Medulla Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Medulla Elementary School

850 SCHOOLHOUSE RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

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.

Medulla Elementary Explorers are safe, tolerant and respectful, active learners, and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Medulla Elementary provides a safe, rigorous and supportive environment that fosters curiosity, inquiry, and a life-long pursuit of knowledge so each child will reach his/her fullest potential and become a respectful and productive citizen.

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
MacLeod, Gale	Principal	The principal is an instructional leader and continuous learner who works collaboratively with others engaging in data driven dialogue to problem solve, make decisions, improve instructional practices and organizational structures to achieve shared goals and improve student learning.
Camp, Shelley	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is an instructional leader, who is a continuous learner, which supports the principal. The AP works collaboratively with others engaging in data driven dialogue to problem solve, make decisions, improve instructional practices and organizational structures to achieve shared goals and improve student learning.
Aranda, Ginnie	School Counselor	The School Counselor collaborates with colleagues in using research in order to select appropriate strategies to solve identified problems, make decisions, manage conflict, and promote meaningful change.
Spear, Tracey	Instructional Coach	This Instructional Coach develops knowledge and understanding of how to identify and use multiple assessment tools aligned with the B.E.S.T. Standards. In addition, develops a climate of trust and reflection to engage colleagues in conversations about student learning data and ways to use data to improve instructional practices.
Wainwright, Christina	Reading Coach	This Literacy Coach develops knowledge and understanding of how to identify and use multiple assessment tools aligned with the B.E.S.T. Standards. In addition, develops a climate of trust and reflection to engage colleagues in conversations about student learning data and ways to use data to improve instructional practices.
Hutchins, Katrina	Math Coach	This Math Coach develops knowledge and understanding of how to identify and use multiple assessment tools aligned with the B.E.S.T. Standards. In addition, develops a climate of trust and reflection to engage colleagues in conversations about student learning data and ways to use data to improve instructional practices

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.

Upon the release of state assessment achievement reports, the leadership team analyzed data and held discussions. During collaborative learning communities, teachers disseminated assessment outcomes while discussions were held and input from staff was recorded. Furthermore, data was shared and discussed with the School Advisory Council, SAC, which includes school leadership, teachers, parents, and community partners. Input from staff was shared and the committee also provided input and

suggestions as well. A consensus was reached on areas of focus and suggestions for the School Improvement Plan.

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))

During preplanning week, the School Improvement will be shared with all staff to maintain a shared vision. To monitor instruction and implementation of focus areas, multiple walks will take place during each week by administrators and coaches using the Standards-Based Walkthrough Tool. Data from walks will be analyzed weekly and discussed during leadership team meetings. Staff will reflect and revise during collaborative learning communities monthly. In addition, the SAC committee will be kept a breast of efforts and outcomes throughout the year during each meeting. Revisions of the plan will take place as needed throughout the year based on feedback.

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 PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	69%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
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	33	36	28	32	24	22	0	0	0	175
One or more suspensions	8	7	12	19	13	26	0	0	0	85
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	4	13	4	10	1	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	3	7	4	4	3	5	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	21	21	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	20	17	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	18	41	44	53	43	39	0	0	0	238

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	7	15	23	23	18	20	0	0	0	106

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	2	1	14	0	1	0	0	0	20
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	37	27	32	23	24	29	0	0	0	172
One or more suspensions	6	8	13	16	8	14	0	0	0	65
Course failure in ELA	3	7	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	1	7	1	1	0	7	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	16	25	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	15	21	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	26	30	41	24	15	14	0	0	0	150

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	10	9	15	12	28	36	0	0	0	110

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	37	27	32	23	24	29	0	0	0	172
One or more suspensions	6	8	13	16	8	14	0	0	0	65
Course failure in ELA	3	7	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	1	7	1	1	0	7	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	16	25	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	15	21	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	26	30	41	24	15	14	0	0	0	150

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	10	9	15	12	28	36	0	0	0	110

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	10
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*	37	45	53	43	47	56	44		
ELA Learning Gains				57			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			42		
Math Achievement*	45	49	59	50	42	50	43		
Math Learning Gains				62			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			46		
Science Achievement*	44	41	54	49	49	59	44		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	50	54	59	57			49		

* 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	215
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	422
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	21	Yes	2	2
ELL	30	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	35	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	38	Yes	1	

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	23	Yes	1	1
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	48			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	49			

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	37			45			44					50
SWD	23			19			7				4	
ELL	25			29			27				5	50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33			49			36				4	
HSP	29			36			35				5	50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	46			51			60				4	
FRL	31			40			42				5	46

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	43	57	53	50	62	51	49					57
SWD	16	33	43	18	26	21	7					
ELL	31	68	53	43	61	33	39					57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	43	42	43	70		47					
HSP	37	55	50	42	59	37	43					58
MUL	67			67								
PAC												
WHT	55	63		60	63		65					
FRL	36	50	52	43	64	50	41					58

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	44	48	42	43	42	46	44					49
SWD	16	39		18	28		18					
ELL	18	25	18	29	21	27	15					49
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	50		40	47		42					
HSP	33	32	17	31	24	27	32					48
MUL	50	70		61	60							
PAC												
WHT	62	65		60	61		68					
FRL	38	46	53	38	42	57	39					49

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	42%	43%	-1%	54%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	53%	-15%	58%	-20%
03	2023 - Spring	36%	42%	-6%	50%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	40%	51%	-11%	59%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	56%	-4%	61%	-9%
05	2023 - Spring	52%	44%	8%	55%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	51%	39%	12%	51%	0%

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.

Student ELA and Math proficiency levels continue to show low performance, which include students with disabilities. Although students made learning gains, proficiency levels were not met. It was noted that baseline data showed a significant majority of incoming students performing below grade level and lacking foundational skills. Staff and students are continuing to become familiar with the BEST benchmarks, learning a new state testing format/platform and daily use of online devices. We also notice a high level of absences and tardies which contributed to loss of instruction.

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

Third grade performance levels show the greatest decline. These students continue to have a deficit in foundational skills. We believe this is partially due to lack of attendance during the pandemic.

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.

The state proficiency averages are 52% in ELA and Math and 48% in Science. The school ELA proficiency levels have the greatest gap and are below the state levels by 10% in grades 3-5. Although students are making learning gains, their growth is not enough to reflect proficiency.

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

Fifth grade math data showed the most improvement. One teacher taught the entire grade level in math. Classes were differentiated to meet student needs. Plans, tasks, and assessments were intentionally aligned to the benchmarks.

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

Student performance in ELA and attendance are two areas of concern.

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

1. increase ELA proficiency which will lead to an increase in math and science
2. increase attendance
3. teachers closely track/monitor data, analyze, and respond accordingly

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.

Based on the achievement gap and lack of movement in proficiency, as well as the need for staff to develop a deeper understanding of the BEST benchmarks, collaborative planning will continue to use the Learning Arc Framework and intentionally focus on steps 5-7 to ensure tasks, assessments, and equivalent experiences are aligned and provided.

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

By spring 2024, overall proficiency will increase by 1% in ELA.

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

To ensure students are mastering benchmarks, we will use district progress monitoring assessments in conjunction with the classroom walkthrough tool to monitor intentional, effective instruction and equivalent experiences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@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.)

Monitor students engaging in equivalent experiences aligned to state expectations using a benchmark walkthrough tool and engage teachers in benchmark planning using the Learning Arc Framework.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to our district progress monitoring data, our core instruction will benefit from evidenced based strategies that when used with fidelity will increase student learning and achievement.

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.

Create a consistent collaborative planning schedule for the year which includes data chats.

Person Responsible: Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@polk-fl.net)

By When: July 31, 2023

Provide professional development on the Learning Arc Framework and BEST instructional practices instructional practices for new teachers and an emphasis on steps 5-7 for returning teachers.

Person Responsible: Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 31, 2023 and continued support provided throughout the year.

Monitoring teacher implementation of the Learning Arc Framework through the use of the Classroom Walkthrough Tool.

Person Responsible: Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monitoring will occur weekly August 2023 - May 2024

Analysis of student progress monitoring data and completed aligned tasks during collaborative planning and data chats.

Person Responsible: Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@polk-fl.net)

By When: Bi-weekly throughout the year

#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.

37% of our students have missed 10% or more school days which is creating disruptions during instruction and learning gaps.

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

By spring 2024 we will decrease the number of students missing 10% or more by 2%.

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

Analyze the district reports and monitor during weekly leadership meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ginnie Aranda (virginia.aranda@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.)

Using district reports, families of students at risk will be contacted following district protocols.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We selected this strategy to increase parent awareness and involvement in their child's education.

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.

Gather and analyze district reports.

Person Responsible: Ginnie Aranda (virginia.aranda@polk-fl.net)

By When: Reports will be run weekly.

Families will be contacted based on district protocols and procedures.

Person Responsible: Ginnie Aranda (virginia.aranda@polk-fl.net)

By When: Based on number of absences as needed

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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.

Students performing below proficiency levels will receive interventions as well as our lowest performing subgroup which is our students with disabilities.

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

By spring 2024 students will have increased to the next placement level within the corrective reading program.

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

Monitoring the Implementation of interventions will take place by using the walthrough form weekly. Student achievement will be monitored through the use of the Individual Reading Progress Chart and district progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gale MacLeod (gale.macleod@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.)

The evidence based intervention being implemented using end of year placement data is the district purchased program, Corrective Reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This intervention will intentionally address our students need in decoding and comprehension skills which are lacking.

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.

Students need to be assessed to determine placement.

Person Responsible: Tracey Spear (tracey.spear@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 2023

Teachers need to be trained on the intervention.

Person Responsible: Tracey Spear (tracey.spear@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 2023

Assign groups/levels across grade levels.

Person Responsible: Tracey Spear (tracey.spear@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 2023

Continuously provide support, monitor, and provide feedback throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Tracey Spear (tracey.spear@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly September 2023 - May 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

• Title I/UniSIG Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)
• Data Com
• Summer Leadership Academy/Retreat
• School Improvement Plan Meetings/Trainings
• PURE Process
• Regional and Office of School Transformation review SIP plans

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

We will increase our K-2 reading proficiency through a focus on building foundational reading skills related to the BEST benchmarks while providing and tracking differentiated small group instruction and interventions.

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

Our 3-5 reading proficiency will increase through intentionally providing and tracking differentiated small group instruction and interventions based on progress monitoring data.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

By spring 2024, students in K-2 will increase proficiency by 1 percentage point on district progress monitoring assessments.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By spring 2024, students in 3-5 will increase proficiency by 1 percentage point on district progress monitoring assessments.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Monitoring will take place by conducting observations during small group, analysis of formative assessment and progress monitoring data, as well as conducting student artifact analysis with grade level teams and/or individual teachers.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Wainwright, Christina, christina.wainwright@polk-fl.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this area is differentiation in small groups for interventions and acceleration as well as differentiation in tasks at learning stations. The specific materials being utilized align and are approved by the state as well as listed on the district PURE list such as Reading Wonders, Leveled Literacy Interventions, and SIPPS.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Differentiated small group instruction will allow the teacher to closely monitor student learning through formative assessments and provide opportunities for reteaching, interventions, and/or enrichment in the identified areas of need. Administration will conduct walthroughs to monitor the fidelity of instruction and documentation of interventions and acceleration provided.

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
Step 1. Provide professional development to new teacher on how to conduct running records, and training using LLI and SIPPS. Assist teachers with decision making in regards to MTSS interventions and acceleration. Step 2. Monitor teacher implementation and provide instructional coaching support and feedback. Step 3. Analyze student outcomes and make instructional adjustments, as needed.	Spear, Tracey, tracey.spear@polk-fl.net

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.

Review Parent and Family Engagement Plan and Compact:
• School/District Webpage - https://medulla.polkschoolsfl.com
• PEN Notebook
• Parent/Family/Community Input Meetings
• Annual Meeting

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))

Review Parent and Family Engagement Plan and Compact:
• Building Capacity Events
• Staff Capacity Building Professional Development
-conferencing
-family/school relationship
• Family/Community Input
• Data Chats/Conferences
• Webpage - https://medulla.polkschoolsfl.com
• Annual Meeting
• Preventing Barriers

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))

Review Use of Funds:
• Supplemental Staff (academic coaches)
• Supplemental Resources
• Professional Development
• Collaborative Planning
Non-Title I initiatives:
• MTSS – Tier Support for Students

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))

• Data Com
• School Improvement Planning Trainings
• Regional (area) Meetings
• Summer Leadership Academy
• Title I Technical Assistance – Use of Funds, PFE Input, Back to School Mtg

• Comprehensive Needs Assessment Technical Assistance
• ESE, Migrant, Early Childhood

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))

• https://polkschoolsfl.com/mentalhealth/
• Individual Counseling
• Group Counseling
• School Consultations
• Drumbeats
• Collaboration with community providers – Peace River Center, Watson Clinic Behavioral Health, Sweet Center – Winter Haven Hospital
-Support Groups
-Grief Support
-Children's Home Society

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))

• Dual Enrollment
• IB/Cambridge
• Career Academies
• Vocational Schools
• Building Capacity of Events – Transition events

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).

• PBiS
• RTI
• MTSS
• Behavior Interventionist, Student Success Coaches, Mental Health Counselors, School Counselors, Deans

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))

• Professional Learning Communities to improve instruction and data
• Data Com
• RTD
• UniSIG Supplemental Teacher/Administrator Allocation
• Collective Bargaining Stipends – Title I, Critical Shortage Area, Highly Effective
• Recruitment and Educator Quality Department - PCPS Culture Ambassador Program

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))

- Early Childhood - https://polkschoolsfl.com/earlychildhood/
- Head Start
- VPK (Title I, ESE and non-Title I)
- Kindergarten Round Up
- Kindergarten Readiness Camps
- Books Bridge Bus
- Migrant Early Childhood Services

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
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention	$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