

Polk County Public Schools

Bethune Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

Bethune Academy

900 AVENUE F, Haines City, FL 33844

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

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.

Bethune Academy values the unique qualities of each person and believes that everyone has the capacity to learn. We expect all learners to attend and show effort, meet the required curriculum, develop responsibility, citizenship, and leadership. We dedicate ourselves to the success of this mission.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a leader in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) education by preparing critical and creative thinkers to meet the challenges through innovation and collaboration.

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
Hewitt, Robin	Principal	Instructional leader and supervisor of everyday student, teacher and staff activities. Provides guidance on the everyday overseeing of the building and management of daily task from teachers and staff.
Aguilar, Janet	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader and supervisor of everyday student, teacher, and staff activities. Assists in providing guidance on the everyday overseeing of the building and management of daily task from teachers and staff.
Williams, Nicole	School Counselor	Provide individual counseling and group guidance to help students cope effectively personal, social, academic, career, and family concerns. Consult with parents, teacher, administrators, and supporting agencies concerning the needs and abilities of students.
Nieves, Itzy	Teacher, ESE	Responsible for organizing and implementing an instructional program to meet the needs of children identified as eligible for exceptional student education services and meeting the duties of teaching as outlined in laws and policies.
Adams, Aisha	Reading Coach	
Hatton, Stella	Magnet Coordinator	TRST, Cambridge Program
McCord, Claudia	Math Coach	
Owens, Patti	Instructional Media	

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.

Our school improvement planning process involves all stakeholders through our various school committees which occur monthly. Our committees includes school advisory council (SAC), data leadership, Cambridge program, positive behavior intervention support (PBIS), and parent, teacher, student association (PTSA). Input is gathered from each of the committees and our SIP is reviewed with each committee throughout the school year. Our School Advisory Council is made up of a diverse group of community members, parents, school staff members, district staff members, and students. Our school leadership team meets weekly and includes the principal, assistant principal, Cambridge coordinator, reading coach, math coach, guidance counselor, media specialist, and ESE teachers. Data leadership, Cambridge, PBIS, and PTSA committees consist of teachers and paraprofessionals from each grade level and content area.

Stakeholders include staff, students, parents, business partners, and community members. We value input from everyone when making decisions. Each member of the committee serves as one of the following:

Facilitator: Prepares and distributes agenda, reviews meeting purpose and facilitate the meeting following the agenda. The responsibility of the facilitator is to follow the agenda helping the group to focus its energies on the task by suggesting methods and procedures, protecting all members of the group from attack, and making sure that everyone has the opportunity to participate. The facilitator serves as a combination of tool guide, traffic officer, and meeting chauffer. S/he is also responsible for all pre-meeting and post-meeting logistics.

Point of Contact (PBIS only): Enters PBIS evaluation data into the PBIS evaluation system (PBISES), ensures evaluation data is shared with the team and used to plan Tier 1 implementation.

Secretary: The secretary’s responsibility is to write down basic ideas using the words of each speaker. The objective is not to record everything that is said but to capture enough ideas that can be preserved and recalled at any time. The secretary’s responsibilities are to type committee minutes into the shared document online.

Classroom Teacher Liaison: Point person for communicating between the team and other staff members ensuring teacher needs are heard and addressed.

Family Liaison: Ensures family input and perspectives are obtained and considered, communicates information to and from family stakeholders and the team.

School Administrator: Attends and actively participates in monthly committee meetings, encourages and supports team efforts, secures resources for planning and implementation.

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))

Our SIP is monitored on a weekly basis during our leadership team meetings and on a monthly basis with our other committees.

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	88%
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: B 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	16	16	23	17	15	8	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	6	7	8	9	6	7	0	0	0	43
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	17	16	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	15	25	0	0	0	55
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	12	7	7	13	0	0	0	46

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	3	5	5	17	15	20	0	0	0	65

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	0	0	10	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) 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	16	14	7	10	8	14	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	17	15	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	24	27	0	0	0	80
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	50	43	47	0	0	0	140

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	16	14	7	10	8	14	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	17	15	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	24	27	0	0	0	80
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	50	43	47	0	0	0	140

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	10	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*	45	45	53	54	47	56	56		
ELA Learning Gains				63			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			30		
Math Achievement*	45	49	59	51	42	50	46		
Math Learning Gains				60			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			21		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	24	41	54	45	49	59	49		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	48	54	59	69			52		

* 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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	204
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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	446
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	3	Yes	3	3
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	41			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	39	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	28	Yes	2	2
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	62			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	52			

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	45			45			24					48
SWD	0			6							2	
ELL	51			47			28				5	48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37			36			21				4	
HSP	47			49			27				5	45
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	70			65							2	
FRL	44			43			24				5	47

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	54	63	59	51	60	45	45					69
SWD	17	31		17	46							
ELL	52	71		43	74		42					69
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	58	52	49	55	39	39					64
HSP	60	65		53	71	67	52					69
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75	80		50	47							
FRL	47	57	52	47	56	43	44					70

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	56	51	30	46	43	21	49					52
SWD	18			18								
ELL	49	41		42	53		47					52

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	48	45	38	29	13	19					
HSP	59	52		47	48		60					54
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	78	47		55	53		71					
FRL	51	58	42	41	53	23	43					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	49%	43%	6%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	53%	2%	58%	-3%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	42%	-1%	50%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	43%	51%	-8%	59%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	56%	9%	61%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	44%	0%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	24%	39%	-15%	51%	-27%

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.

Science proficiency is 24%. There was a discrepancy in correlation of Science Quarterly data to the State Assessment data. Q3= 57%, Q1&Q2= 45%. 5th grade Science teacher was a sub, we had limited cross-curricular alignment, lack of resources (Blue Book), no coach, and limited modeling of lesson implementation.

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

Science Proficiency showed the greatest decline from the year (2021-2022) showing (45% proficiency.) For the 22-23 school year, Science proficiency was 24%.

- Only one 5th grade science teacher, which was a substitute.
- No Science Coach and monthly support with planning.
- Limited cross-curricular alignment opportunities.
- Limited modeling of lesson implementation and long-term investigations.

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.

Science had the greatest gap from the year before. During the 21-22 school year, 45% of our students were proficient. Based on the 22-23 school year, only 24% of our students were proficient.

Bethune-- 24%
District- 39%
State- 51%

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

Based on the 2022 FSA data ELA, Math and Science data, there was no improvement in any content area.

We stayed the same in our math proficiency for the 21-22 and 22-23 school year.

FSA 21-22
ELA- 54%
Math 51%
Science 45%

FAST 22-23
ELA- 47%
Math 51%
Science- 24%

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

Based on the EWS data from Part 1, the area of concern is the students who have 2 or more indicators and one being attendance.

We have addressed our attendance in our school culture and climate goal in this year's 2023-2024 SIP.

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

- To continue to develop a framework to increase standards based instruction
- To increase science proficiency to at least 45%.
- Increase fluency and comprehension through phonics instruction in K-3.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Based on the 2022-2023 Attendance was 93%. We identified over 85 students with 15 or more unexcused absences.

Bethune Academy will establish and maintain a positive culture to support student outcomes.

- increase attendance and PBIS systems and structures

Measurable Outcome:

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

-Bethune Academy will increase its daily attendance to at least 95% or higher.

- (daily attendance report in Focus)

- (% of students attending 22-23 school wide celebration needed here*****

Monitoring:

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

- Monthly attendance celebrations

- % of students attending school wide PBIS celebration (using Bethune bucks to attend)

- Weekly/monthly check and connects with students and families of identified Tier 3 attendance concern students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Williams (nicole.williams@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.)

Based on the PBIS Summer Institute, School wide expectations will be created that include, but not limited to grade level and classroom expectations and protocols.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on the 2022-2023 PBIS celebration attendance, school wide and classroom expectations were not aligned.

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.

The PBIS Team for 23-24 will attend a Summer Institute training and use strategies learned to create school wide expectations and classroom expectations.

Person Responsible: Nicole Williams (nicole.williams@polk-fl.net)

By When: 8/1/23

The PBIS Team for 23-24 will share out school-wide expectations and assist teachers in creating their classroom rules, expectations, consequences, and reward system.

Person Responsible: Nicole Williams (nicole.williams@polk-fl.net)

By When: 8/11/23

The PBIS team will monitor and collect attendance data, discipline data, and classroom incentive data monthly to share at the monthly PBIS committee meeting.

Person Responsible: Nicole Williams (nicole.williams@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly

The PBIS team will create, plan, and facilitate school-wide celebrations.

Person Responsible: Nicole Williams (nicole.williams@polk-fl.net)

By When: Quarterly PBIS Celebrations Cadet of the Month

#2. 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.

Continue work on Learning Arc through collaborative planning with intentional transdisciplinary connections to increase achievement in all areas and learning gains for all students. When teachers plan collaboratively and use common assessments, student achievement will increase. This is a critical need because as we continue to fully implementing BEST standards, teachers need to align tasks and assessments creating equivalent experiences during planning.

This area of focus is aligned to the district strategic plan goals

- 1: Student academic outcomes
2. Develop great teachers and leaders
- 3: Engaging family and community
- 4: Equitable use of resources
5. Educating the whole child

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA proficiency will increase from 47% to 55%

Math proficiency will increase from 51% to 65%

Science proficiency will increase from 24% to 55%

Monitoring:

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

Learning Arc completion and Standards-Based Instructional Walk-Throughs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robin Hewitt (robin.hewitt@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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**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.

Science proficiency for 22-23 was much lower than years past. There was a disconnect between Science Quarterlies and the state assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Science proficiency will increase from 24% to 50%

Monitoring:

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

- Science standards proficiency tracking.
- TRST & District science coach will work to develop a 5th grade science assessment given 3 times a year. This assessment would include all Science standards students would be assessed on.
- Analyze the data to create an intentional small group instruction plan based on student performance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Janet Aguilar (janet.aguilar@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.)

- Modeling of the scientific process, equivalent experience resources, hands-on activities.
- Teacher will track student understanding of the lesson with exit tickets. Teacher will use the data to support small group and or bell work remediation support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need to see the scientific process modeled for them multiple times to learn the procedure. Assessing students using benchmark aligned resources to support the equivalent experience, to ensure students are exposed to the type of questions they will see on the state assessment. Opportunities to explore scientific concepts in action assists students in internalizing information and apply their learning to these investigations.

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.

- Modeling of long-term investigations whole group.
- Analyzing and support tracking of daily exit tickets.
- Develop of science assessment that covers all standards assessed in 5th grade.

Person Responsible: Janet Aguilar (janet.aguilar@polk-fl.net)

By When: - Daily, weekly and quarterly.

Training and implementation of blue books for equivalent experience to questions found in assessment, including charts and graphs.

- Coaching and modeling of whole group science lesson-- With focus on I do, we do, you do.

Person Responsible: Claudia McCord (claudia.mccord@polk-fl.net)

By When: daily, weekly and monthly.

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).

School improvement funding allocations are determined based on our student data. This year's science data was historically lower than in previous years. Our primary focus will be on increasing student science achievement back to our average of at least 50%.

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

K-2 STAR PM3

Phonics

K-23%

1st- 24%

2nd- 73%

3- 74%

Vocab-

K-48%

1- 28%
 2-65%
 3-71%

At the end of 2022-2023 only 3 students tested out of Early STAR

This 2023-2024 school year, our K-2 students will use Reading to Phonics resource during Power Hour to support phonics and vocabulary instruction.

The resource unpacks the vocabulary and phonics benchmark more explicitly to support teaching and student learning.

Teachers will be training on the resource during the 2nd week of September by ELA coach and district trainer.

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

2022-2023 school year, 47% of our students in grade 3rd-5th scored a level 3 or higher. This means 53% of our students scored below a level 3 in grades 3rd-5th.

Teachers in grades 3rd-5th will be provided additional support in instructional practices and delivery during PLCs. This would include teachers planning actual delivery (teacher talk) during planning. Teachers will also plan at what point they will include questioning and progress monitoring in their lessons.

Retained students and Tier 2 and 3 students will be assigned to members of the leadership team for data tracking and supporting in small groups.

Teachers will be provided training and coaching cycles with ELA coach to provide specific and targeted instructional feedback and next steps from coaching cycle.

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

At least 60 % of students in grades K-2 will score out of Early STAR in PM3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

At least 55% of students in grades 3-5 will score a level 3 or higher on PM# for the 2023-2024 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.

-Teachers will use the Reading to phonics assessment as a quick progress monitoring tool to measure student understanding.

- Analyze data from PM1, PM2 and PM3 data.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Adams, Aisha, aisha.adams@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?

- Evidenced Based practices

-- Target small group interventions

-- Reading to Phonics resource to be used during Power Hour

- Staff training on the ELA whole group block and support with pacing.

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?

Based on the 22-23 PM3 FAST Assessment, was evident that intentional support in phonics and vocabulary would increase overall student performance in K-2 and 3rd-5th.

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
-- Teacher training on Reading to Phonics - Teacher coaching cycle using the Reading to Phonics resource - Planning and support during PLC on specific instructional delivery. - Based on PM1 FAST data develop small groups and target retained and Tier 2/3 students for additional support.	Adams, Aisha, aisha.adams@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.

na

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))

na

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)

na

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))

na

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))

na

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))

na

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).

na

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))

na

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))

na

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

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$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