Lewis Anna Woodbury Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lewis Anna Woodbury Elementary School

610 CHARLESTON AVE S, Fort Meade, FL 33841

http://www.lawallstarlions.com/

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.

Committed to EXCELLENCE by providing a high quality education for everyone.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lewis Anna Woodbury Elementary prepares students with the academic skills, habits of mind, and character traits necessary to perform on or above grade level and be prepared for success in college, career, and as productive citizens in the local and global community.

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
mcluckey, alexander	Principal	Principal responsible for data collection and trend analysis. Focusing on results for all students and ESSA groups. Specifically focusing on Math.
Harrison, Christine	Assistant Principal	Assistant principal responsible for analyzing data and monitoring growth of all ESSA groups. Specifically focusing on ELA.
Roberts, Adam	Math Coach	Math coach, responsible for close monitoring of Math proficiency trends and ESSA groups within their subject area.
Barber, Kimberly	Reading Coach	Reading coach, responsible for close monitoring of ELA proficiency trends and ESSA groups within their subject area.

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.

The school leadership team analyzed data from previous year trends, as well as, recent data from the previous year to develop targeted goals for specific groups. A school initiative remains of challenging every grade level to increase student proficiency by a minimum of three percent. The School Advisory Council assisted in developing goals for the 23-24 school year by providing areas of concern for our students through our 22-23 school year SAC meetings. The areas of concern, discussed during SAC meetings has been incorporated into the SIP in the form of specific goals, coupled with findings supported by data. As well as, specific strategies/resources the school will use to reach our goals.

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))

The monitoring and implementation of the plan falls to the principal to guarantee the SIP is being followed. Under the principal's umbrella of supervision, each member of the leadership team, including the principal has been assigned a goal/student subgroup to monitor closely and report back to the team on the overall progress. After reporting the progress to the group, as a team, tweaks to the supports can be made if data demonstrates minimal progress toward the anticipated/expected student achievement goal.

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	68%
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) 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: D
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	26	32	20	33	28	18	0	0	0	157
One or more suspensions	1	5	4	8	4	12	0	0	0	34
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	7	14	7	19	2	15	0	0	0	64
Course failure in Math	3	10	9	10	4	23	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	30	35	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	33	33	32	0	0	0	98
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	20	17	24	36	37	0	0	0	140

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	1	12	7	35	36	37	0	0	0	128

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	7	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	33	16	33	17	21	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	3	0	6	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	11	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	13	31	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	17	38	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	8	3	6	11	13	0	0	0	41

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	10	5	5	1	0	0	0	0	21
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	33	16	33	17	21	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	3	0	6	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	11	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	13	31	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	17	38	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	8	3	6	11	13	0	0	0	41

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	10	5	5	1	0	0	0	0	21
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*	43	45	53	42	47	56	37		
ELA Learning Gains				43			34		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			44		
Math Achievement*	51	49	59	39	42	50	33		
Math Learning Gains				42			27		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			12		
Science Achievement*	40	41	54	26	49	59	33		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	47	54	59	56			48		

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	231
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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	344
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	18	Yes	4	2
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	47			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	46			

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	30	Yes	3	1
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	41			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	44			
FRL	42			

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	43			51			40					47
SWD	13			22			15				4	
ELL	37			44			30				5	47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33			41							3	
HSP	45			51			39				5	48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	42			53			50				4	
FRL	41			51			42				5	49

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	42	43	50	39	42	46	26					56
SWD	18	38	52	15	34	35	15					
ELL	33	38	44	36	48	53	21					56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	46		32	33		19					
HSP	40	40	46	38	46	50	14					57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	48	48		44	38	40	47					
FRL	38	45	51	36	42	47	25					50

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	37	34	44	33	27	12	33					48
SWD	11	40		18	33		8					
ELL	29	25	42	30	28	9	25					48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19	20		26	20							
HSP	35	31	41	32	28	17	31					48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	49	43		41	29		50					
FRL	37	34	50	30	23	5	31					46

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	40%	43%	-3%	54%	-14%
04	2023 - Spring	47%	53%	-6%	58%	-11%
03	2023 - Spring	43%	42%	1%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	58%	51%	7%	59%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	56%	-8%	61%	-13%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	44%	0%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	38%	39%	-1%	51%	-13%

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.

The lowest performance area was science at 39% proficiency. A contributing factor for science proficiency was linked to the overall 5th grade ELA proficiency. Science scored 5 percent lower than the overall 5th grade ELA proficiency. Even with science being the lowest performing area, science demonstrated 13% growth from the previous year and stopped a downward science trend that started in 2016-2017 and saw a decrease of 17% proficiency during that time.

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

None of the core school grade components showed a decline comparatively to the previous year. Of the three cells used to calculate school grade all proficiency levels increased. Math and Science had over a 10% increase over the previous year's proficiency, ELA grew by 3%.

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

5th grade ELA had the largest gap between the state average both in percent proficient and in average scale score. Even though the results are lower than the state average, the cohort of 5th graders made a

4% gain in proficiency for ELA from their 4th grade year and a 14% gain in proficiency in math from their 4th grade year.

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

Two specific grade levels showed higher percent proficient from their previous year. Both 4th and 5th grade demonstrated 18% higher proficiencies in Math from their previous years scores. 4th grade in 21-22 had 30% proficient and during the 22-23 year 4th grade math proficiency was 48%. 5th grade math proficiency was 26% in the 21-22 school year, the students scored 44% proficient in 22-23 school year. 5th grade science was the next highest earner with 13% higher proficiency over the past year. Actions that were taken to support student growth were daily classroom walkthroughs, active tracking during instruction to support small group rotation and the implementation of the learning arc and RTD.

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

The primary area of concern based on EWS is the number of students who are flagged as having substantial reading deficiencies. Across grade levels k-5 from last school year 140 students were flagged as having substantial reading deficiencies. Another primary areas of concern is the number of level 1's in both ELA and Math. Roughly 1 in 3 students scored a level 1 in grades 3 through 5.

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

Establishing and Maintaining 3% proficiency growth for each grade level in each subject area.
Substantial reading deficiencies are targeted and overcome
Increasing student attendance
Improving student scores on FAST and reducing the number of level 1's in Reading and Math.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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

ELA proficiency over a six-year period has averaged 40.8% with Math's proficiency averaging 44% proficiency. Science has the lowest overall proficiency with 36.8%. The focus will be on the instructional practice to increase overall proficiency and support growth throughout the school.

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

To combat historic proficiency levels, school-wide grade level goals of 3% proficiency growth will be implemented. Once initial data is received on the new kindergarten cohort, we will be able to establish a baseline for our youngest students. This baseline will allow leadership to see if the cohort grew 3% over the coarse of their time at Lewis Anna Woodbury. Each grade level will grow a minimum of 18% from their baseline kindergarten score. All other grade levels will be required to grow their grade-level proficiency by 3% over the course of the school year from their fall baseline data.

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

Progress monitoring data offered by district-level assessment platforms will be used to ensure students are mastering benchmarks being taught after planning is properly implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

alexander mcluckey (alexander.mcluckey@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.)

Teaching grade-level benchmarks and providing on-grade-level work.
Using the Learning Arc during planning to effectively plan lessons and appropriate tasks.
Focus on active tracking during instruction to determine daily learning gaps.
Provide students with rubrics and criteria when completing work and interacting during centers so they understand expected outcomes.
Create universal expectations for teachers so that all students receive a similar experience and all students receive the same level of preparedness.
Implementation of Numberworlds and Reading Mastery/Corrective Reading

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

Active tracking allows for in-the-moment understanding of student knowledge. Universal expectations provides students a similar experience. On-grade-level work guarantees students are exposed to an equivalent experience to what they will see when tested.

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.

Assigning grade-level goals of 3% and monitoring their success.

Person Responsible: alexander mcluckey (alexander.mcluckey@polk-fl.net)

By When: Grade level goals and expectations will be provided to teachers during pre-planning week and teachers will be reminded weekly at their planning.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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 2022-23 ESSA data, our students with disabilities fell below the 41% federal index consecutively for 3 years.

The effectiveness of the school leadership team will be measured utilizing walkthrough tool data. From walkthrough data an action plan will be established to address instructional priorities that enhance instructional delivery that will positively impact student achievement.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024, 50% (29 out of 57) of students with disabilities will show growth or learning gains as measured by the ELA FAST.

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

SLT will conduct weekly SWT and provide ESE teachers with feedback on enhancing instructional delivery and assessing students' learning. SLT will actively participate and attend weekly collaborative planning with grade level teachers and ESE teachers. The team will focus on planning scaffolding supports to help students with disabilities to have access to aligned benchmark tasks to help close the learning gap among them and their peers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

alexander mcluckey (alexander.mcluckey@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.)

Through collaborative planning with SLT, grade level teachers, and ESE teachers, differentiated benchmark aligned tasks will be created to support the specific instructional needs of the targeted student group of SWD. ESE teachers will provide daily push-in instructional support into the general education classroom. Both the general education teacher and ESE teacher will assess and track students' mastery toward the FL BEST benchmarks. Admin will use the walkthrough tool to gather data and provide feedback and coaching to teachers to enhance their instructional delivery of the FL BEST benchmarks.

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

These evidence-based interventions/strategies will ensure that the ESE teachers' instructional support is benchmark aligned and is providing our students with disability with equivalent experiences of the ELA FAST. Data Chats between admin, the general teachers, and ESE teachers,

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.

Collaborative Planning with general education teachers and ESE teachers to ensure a clear understanding of the state's intent of each benchmark and to plan common benchmark aligned task and assessments.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Barber (kimberly.barber@polk-fl.net)

By When: This will be completed weekly through collaborative planning using the learning arc tool or following the uniform collaborative planning agenda.

Conducting standard walkthroughs and providing feedback on the instructional delivery of the BEST benchmark and how teachers are assessing and tracking students' mastery of the benchmark.

Person Responsible: alexander mcluckey (alexander.mcluckey@polk-fl.net)

By When: Walkthroughs will be conducted weekly, and intentional and timely feedback will be provided.

Conducting standard walkthroughs and providing feedback on the instructional delivery of the BEST benchmark and how teachers are assessing and tracking students' mastery of the benchmark.

Person Responsible: Christine Harrison (christine.harrison@polk-fl.net)

By When: Walkthroughs will be conducted weekly, and intentional and timely feedback will be provided.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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 2022-23 ESSA data, our African American students fell below the 41% federal index consecutively for 2 years.

The effectiveness of the school leadership team will be measured utilizing walkthrough tool data. From walkthrough data an action plan will be established to address instructional priorities that enhance instructional delivery that will positively impact student achievement.

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

The expectation is that our African American student population will grow by at least 14% in ELA proficiency. We currently have 37 total students who represent our African American population. For the school to reach 41% minimum proficiency 16 students across grades 3-5 are needed to be proficient. According to lasty years data 11 students were proficient from our returning students which would require 5 more students to earn proficiency.

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

SLT will conduct weekly SWT and provide teachers with feedback on enhancing instructional delivery and assessing students' learning. SLT will actively participate and attend weekly collaborative planning. The team will focus on each teacher's understanding the state's full intent of each benchmark, planning aligned common tasks and assessments, and planning intentional ELA FAST equivalent experiences for students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
alexander mcluckey (alexander.mcluckey@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.)

Through collaborative planning with SLT and teachers, differentiated benchmark aligned tasks will be created to support the specific instructional needs of the targeted student group of African American students. Teachers will assess and track students' mastery toward the FL BEST ELA benchmarks. Admin will use the walkthrough tool to gather data and provide feedback and coaching to teachers to enhance their instructional delivery of the FL BEST ELA benchmarks.

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

These evidence-based interventions/strategies will ensure that teachers' instructional delivery is benchmark aligned and is providing our students with equivalent experiences of the FL FAST ELA assessment.

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.

Collaborative Planning with teachers to ensure a clear understanding of the state's intent of each benchmark and to plan common benchmark aligned task and assessments.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Barber (kimberly.barber@polk-fl.net)

By When: This will be completed weekly through collaborative planning using the learning arc tool or following the uniform collaborative planning agenda.

Conducting standard walkthroughs and providing feedback on the instructional delivery of the BEST benchmark and how teachers are assessing and tracking students' mastery of the benchmark.

Person Responsible: alexander mcluckey (alexander.mcluckey@polk-fl.net)

By When: Bi-quarterly data chats, every 4 to 5 weeks.

#4. 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.

Teachers will implement the schoolwide PBIS plan by utilizing data, Sanford Harmony, student culture activities, and PBIS teacher response strategies to support positive behavioral and social emotional outcomes for all students. This Area of Focus cultivating a safe and positive learning environment where students can be academically and socially successful. The student tracking forms will be collected monthly to measure the implementation of the program with fidelity. The goal is 80% of students will be earn the monthly tier 1 PBIS reward. This form will show a increase of student positive outcomes, as well to identify areas of intervention needs and data trends.

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

Through this area of focus of supporting students behavior and social emotional needs, the school will see a 5% decrease in the amount of students with 10% absences or more during the 2023-2024 school year.

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

This area of focus will be monitored weekly by reviewing the attendance of students with more that 10 days absent.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Harrison (christine.harrison@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 strategies for this area of focus will include teach, monitor and reinforcing classroom rules and expectations aligned to the schoolwide PBIS expectations, teach routines and procedures to maximize structure in the classroom to create an positive and orderly learning environment, and implementing a daily social emotional lessons (Sanford Harmony).

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

These strategies will provide high expectations across the campus while producing a positive campus culture and optimal learning environment for all students.

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.

Monitoring student attendance with 10 or more days out.

Person Responsible: Christine Harrison (christine.harrison@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly

Conduct attendance meetings and provide tier support to families.

Person Responsible: Leslie Belcher (leslie.belcher@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly

Facilitate PBIS meetings including data analysis to make adjustments to the schoolwide plan based on student needs.

Person Responsible: Christine Harrison (christine.harrison@polk-fl.net)

By When: 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).

A variety of methods are used to review school improvement funding and determine if allocations have been made to the correct resources to support student achievement:

Title I/Unisig Comprehensive Needs Assessment
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

Kindergarten proficiency based on STAR was 79%, with 1st grade proficiency being 47% and 2nd grade proficiency at 39%. This averages to 55% for k-2 according to STAR.

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

Third Grade had 44% proficiency and 4th grade had 47% proficiency for the 22-23 school year. 5th grade students were 41% proficient based on 22-23 FAST data. To support deficiencies in ELA for grades 3-5 Lewis Anna Woodbury is utilizing corrective reading to support struggling readers during Power Hour.

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

Students in K-2 will have an average of 50% proficient on STAR/FAST Reading/Early Literacy Assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Students in 3-5 will have an average of 50% proficient on the FAST ELA assessment.

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.

The area of focus will be to increase student achievement in all grades to reach a minimum average of 50% across the three clustered grades, K-2 and 3-5. SLT will conduct weekly SWT and provide teachers with feedback on enhancing instructional delivery and assessing students' learning. SLT will actively participate and attend weekly collaborative planning. The team will focus on each teacher's understanding the state's full intent of each benchmark, planning aligned common tasks and assessments, and planning intentional ELA FAST equivalent experiences for students.

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

mcluckey, alexander, alexander.mcluckey@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?

Through collaborative planning with SLT and teachers, benchmark aligned tasks will be created to support the state's full intent of the benchmarks. Teachers will assess and track students' mastery toward the FL BEST ELA benchmarks. Admin will use the walkthrough tool to gather data and provide feedback and coaching to teachers to enhance their instructional delivery of the FL BEST ELA benchmarks. In addition, in grades 3-5, Corrective Reading is being implemented as a remediation strategy to assist struggling readers and support learning gains that could allow bubble students to reach proficiency.

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?

These evidence-based interventions/strategies will ensure that teachers' instructional delivery is benchmark aligned and is providing our students with equivalent experiences of the FL FAST ELA assessment. Corrective Reading is being offered to lower performing students who tested into the program to support learning gains in the hopes of increasing bubble students to reach proficiency.

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
Tier 1 teaching- Collaborative Planning with teachers to ensure a clear understanding of the state's full intent of each benchmark and to plan common benchmark aligned task and assessments.	Barber, Kimberly, kimberly.barber@polk-fl.net
Conducting standard walkthroughs and providing feedback on the instructional delivery of the BEST benchmark and how teachers are assessing and tracking students' mastery of the benchmark. Conduct Data Chats every 4-5 weeks to assess student growth.	mcluckey, alexander, alexander.mcluckey@polk-fl.net
Assessing Corrective Reading effectiveness and if changes need to be made to groups based on student advancement through the levels.	Harrison, Christine, christine.harrison@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.

The school uses multiple methods for dissemination of the SIP:
School and District webpage
Parent/Family/Community Input Meetings
SAC meetings

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))

The school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders by:
Hosting Title 1 events (Literacy Night, Math Night) to support parents by displaying what their children are learning and providing materials to support growth.
Providing information on the school webpage.
Family conferences/Data chats
Monthly AR nights to increase a desire for students to read and support families who encourage their children to read.
Grade Level Awards ceremonies at the end of the year.

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)

The school plans to strengthen our academic program through the funding of supplemental staff to support the core subject areas with planning. Also, 4 other support personnel have been funded through Title 1 funds to push in and support student growth in the classroom. Funds for collaborative planning have been allocated to support proper analysis of student data and creation of lessons based on data driven student needs. Similarly, supportive materials for content areas and online subscriptions have been funded to support student growth. The school also participates in RTD (response to data) to assist with supporting student growth and overall proficiency.

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))

This plan fits within the guidelines established by the federal, state, and local services because administrators and leadership members attend school improvement planning trainings. A comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) is completed by school leadership to determine student needs and identify how to allocate resources. Also, specific programs are implemented at the school level with targeted students in mind: ESE, Migrant, and 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))

The school supports various services used to assist students regarding mental health services, specialized support services, and mentoring services:
https://polkschoolsfl.com/mentalhealth/
Individual Counseling
School Consultants
Drumbeats
Harmony Lessons
Collaboration with community providers- Peace River Center, Watson Clinic Behavioral Health

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

n/a

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

To support different student levels of behavior and academics the school has implemented multiple methods for tiering. The school utilizes a PBiS support system throughout the classrooms and common areas. Teachers are supported and rewarded as well for their participation and work. Also, the school has implemented MTSS meetings established by the school counselor to support students who are struggling educationally in the classroom. Similarly, the school has the support of behavior interventionists and mental health counselors for situations that require further support.

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))

To promote student achievement the school offers various methods of professional learning for the staff. We have incorporated professional learning communities that are led by teacher leaders. The majority of learning for the staff is driven by teacher leaders who create the agenda and plan the activities in accordance with the mission and vision of the school. We use Data Com to identify trends regarding student learning that need to be addressed to support academic growth.

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))

The school uses various methods to promote preparedness for our pre-k students transitioning to the elementary program. We have Head Start for our students and parents and Early Childhood- https://polkschoolsfl.com/earlychildhood/. Also, our school engages in a kindergarten roundup to allow parents information regarding our kindergarten program. Parents are able to meet teachers and explore the campus. During this event, parents are provided educational material to support their child's growth over the summer to increase kindergarten readiness. Furthermore, our school provides a kindergarten readiness camp over the summer that lasts 4 weeks and helps prepare students for the length of educational days and the rigors that kindergarten requires.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	$0.00
4	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