

Polk County Public Schools

Polk City Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Polk City Elementary School

125 BOUGAINVILLEA AVE S, Polk City, FL 33868

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

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.

Polk City Elementary will demonstrate high expectations by collaborating and communicating with the community, parents, staff and students to foster a safe, respectful and diverse learning environment that provides differentiated opportunities for all to think critically and participate in student centered, rigorous, standards based, high quality instruction.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Polk City Elementary School students will be independent thinkers and problem solvers who work cooperatively to meet high expectations in order to become lifelong learners.

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
Erb-hancock, Jennifer	Principal	To provide the vision and leadership necessary to develop and administer educational experiences that optimize the human and material resources available. To ensure implementation of learning processes for all students and staff leading to enhanced student achievement. To provide a safe and orderly environment for students, staff, parents and community members.
Miller, Jessica	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal in providing the vision and leadership necessary to develop and administer educational experiences that optimize the human and material resources available. To assist the principal with ensuring implementation of learning processes for all students and staff leading to enhanced student achievement. To provide a safe and orderly environment for students, staff, parents and community members.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

School improvement goals are developed based on the school data and school need. Goals and data are presented to faculty, staff and the school advisory council annually. Input is solicited, noted and included in making modifications to the established 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))

Each goal written in the SIP will drive our day to day operation of ensuring learning achievement. Student data will be reviewed following each progress monitoring period. Teacher observation data will be reviewed quarterly. If revisions are necessary, they will be made mid year.

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	34%
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	31	33	25	23	24	25	0	0	0	161	
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	10	5	7	0	0	0	25	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	16	27	29	31	22	29	0	0	0	154	

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	9	9	11	45	29	27	0	0	0	130

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	8	11	7	26	0	0	0	0	0	52
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	43	35	35	20	25	0	0	0	0	158	
One or more suspensions	3	5	3	8	10	6	0	0	0	35	
Course failure in ELA	20	24	27	17	11	0	0	0	0	99	
Course failure in Math	11	18	24	26	11	0	0	0	0	90	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	37	23	21	0	0	0	81	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	37	21	27	0	0	0	85	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	20	46	96	87	35	10	0	0	0	294	

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	7	18	23	20	38	30	0	0	0	136

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	10	8	18	0	2	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	43	35	35	20	25	0	0	0	0	158	
One or more suspensions	3	5	3	8	10	6	0	0	0	35	
Course failure in ELA	20	24	27	17	11	0	0	0	0	99	
Course failure in Math	11	18	24	26	11	0	0	0	0	90	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	37	23	21	0	0	0	81	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	37	21	27	0	0	0	85	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	20	46	96	87	35	10	0	0	0	294	

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	7	18	23	20	38	30	0	0	0	136

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	10	8	18	0	2	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	37	45	53	43	47	56	40		
ELA Learning Gains				59			36		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			57		
Math Achievement*	36	49	59	43	42	50	41		
Math Learning Gains				53			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			63		
Science Achievement*	36	41	54	38	49	59	45		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	73	54	59	50			56		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	217
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	47

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	379
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	25	Yes	3	2
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	42			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	36	Yes	1	
FRL	38	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	2	1
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	50			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	43			
FRL	43			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	37			36			36					73
SWD	18			16			18				5	43
ELL	27			24			40				5	73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	34			36			36				5	73
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	39			35			33				4	
FRL	30			29			32				5	74

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	43	59	49	43	53	44	38					50
SWD	17	39	53	22	34	27	25					
ELL	38	67		22	60							50
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK												
HSP	47	66		38	62	58	29					50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	40	54	43	41	48	41	37					
FRL	37	54	47	37	50	44	30					47

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	40	36	57	41	40	63	45					56
SWD	20			18	50		40					
ELL	59			35								56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	47	33		39	46		46					56
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	37	35	45	41	36	55	46					
FRL	33	35	50	35	34	50	42					45

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	41%	43%	-2%	54%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	53%	-9%	58%	-14%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	31%	42%	-11%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	30%	51%	-21%	59%	-29%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	56%	-6%	61%	-11%
05	2023 - Spring	33%	44%	-11%	55%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	36%	39%	-3%	51%	-15%

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.

Overall grades 3-5 in all subjects are showing as low performing. Grade 3 ELA and Math are the lowest performers. Students coming from 2nd grade were not adequately prepared for 3rd grade, teacher turnover and high class sizes could have contributed to the low performance.

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

Students leaving 4th grade in 21-22 were showing proficiency, however the same students as 5th graders for 22-23 had a significant decline in ELA and Math.

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.

Both ELA and Math show a gap when compared to the state average.

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

Students in 3rd grade during the 21-22 school year showed significant improvement as 4th graders in the 23-24 school year in both ELA and Math.

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

The number of student discipline referrals for the same students and overall student attendance rates.

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

ELA, Math, Science proficiency
ESE subgroup proficiency
Small group instruction to close learning gaps
Student discipline
Student attendance

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.

The area of focus is the strengthen Tier 1 instruction to increase student achievement in literacy, mathematics and science.

Rationale-Current proficiency levels in all subjects are well below 50% in grades 3, 4, 5 as measured by FAST.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency for each subject will be determined by STAR Early Literacy, STAR reading and math, FAST ELA and Math and Science NGSSS, respectively. 50% of the students tested are expected to be proficient at the respective grade level in each subject.

Monitoring:

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

Administration/Leadership Team will:

Use Qualtrics during walk throughs to monitor and measure benchmark aligned instruction.

Progress monitoring data will be reviewed following each test administration.

Participate and coach in collaborative planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@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.)

Implement the learning arc as a planning tool to appropriately align benchmarks to tasks and assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Planning for instruction of tasks and assessments that directly align to the benchmarks will increase opportunities for all students to receive appropriate and differentiated Tier 1 instruction.

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.

Leadership team will provide professional development in the following areas: learning arc, BEST standards, formative and summative assessments, data collection and analyzing data.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the school year, by end of the 3rd quarter.

Utilize PLC processes including the learning arc to collaboratively plan instruction and tasks, develop appropriate assessments, analyze data and act on assessment results.

Person Responsible: Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the school year, by end of the 3rd quarter.

Inclusion teachers will support classroom teachers and students with disabilities with Tier 1 instruction. Inclusion teachers will provide students with disabilities support through the use of scaffolding skills so students have the tools necessary to master the grade level benchmarks

Person Responsible: Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the school year, by end of the 3rd quarter.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group 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.

Teachers will use data to diagnose student deficiencies, intentionally plan targeted intervention lessons, consistently deliver targeted intervention lessons, monitor student progress and adjust instruction based on response to intervention.

Rational-Student data shows students are not proficient with tier 1 instruction and will require tier 2 and tier 3 interventions to close the achievement gap.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By targeting specific students with specific academic gaps, proficiency will increase.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers and leadership team will monitor student MTSS data and progress monitoring results. Leadership team will conduct walkthroughs with feedback and coaching during intervention time.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@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.)

Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading, Numbers World and Fountas & Pinnell guided reading materials.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research supports that guided reading and prescriptive small group instruction closes the achievement gap improving proficiency.

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.

Teachers will administer diagnostic and progress monitoring assessments. Teachers will analyze data to plan for and form/adjust groups. Teachers will monitor student progress and adjust instruction accordingly.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the school, by the end of the 3rd quarter.

Leadership team will monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 instructional plans and small group instruction. Teachers will receive support and coaching in areas of need.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the school, by the end of the 3rd quarter.

Students with disabilities will receive support and differentiated instruction to meet their needs while working towards proficiency.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the school, by the end of the 3rd quarter.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

Effectively implement behavior expectations and strategies to increase positive student behavior and improve student attendance rates.

Rationale-Students who are present daily and authentically engaged exhibit less disruptive behaviors.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The number of ODRs and cases of bullying/harassment will decrease by 20%. Attendance rates will increase by 4%.

Monitoring:

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

Discipline and attendance reports will be monitored and reviewed by the leadership team weekly. Attendance manager will also monitor attendance rates.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Social skills/Sanford Harmony lessons will be taught daily in all classrooms. All staff will implement the schoolwide behavior expectations. School counselors will support specific groups of students to address targeted needs. The attendance manager and truancy officer will work with parents to support students with chronic absences.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Due to the high percentage of low SES students it is necessary to teach social skills to decrease unwanted behaviors. Based on the number of absences it is imperative to implement interventions and support.

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.

Teachers will contact families after 2 consecutive absences. Teachers will be responsible for creating intervention plans with the families to improve student attendance rates. Teachers will collaborate with the attendance manager as needed.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

School counselor will support teachers with implementing and teaching social skills/Sanford Harmony lessons.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Administration and school counselors will support teachers with implementing behavior expectations and behavior plans.

Person Responsible: Jessica Miller (jessica.miller@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

#4. 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 STAR progress monitoring and state assessment data, students with disabilities are underperforming compared to their general education peers in both ELA and Math. Overall student data shows students who are not proficient with Tier 1 instruction will require Tier 2 and/or 3 interventions to close the achievement gap. Teachers will use data to diagnose student deficiencies, intentionally plan targeted intervention and acceleration lessons, consistently deliver targeted intervention and acceleration lessons, monitor student progress and adjust instruction based on the response to intervention and acceleration.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase ELA and Math proficiency levels for students with disabilities by 10%. 50% of students with disabilities will show an increase in scale score between progress monitoring 1-2 and 2-3.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers and leadership team will monitor student MTSS data and progress monitoring results. Leadership team will conduct walkthroughs with feedback and coaching during intervention time.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@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.)

Use the MTSS process during intervention time for targeted Tier 2 and 3 instruction as well as targeted small group instruction within Tier 1 to close achievement gaps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research supports that guided reading and small group instruction increases proficiency and closes the achievement gap by scaffolding instruction and differentiating tasks to meet the student at their current instructional level. Monitoring student response to intervention and making instructional adjustments to meet the need of diverse learners will increase student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will administer diagnostic and progress monitoring assessments. Teachers will analyze data to plan for and form/adjust groups. Teachers will monitor student progress and adjust instruction accordingly. Teachers will conference with parents to keep them informed. Teachers will use research based materials.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Inclusion and self contained (ESE) teachers will support students with disabilities with meeting their IEP goals by analyzing data to plan for instruction. Inclusion and self contained (ESE) teachers will monitor student progress and adjust instruction accordingly. Inclusion and self contained (ESE) teachers will conference with parents and collaborate with general education teachers.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Erb-hancock (jennifer.erb-hancock@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

Title I and ESE funds will be used to ensure the appropriate resources are available to teachers and students.

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

Less than 50% of 1st and 2nd grade students scored into STAR Reading and/or scored proficient in STAR Reading. Students in 1st and 2nd grades will receive instruction and remediation in foundational literacy skills in small groups with the teacher.

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

38% of 3rd-5th grade students scored proficient on the 22-23 state assessment. Corrective Reading will continue to be implemented for students falling below proficiency. Students will also receive remediation and intensive interventions in ELA.

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

80% of students in kindergarten will score at or above proficiency.

50% of students in grades 1 and 2 will score at proficiency.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

51% of students in grades 3-5 will score at proficiency by the PM3 period.

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.

STAR and FAST progress monitoring data will be analyzed and reviewed each testing period. Corrective Reading tracking data, guided reading data, and MTSS progress monitoring data will be analyzed monthly to make instructional decisions.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Erb-hancock, Jennifer, jennifer.erb-hancock@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?

Programs will include Corrective Reading and tiered interventions.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The practices and programs selected diagnose student need and have proven effectiveness based on state assessment learning gains.

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
Teachers will receive PD and support with Corrective Reading, guided reading, foundational literacy skill instruction and MTSS processes.	Miller, Jessica, jessica.miller@polk-fl.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

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

Review PFEP and the Compact which is available on the school/district website, parent engagement notebook and during Title I annual meeting. Hold meetings seeking parent/family/community input.

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))

Building capacity events, staff capacity events, family/community input, parent-teacher conferences, annual meeting and the school website.

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))

Add supplemental staff to support students, ELP, professional development, collaborative planning and MTSS support.

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

Data Com, SIP trainings, Regional meetings, summer leadership academy, Title I technical assistance, CNA technical assistance, ESE, migrant, early childhood, Cambridge/IB, Workforce.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

<https://polkschoolsfl.com/mentalhealth/>
individual and/or group counseling
school consultations
drumbeats
collaboration with community providers (Peace River)
support groups

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

Dual enrollment, IB/Cambridge, Career academies, Vocational schools, Transition events.

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

PBIS, RTI, MTSS, Counselors (Mental Health and School Based), District support ABSTs,

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))

PLCs to improve instruction, RTD, Data Com.
Collective bargaining stipends, recruiter and educator department.

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))

Head Start, VPK, Kindergarten Round Up, Kindergarten Readiness Camp, Books Bridge Bus, Migrant Early Childhood Services

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$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