine the effectiveness of instructional strategies, and next steps needed to move the students forward. School Leaders suggest professional develop needs for the staff. The literacy coach facilitates collaborative planning and provides coaching to the teachers. The guidance counselor provides teachers with social/emotional data and strategies for Tier 1, 2, and 3 students.
Stephens, Emily	Reading Coach	Reading Coach SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring Modeling and Mentoring Teachers
Gainer, Linda	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor Oversee the MTSS process Counsels Students

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cruz, Barbara	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Byrd, Theresa	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Monserrat, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Mullens, Kelley	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Monge, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Ibarra, Rose	Other	LEA Decision Making Data Analysis
Tabb, Caitlin	Teacher, K-12	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Scarbrough, Lynn	Teacher, ESE	Classroom Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring
Wren, Tristi	Teacher, K-12	Music Teacher SIP Planning Collaborative Planning Data Monitoring

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Administration meets quarterly with SAC to review academic data, behavior data, and progress monitoring data. School Leadership Team meets weekly and PBIS (Positive Behavior) Team meets monthly to review academic and behavior data. SAC, School Leadership Team and PBIS Team help address needs and give input for the SIP.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

School leadership team meets weekly to analyze academic data, review our action steps in our two areas of focus in our SIP to ensure continued implementation is being seen in the classrooms, and continually review, monitor and update SIP as needed.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	52%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	88%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	17	12	13	15	15	16	0	0	0	88	
One or more suspensions	6	3	7	8	6	3	0	0	0	33	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	3	2	5	4	1	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in Math	1	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	2	2	10	8	6	13	0	0	0	41	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	6	0	11	8	6	7	0	0	0	38	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	5

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	22	18	13	15	20	0	0	0	88	
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	5	2	7	0	0	0	18	
Course failure in ELA	3	2	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	6	6	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	11	0	0	0	19	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	2	5	3	6	6	0	0	0	23	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	22	18	13	15	20	0	0	0	88	
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	5	2	7	0	0	0	18	
Course failure in ELA	3	2	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	6	6	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	11	0	0	0	19	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	2	5	3	6	6	0	0	0	23	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	70	45	53	72	47	56	69		
ELA Learning Gains				77			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65			36		
Math Achievement*	79	49	59	83	42	50	74		
Math Learning Gains				84			59		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				79			42		
Science Achievement*	70	41	54	68	49	59	63		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	292
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	528
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	40	Yes	1	
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	60			
HSP	75			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	79			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	59			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	55			
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	67			
HSP	78			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	68			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	70			79			70					
SWD	38			38			40				4	
ELL	53			73							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			59			70				3	
HSP	65			78			63				4	
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	81			86			74				4	
FRL	58			69			55				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	72	77	65	83	84	79	68					
SWD	39	45	45	56	76	70						
ELL	29	80		69	91							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	56	71	60	69	80	80	50					
HSP	62	88	91	80	88	80	54					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	84	74		91	84		88					
FRL	59	71	65	76	81	76	50					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	69	58	36	74	59	42	63					
SWD	28			34			40					
ELL	38			46								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47	42		41	27		17					
HSP	63			74								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	82	67		89	76		92					
FRL	58	33		62	50		50					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	63%	43%	20%	54%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	53%	26%	58%	21%
03	2023 - Spring	65%	42%	23%	50%	15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	38%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	72%	51%	21%	59%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	83%	56%	27%	61%	22%
05	2023 - Spring	79%	44%	35%	55%	24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	68%	39%	29%	51%	17%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Grade 2 Math 61% proficient--one of the 2nd grade classes did not have a teacher for more than a quarter of the school year.

Grade 5 ELA 62% proficient--students were not reading independently on grade level

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Grade 5 ELA from 74% in 21-22 to 62% in 22-23--more students in the grade level (from 2 classes to 3); students not reading independently on grade level
Grade 5 Math from 91% in 21-22 to 76% in 22-23--more students on the grade level (from 2 classes to 3)

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Grade 4 ELA--81% of our students were proficient in comparison to the state average of 58%
Grade 5 Math--76% of our students were proficient in comparison to the state average of 55%
Grade 4 Math--82% of our students were proficient in comparison to the state average of 61%
Having high expectations for all students; monitoring book level by student at every grade level weekly via AR diagnostic reports; monitoring student progress on unit math assessments; holding students accountable for their learning and behavior; communicating student progress with parents regularly.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Grade 4 ELA from 77% in 21-22 to 81% in 22-23--ELA teachers set specific reading goals with all students, supported their efforts to meet the goals, and held students accountable; 96% of students were reading on grade level independently based on AR data; para support for students in small groups
Grade 4 Math from 80% in 21-22 to 82% in 22-23--Math Fluency was a focus throughout the school year; students were instructed in small groups in order to focus on specific skills needed for all students; para support for students in small groups

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The high number of second grade students scoring level 1 on ELA and Math state assessments, as these students will be going into 3rd grade below grade level.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Grade 3 ELA
Grade 3 Math

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to our Spring ELA 2023 FAST STAR data, 88% (52/59) Kindergarteners are reading on grade level, 87%(60/69) of our 1st graders are reading on grade level and 68% (42/62) of our 2nd graders are reading on grade level. Based on our Spring ELA 2023 FAST data, 68% of our 3rd graders are reading on grade level, 81% of our 4th graders are reading on grade level.

Measurable Outcome:

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

70% (43/62) of our 3rd graders will score proficiency on Spring ELA FAST in May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Small groups - SIPPS (systematic intensive phonics) program will be implemented
Weekly--AR book levels, comprehension percentages, and points earned
Bi-Monthly--Florida Wonders reading comprehension assessments, math module assessments, science unit assessments
Quarterly--STAR and Progress Monitoring assessments in ELA and Math; science quarterly assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Monitor student AR book level, comprehension percentage, and points earned each week.
2. Engage teachers in benchmark-aligned planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

There is a relationship between academic success and ensuring students are able to engage in grade level standards-based expectations and assignments. There is a relationship between student's AR book level, comprehension level, and points earned and academic success. It is imperative to monitor for AR success and teachers' understanding of benchmarks and aligned tasks.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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: AR

1. AR Diagnostic and STAR reports analyzed by administration, reading coach, classroom and ESE teachers weekly.
2. Train teachers to use the Diagnostic report to make appropriate instructional decisions for student

success.

3. Teachers will communicate via phone calls, texting, agendas, Tuesday Folders, and Family Night meetings to inform parents of their child's academic status.

5. Paras and other support staff will work with students who are not making adequate progress toward AR goals each week.

Person Responsible: Emily Fite (emily.fite@polk-fl.net)

By When: Administration Team, Emily Fite & Lee Kranek will complete action steps weekly assuring steps are being implemented on each grade level and communicate specific feedback during weekly Leadership meetings.

Strategy 2: Learning Arc Framework

1. Classroom observations by the administration using Journey and the Standards Walkthrough Tool to ensure the implementation of the benchmarks and the assigned tasks.

2. Analysis of student products, formative and summative assessment data, to ensure tasks are at grade level.

3. Weekly collaborative planning with Literacy Coach, utilizing the Learning Arc Framework to ensure grade level assignments are being used in classrooms.

4. Literacy Coach will meet with each grade level for a Collaborative Planning Day once per year.

Teachers will meet during summer months to review school data and plan appropriately for the coming school year.

5. Teachers, paras and/or support staff will work daily with small groups of students in K-5th grades in the areas of ELA and Math to support instruction of benchmarks using grade level materials.

6. After school tutoring will be offered for students.

Person Responsible: Emily Fite (emily.fite@polk-fl.net)

By When: Administration Team, Emily Fite & Lee Kranek will complete action steps weekly assuring steps are being implemented on each grade level and communicate specific feedback during weekly Leadership meetings.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In 2022-2023, administration processed 195 discipline referrals.
33 out of 385 students, or 9% had one or more out-of-school suspensions.
The highest referrals (59) being abusive language/conduct-Others
Our goal is our referrals will decrease in the area of abusive language and out of school suspensions which will be tracked by analyzing data from our monthly PBIS data turned in to admin by teachers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2023-2024 school year, our overall goal is to decrease the number of discipline referrals in abusive language/ conduct by 30% and our out -of-school suspensions by 1%.

Monitoring:

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

Discipline data will be monitored weekly by administrators and school counselor during leadership meetings. Students will be identified for support as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emily Fite (emily.fite@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

CHAMPS used by all staff in order to set the expectations for all students.
School-wide PBIS program
Sanford Harmony

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

CHAMPS is used in order to teach the expectations for students. Students are less likely to misbehave if they know exactly what the teacher expects during specific activities throughout the day. PBIS is a successful program that rewards students for positive behaviors and provides supports for negative behaviors. Sanford Harmony is a social-emotional program that fosters communication, connection, and community both in and outside of the classroom.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Provide the staff with ongoing professional development in CHAMPS
Conduct monthly meetings with the PBIS team to discuss trends and provide support for specific students
Provide parents with Parent Partnership agreement

Teachers will send home communication folders on Tuesday. Student agendas, PBiS cards and Behavior cards will go home daily for parents to review
 Kindness Club will meet monthly to promote kindness amongst students in K-5th
 Positive messages on our morning shows--Review School-Wide Expectations, PBiS Rewards, Manners Matter (Character Education each month)
 Monthly PBiS Reward
 Reteach classroom/school/bus/expectations and appropriate responses to students receiving referrals
 Provide staff training in the Sanford Harmony Program as needed

Person Responsible: Lee Kranek (lee.kranek@polk-fl.net)

By When: Administration Team, Emily Fite & Lee Kranek will complete action steps weekly assuring steps are being implemented on each grade level and communicate specific feedback during weekly Leadership meetings.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP is disseminated with all members of the school's staff during the first week teachers and staff are back, and throughout the school year during weekly faculty meetings and professional development days. The SIP is shared with the School Advisory Council at the initial meeting of the school year in September. The SIP is available digitally to all stakeholders via the school website <http://clevelandcourt.polk-fl.net/>.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

CCE will build positive relationships with families and community stakeholders throughout the school year. Families are encouraged to participate in several family engagement events at the school including the Annual Parent Meeting, Grade Level Family Nights, Season's Readings, Portfolio Night, and monthly Spirit Night events hosted by the PTO. Teachers will build positive relationships by maintaining regular communication with all families regarding the academic and behavioral progress of their students using student agendas, email, text, phone calls, parent/teacher conferences, and weekly Tuesday Folders. Families are also invited to participate in reviewing the school/family compact and the Family Engagement Plan each year. The Family Engagement Plan is available to families via the school website <http://clevelandcourt.polk-fl.net/>.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(ii))

CCE is a STEM Academy where all students and families embrace our Accelerated Reader Program, support our STEM emphasis of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics concepts and challenging curriculum. We take a proactive approach to identify students who needed accelerated academics and students who need academic interventions and support.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Title I, Part A project funds school-wide services at our eligible and participating Title I schools. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions so that all students achieve academic success.

Title I, Part C project funds assist students that are prioritized by the MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status, as defined by federal and state regulations.

Title I, Part D project funds provide Transition Facilitators at select Neglected and Delinquent school sites to assist students who transition from Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facilities back into their zoned school.

Title II funds provide professional development resources to build the capacity of teachers by funding consultants, district professional development personnel, including district/regional coaches, and curriculum specialists. The Title II project contributes to the recruitment/retention of teachers in the district by funding district recruitment personnel, recruitment initiatives both within and outside the school district.

Title III provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their teachers in Title I schools, professional learning opportunities for school staff, as well as parent family engagement opportunities.

Title IX – Homeless OR HEARTH Program funded through Title IX and Title I, provides support for students identified as being in a homeless situation. Title I provides support for this program, through funding of HEARTH staff, professional development, and contracted extended learning services for students.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Our guidance counselor trains our teachers in the beginning of the year in how to implement Sanford Harmony in the classroom which teaches our students effective social and emotional strategies to use with their peers. Our district and our school uses HAZEL Health and our mental health facilitator for extra support services.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Our teachers are trained at the beginning of the school year by our guidance counselor and administration in implementing the MTSS Tiered model.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Polk County District offers a variety of professional learning from implementing highly effective teaching strategies, classroom management through Schoology for our instructional staff. Administration meets weekly with grade levels during collaborative planning and PLCs to analyze academic and behavior data.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No