

Polk County Public Schools

North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

North Lakeland Elementary School Of Choice

410 ROBSON ST W, Lakeland, FL 33805

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

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.

North Lakeland Elementary - In partnership with families and the community, create a safe and engaging learning environment that provides our students with opportunities to prepare them for academic success, career readiness, life-long learning, citizenship, and global awareness.

Provide the school's vision statement.

North Lakeland Elementary—A learning community that prepares our students for success by meeting the individual needs of each and every student.

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
Miller, Talley	Principal	The principal will be visible on campus leading collaborative planning sessions and conducting classroom walk throughs to ensure the follow through and connections between planning and instruction are implemented with authenticity. The principal will conduct leadership team classroom walk throughs to calibrate and notice trends for classroom needs. The principal will review and discuss real time data with leadership team and with faculty during collaborative planning. The principal will hold real time discussions and provide timely feedback to the faculty and staff.
Wiedenman, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal will support the principal and leadership team by being visible on campus, leading collaborative planning sessions, and conducting classroom walk throughs to ensure the follow through and connections between planning and instruction are implemented with authenticity. The assistant principal will participate in leadership team classroom walk throughs to calibrate and notice trends for classroom needs. The assistant principal will review and discuss real time data with leadership team and with faculty during collaborative planning. The assistant principal will hold real time discussions and provide timely feedback to the faculty and staff.
Curatolo, Jessica	Reading Coach	The reading coach provides support, coaching, and modeling to faculty in conjunction with trends noticed through leadership team walk throughs. The reading coach will use a tiered system of support ranging from teachers that need minimal classroom support or resources support up to maximum support of coaching coaching cycles and modeling of literacy instruction.
Wright, Caitlin	Math Coach	The math coach provides support, coaching, and modeling to faculty in conjunction with trends noticed through leadership team walk throughs. The math coach will use a tiered system of support ranging from teachers that need minimal classroom support or resources support up to maximum support of coaching coaching cycles and modeling of mathematics instruction.

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.

School administration and leadership team host multiple events to gather stakeholder input. During spring family events, draft documents are passed out and families are requested to provide feedback through surveys. After the events, draft documents are distributed to staff and families not in attendance at the events through teacher mailboxes and sent home with each student. Staff and families are requested to provide feedback through surveys. The draft documents are also presented at SAC meetings where neighborhood stakeholders (church members and community members) are able to provide verbal feedback after review and discussion.

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 weekly Leadership Team meetings, walk through calibrations, ongoing progress monitoring data, and feedback from district Instructional Reviews will be reviewed. Goals and focus of SIP will be reviewed with staff at progress monitoring points throughout the year. Adjustments will be made to the SIP.

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	77%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 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	51	59	41	56	31	31	0	0	0	269	
One or more suspensions	10	10	7	20	19	11	0	0	0	77	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	1	12	9	34	8	0	0	0	64	
Course failure in Math	0	1	8	5	14	4	0	0	0	32	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	36	25	0	0	0	89	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	34	27	0	0	0	85	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	19	40	34	49	20	38	0	0	0	200	

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	15	25	13	63	30	51	0	0	0	197

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	0	1	4	8	44	9	0	0	0	66
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

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	66	41	50	43	34	47	0	0	0	281	
One or more suspensions	9	9	15	12	3	16	0	0	0	64	
Course failure in ELA	1	12	9	34	8	14	0	0	0	78	
Course failure in Math	1	8	5	14	4	8	0	0	0	40	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	47	3	27	0	0	0	77	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	46	3	30	0	0	0	79	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	26	26	38	29	41	57	0	0	0	217	

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	26	26	38	29	41	57	0	0	0	217

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	8	44	9	0	0	0	0	66
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

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	66	41	50	43	34	47	0	0	0	281	
One or more suspensions	9	9	15	12	3	16	0	0	0	64	
Course failure in ELA	1	12	9	34	8	14	0	0	0	78	
Course failure in Math	1	8	5	14	4	8	0	0	0	40	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	47	3	27	0	0	0	77	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	46	3	30	0	0	0	79	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	26	26	38	29	41	57	0	0	0	217	

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	26	26	38	29	41	57	0	0	0	217

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	8	44	9	0	0	0	0	66
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

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*	28	45	53	37	47	56	35		
ELA Learning Gains				57			30		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			33		
Math Achievement*	32	49	59	33	42	50	37		
Math Learning Gains				51			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			29		
Science Achievement*	25	41	54	36	49	59	36		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	51	54	59	54			44		

* 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	160
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	354
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	9	Yes	4	3
ELL	23	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	22	Yes	1	1
HSP	36	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	28	Yes	1	1
FRL	30	Yes	1	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	26	Yes	3	2
ELL	35	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	41			

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	43			

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	28			32			25					51
SWD	8			18			0				4	
ELL	16			31			6				5	51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22			28			21				4	
HSP	31			39			27				5	51
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	32			25			38				4	
FRL	27			30			25				5	48

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	37	57	41	33	51	45	36					54
SWD	10	38	37	12	38	33	14					
ELL	26	46	30	28	40	33	22					54
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	27	53		29	59	64	41					
HSP	35	54	38	29	46	40	29					53
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	49	64		43	51		39					
FRL	32	56	46	27	50	50	30					53

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	35	30	33	37	44	29	36					44
SWD	18	10	8	18	19	9	7					
ELL	27	38		27	50		36					44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	24	30	31	25	17	21					
HSP	30	30		31	45		41					44
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	51	37		60	67		56					
FRL	28	25	33	29	40	27	31					38

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	27%	43%	-16%	54%	-27%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	53%	-8%	58%	-13%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	26%	42%	-16%	50%	-24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	35%	51%	-16%	59%	-24%
04	2023 - Spring	41%	56%	-15%	61%	-20%
05	2023 - Spring	30%	44%	-14%	55%	-25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	23%	39%	-16%	51%	-28%

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.

5th grade science demonstrated the lowest performance at 25% proficiency. Teacher and student absences were significant contributing factors. 31% of 5th grade students had an attendance rate less than 90%. In addition to attendance, 2023 ELA proficiency had a decrease of 6% schoolwide in comparison to the 21-22 school year which is a contributing factor when students are unable to read and respond to grade level text. In the trend data, ELA achievement has fluctuated over the past few years. ELA declined in 2021 and increased slightly in 2022. Specifically, 3rd grade ELA scores, at 22% proficient, can be attributed to teachers struggling with stacking benchmarks. Often, the comprehension benchmarks were taught in isolation without supporting benchmarks which led to missed instructional opportunities.

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

5th grade Science showed the greatest decline at an 11% decrease in proficiency from the prior year. In addition to absences and difficulty reading grade level text, there was a loss of a teacher with science instructional strength.

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.

At 29% difference, 5th grade ELA proficiency had the greatest gap from the state average. Contributing factors are teacher and student attendance as well as changes in 5th grade teachers.

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

Math Achievement showed improvement with a 3% increase in proficiency. A change in math coach during the first quarter of 22-23 allowed for a deeper dive into the foundational math practices during collaborative planning. Additionally, the math coach was able to support a variety of teachers with differentiated resources and coaching. Classroom teachers demonstrated confidence in math instruction.

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

The areas of concern are 269 students absent more than 10% of the time and 200 students that have a substantial reading deficiency.

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

1. increase reading proficiency
2. increase science proficiency
3. increase math proficiency
4. reduce number of students with substantial reading deficiency
5. increase attendance for students

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 low proficiency scores in ELA (31%), Science (25%), and Math (36%), benchmark-aligned instruction is a critical need. The rate at which the SWD and ELL subgroups are achieving proficiency is lower in comparison to other subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 23-24 school year, student achievement in ELA will increase 12% proficiency, Science will increase 18% proficiency, and Math will increase 7% proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring toward the goals will be monitored using the District's Standardized Walkthrough Tool. The data will be used to ensure that the instructional materials and student learning tasks developed in common planning aligns with the full intent of the benchmark.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Talley Miller (talley.miller@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.)

Collaborative Planning using the Learning Arc will allow for instructional planning to provide consistent grade level opportunities for students to have equivalent experiences and to demonstrate mastery on a daily basis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Marzano, all students need to have the opportunity to be engaged in grade level, meaningful work. Students need the opportunity to work on grade appropriate assignments, strong instruction where students are doing most of the work, deep engagement, and high expectations.

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 calendar of calibration walk throughs for administrators and leadership team using the District Walk Through Tool

Person Responsible: Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 2023

Review walk through trends during weekly Leadership Meetings and discuss next steps

Person Responsible: Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

By When: ongoing

Review walk through trends during weekly Collaborative Planning and discuss next steps

Person Responsible: Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

By When: ongoing

Ensure each benchmark is addressed through the use of an equivalent experience in collaborative planning

Person Responsible: Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

By When: ongoing

During instructional planning, benchmarks that have a relationship will be selected and either stacked or connected with target benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

By When: ongoing

#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.

According to 22-23 attendance data, 42% of students have less than 90% attendance rate. Comparably, within the subgroups, 42% of SWD and 43% of ELL students have less than 90% attendance rate. When students are not in attendance, they are unable to receive instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student attendance will improve and students with less than 90% attendance rate will decrease by 5% to at least 37%.

Monitoring:

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

The administration will review weekly attendance data and disseminate to staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Wiedenman (jennifer.wiedenman@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.)

School staff will improve attendance by fostering communication and collaboration with parents and families as well as providing established routines for students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research indicates that chronic absenteeism is a contributing factor in school drop out rates and unsuccessful academic careers.

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.

Administration will recognize classes and students that have above 90% attendance rate.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Wiedenman (jennifer.wiedenman@polk-fl.net)

By When: ongoing, weekly

During parent events, staff will provide awareness and discussion opportunities with families about the impact and importance of attendance.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Wiedenman (jennifer.wiedenman@polk-fl.net)

By When: quarterly family events

Office staff, teachers, and administrators will follow up with students and families when noticeable absenteeism begins, which could include but is not limited to letters, phone calls, home visits, or district support.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Wiedenman (jennifer.wiedenman@polk-fl.net)

By When: ongoing

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).

Beginning with the Title 1 Comprehensive Needs Assessment, funds were allocated for instructional support staff. Instructional coaches, interventionists, and paraeducators are needed to provide targeted reading and math intervention for small groups of students. In a review of historical school data and current performance data during Data Com, data trends indicate an ongoing decline in student proficiency. Attendance and family involvement are contributing factors to student achievement so funding is allocated to support family events.

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

The implementation with fidelity and consistency of resources for remediation has been a need for our teachers. It is necessary for differentiation to occur in the classroom for student achievement to increase. We will utilize the program Reading Mastery in order to increase students proficiency in grades K-2 using a systematic approach that focuses on decoding through explicit phonics methods and comprehensions along with vocabulary instruction.

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

The implementation with fidelity and consistency of resources for remediation has been a need for our teachers. It is necessary for differentiation to occur in the classroom for student achievement to increase. We will utilize the programs, Corrective Reading, and LLI in order to increase students proficiency in

grades 3-5. This will allow for focused targeted interventions that will assist with decoding, phonemic awareness, and phonics instruction along with vocabulary and comprehension.

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

Progress monitoring data will show cohort data achieve at least a 5% increase in proficiency from the 22-23 school year.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

State data will show an overall increase of at least 5% from the 21-22 school year in learning gains for ELA and bottom 25% learning gains in ELA. The learning gains will be compared to the 21- 22 school year due to no learning gains for the 22-23 school year.

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.

Through the use of consistent progress monitoring utilizing the district progress monitoring tool to assess students progress. We will also utilize the district standard walkthrough tool in order to ensure that the task that students are working on are properly aligned with the states intent of the standard. We will implement the use of the corrective reading walkthrough tool to ensure the program is being implemented with fidelity.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Miller, Talley, talley.miller@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?

Corrective Reading was found to have potentially positive effects on alphabetic and fluency and no discernible effects on comprehension. Corrective Reading is designed to promote reading accuracy (decoding), fluency, and comprehension skills of students in grade 3 or higher who are reading below their grade level.

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?

The rationale for selecting the programs includes that it has examined in grades 3-5 in urban and rural settings as well as among multiple races and socioeconomic backgrounds. These studies have been rated by several groups as followed.

Corrective Reading has been rated as Strong by Evidence for ESSA (<https://www.evidenceforessa.org/programs/reading/corrective-reading-elementary>) for students in grades three and five. The What Works Clearinghouse reported Potentially Positive Effects for Alphabets and Fluency, but No Discernible Evidence for building Comprehension skills in 3rd grade (https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/InterventionReports/WWC_Corrective_Reading_070207.pdf) or for improving Alphabets, Fluency, and Comprehension in 5th grade (https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/InterventionReports/wwc_corrective_reading_091410.pdf).

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
1. Professional Learning- Staff will attend Corrective Reading or reading mastery training prior to teaching the program.	Curatolo, Jessica, jessica.curatolo@polk-fl.net
Literacy Coaching will be provided to teachers that are new to teaching or in need of extra support based off the district walkthrough tool and student data during progress monitoring.	Miller, Talley, talley.miller@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.

Information is accessible to families on the school website and social media in dual languages, presented during the annual meeting, and reviewed during parent conferences. Information is also printed within the student agenda.

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))

Positive relationships with stakeholders will begin with building staff capacity for communication with families. Positive relationships with stakeholders will grow throughout the year during parent conferences and quarterly family events, starting with the Title One Annual Meeting and Open House, continuing with Parent Conference Night and STEM Night, and ending with the transition event of Kindergarten Round Up.

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)

Academic coaches and interventionists support the facilitation of professional development and collaborative planning to ensure benchmark aligned instruction. Paraeducators are utilized to implement supplemental reading and math resources with small groups of students in need of remediation and acceleration.

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))

not applicable

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.

Yes