

Polk County Public Schools

Chain Of Lakes 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Chain Of Lakes Elementary School

7001 STATE HIGHWAY 653, Winter Haven, FL 33884

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

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.

We believe each child is unique and has potential. We believe it is our responsibility to instill in each child the ability to think critically, work cooperatively, pursue knowledge, respect others, and make responsible healthy choices.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Chain of Lakes Elementary is a family partnership committed to excellence. We expect everyone to cooperatively acquire the skills and knowledge necessary to become successful lifelong learners and productive citizens with respect for themselves, others, and the world around them.

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
Nelson, Suzie	Principal	Chief Instructional Leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with staff about data and instructional planning.
Klupp, Stephen	Assistant Principal	Collaborates with staff about data and instructional planning in the content area of ELA.
Thomas, Brittany	Staffing Specialist	Coordinates with ESE teachers, administration, students, and families to ensure students receive instruction based upon their up-to-date individualized education plans.
Drehmer, Melissa	ELL Compliance Specialist	Coordinates with teachers, administration, families, and students to ensure English Language Learners receive needed ESOL support.
Wilson, Kristi	Instructional Coach	Induction Coordinator. Coaches teachers in the content areas of math and science. Collaborates with teachers about math/science data and instruction.
McGorry, Gerilyn	Instructional Coach	Induction Coordinator. Coaches teachers in the content area of ELA K-2. Collaborates with teachers about ELA data and instruction.
cofield-harris, la-chaz	Assistant Principal	Collaborates with staff about data and instructional planning in the content area of science .

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

Our school reviews our comprehensive needs assessment with our School Advisory Council three times a year and field questions periodically. The council gives us advise on ways to modify action steps to achieve our goals. Additionally, the SIP plan is reviewed with our staff during staff development days twice a year.

SAC Team Members:

Suzie Nelson, Principal
 Stephan Klupp, Assistant Principal
 Cofield-Harris, Assistant Principal
 Duane Hunt, Community
 Nikki Smith, Community
 Lori Rewis, Parent
 Melissa Drehmer, Teacher/ SAC Chair
 Alex Santiago, Community
 Nate Prescott, Parent
 Erica Bazo, Parent
 Ramon Garcia, Network Manager
 Brian Reeves, Community
 PJ Gaines, Parent

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))

Leadership teams will review progress monitoring at the conclusion of instructional units/benchmarks in reading this is done biweekly, in math at the conclusion of each unit, and in science after the instruction of each benchmark. Using the SWT walkthrough tool, the admin team will conduct standards-focus walks weekly. The leadership team will review and disaggregate all subgroups' FAST progress monitoring data for ELA, math, and 5th grade science at the conclusion of each testing window. The information will be shared with our SAC and staff and the team will review possible adaptations or additions to needed action steps. We use the 3rd-5th FAST progress monitoring data along with K-5 STAR reading progress monitoring to plan for tiered interventions with our teachers. For science we will analyze data from the Districtwide quarterly benchmark assessments.

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	62%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	89%
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	69	59	44	59	52	37	0	0	0	320	
One or more suspensions	6	1	8	8	5	10	0	0	0	38	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	11	25	21	35	8	19	0	0	0	119	
Course failure in Math	6	5	21	21	22	1	0	0	0	76	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	27	27	26	49	28	43	0	0	0	200	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	24	15	25	46	31	54	0	0	0	195	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	19	12	12	15	16	16	0	0	0	90	

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	10	13	18	55	30	41	0	0	0	167

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	6	17	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	48
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	64	38	57	39	42	37	0	0	0	277
One or more suspensions	8	3	7	11	20	22	0	0	0	71
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	32	40	0	0	0	89
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	26	41	0	0	0	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	61	74	89	28	21	17	0	0	0	290

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	27	12	25	17	32	52	0	0	0	165

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	9	8	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	41
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	64	38	57	39	42	37	0	0	0	277	
One or more suspensions	8	3	7	11	20	22	0	0	0	71	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	32	40	0	0	0	89	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	26	41	0	0	0	87	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	61	74	89	28	21	17	0	0	0	290	

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	27	12	25	17	32	52	0	0	0	165

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	9	8	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	41
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*	54	45	53	58	47	56	61		
ELA Learning Gains				52			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			45		
Math Achievement*	60	49	59	62	42	50	65		
Math Learning Gains				61			50		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			36		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	39	41	54	39	49	59	52		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	55	54	59	67			62		

* 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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	260
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	434
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	20	Yes	2	2
ELL	34	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	33	Yes	2	
HSP	46			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	47			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	1	1
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	52			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	49			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	54			60			39					55
SWD	12			16			14				5	44
ELL	26			42			22				5	55
AMI												
ASN	76			95			67				4	58
BLK	39			45			20				4	
HSP	48			51			28				5	52
MUL	56			81							2	
PAC												
WHT	64			70			47				4	
FRL	47			53			31				5	57

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	58	52	37	62	61	58	39					67
SWD	16	25	23	25	41	46	6					
ELL	47	47	36	47	60	64	29					67
AMI												
ASN	72	72		83	83							73
BLK	39	39	29	45	54	52	23					
HSP	52	49	35	57	61	60	29					69
MUL	53	17		88	83							
PAC												
WHT	69	61	50	67	59	60	51					
FRL	49	46	33	54	58	55	31					65

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	61	59	45	65	50	36	52					62
SWD	20	41	43	32	44	47	22					
ELL	47	50		59	70		44					62

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	75			96								
BLK	49	58		45	42		38					
HSP	47	47	43	53	53	38	34					65
MUL	72			83								
PAC												
WHT	70	68	38	73	55	29	66					
FRL	54	56	52	56	48	39	40					57

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	42%	43%	-1%	54%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	53%	14%	58%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	48%	42%	6%	50%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	64%	51%	13%	59%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	56%	15%	61%	10%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	44%	2%	55%	-9%

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.

5th grade science. Contributing factors were: ELA proficiency and limited time using RTD lessons. Students' comprehension of the text posed the greatest challenges. (2) science teachers were new to the school, with one coming from middle school. Inconsistent classroom management in 1/2 science classes was an ongoing barrier to student success in the instructional environment.

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

Overall, the ELA content area experienced a 5% decline. Factors: The introduction of the BEST standards, new teachers to the tested grade levels, and loss of the instructional coach mid-year, teacher understanding and ownership of the ARC learning process specific to standards alignment and year-long quality of student tasks.

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 across all content areas. Mid-year class change in 3/7 classes. Historically, classroom behavior and the number of student referrals have been a concern for the cohort of students for the past two years, and lack of a school dean to support them. The loss of an instructional coach midway through the year limited support.

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

4th grade ELA and Math. New actions: Teachers took ownership of the learning ARC process in the creation of lesson plans, student tasks were aligned to the benchmarks, and greater student autonomy.

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

Absenteeism is an evolving concern, it is approximated that a quarter of the school was not in consistent attendance.

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

Teir-1 instruction in science, math, and ELA.
Student culture: Peer to peer relationships.
Improve teacher/student relationships.
Student autonomy in the learning environment

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.

Planning, delivering core instruction, and student tasks that is aligned to the BEST/NGSS standards. Data from STAR shows student proficiency in the area of ELA and Mathematics consistently declined throughout the school year per grade level. Data from FSA shows a trend of <10% proficiency loss in both ELA and Math from 2022-2023 FSA and an overall >15% proficiency loss in Science from years 2021-2023 Statewide Science Assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

State data will show a minimum of +1% proficiency increase for all grades/content as well as 10% of the students just below the proficiency line becoming proficient.

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:

Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Monitor students engaging in equivalent experiences aligned to state expectations using SWT. Engage teachers in standards-based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework. Data analysis from weekly benchmark progress monitoring assessments

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

TNTP's The Opportunity Myth speaks to the relationship between academic success and ensuring students are able to engage in grade level standards-based expectations. It is imperative we both monitor for aligned instruction and plan for teacher's understanding of the Benchmarks and aligned tasks and assessments.

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.

Strategy 1 – Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 1 – Create calendar for leadership team calibration walks. Leadership team will conduct calibration walks across 3 of 6 grade levels (K-5) weekly and provide written feedback (formal & informal) to inform content educator's instructional practice.

Person Responsible: Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

By When: Initiates within the 1st quarter and is ongoing.

Strategy 1 – Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 2 – Train leadership team on walkthrough tool in first two calibration walks. 100% of leadership team will receive training at the end of two calibration walks and will demonstrate consistency with rational 90%-100%.

Person Responsible: Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

By When: 1st Quarter and ongoing.

Strategy 1 – Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 3 – Conduct ongoing calibration walks until team shows 90-100% calibrated consistency with rationale.

Person Responsible: Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

By When: 1st Semester and ongoing.

Strategy 1 – Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 4 – Add SWT data review to every leadership team meeting agenda.

Person Responsible: Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

By When: 1st quarter and ongoing

Strategy 1 – Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 5 – Establish protocol to review data including evidence in SWT

Person Responsible: Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

By When: 1st quarter and ongoing

Strategy 1 – Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 6 – Monitor impact between data review from SWT and planning per content/course/grade level

Person Responsible: Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

By When: 1st quarter and ongoing

Strategy 1 – Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 7 – 6 per week (2 team/4 individual). Analyze the results of the walkthrough Qualtrics weekly and utilize the data to strengthen core instructional planning.

Person Responsible: Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

By When: 1st quarter and ongoing

Strategy 2 – Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 1 – Create master schedule that includes intentional collaborative planning. Grade levels in ELA, Math, and Science will plan weekly with the instructional coaches.

Person Responsible: Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

By When: 1st quarter and ongoing

Strategy 2 – Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 2 – Assign and train 100% of planning facilitators.

Person Responsible: Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

By When: 1st quarter and ongoing

Strategy 2 – Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 3 – Add planning results findings to the leadership team meeting agenda.

Action Step 4 – Conduct planning protocol on a “weekly” basis.

Action Step 5 – Review planning findings during leadership team meetings on a routine basis.

Action Step 6 – Conduct correlation analysis between SWT findings and Benchmarks planned for using Arc in ELA, Math, and Science.

Person Responsible: Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

By When: 1st quarter and ongoing

Strategy 2 – Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 2 – Assign and train 100% of planning facilitators.

Person Responsible: Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

By When: 1st quarter and ongoing

Strategy 2 – Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 3 – Add planning results findings to leadership team meeting agenda

Action Step 4 – Conduct planning protocol on a “weekly” basis

Action Step 5 – Review planning findings during leadership team meetings on a routine basis

Action Step 6 – Conduct correlation analysis between SWT findings and Benchmarks planned for using Arc for each benchmark in ELA, Math, and Science..

Person Responsible: Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

By When: 1st quarter and ongoing

#2. 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.

Although progress was made in the reduction of student referrals, the number of referrals processed in the 2023 school year continues as an opportunity for growth.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Referral data will show a 10% decrease in referrals for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will meet monthly to report progress towards this strategy, review data trends, discuss barriers, and revise as needed. Each member of the leadership team will have a specific grade level to monitor for fidelity in PBIS and lesson implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephen Klupp (stephen.klupp@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.)

Empower students to develop personal leadership habits through school-wide Leader in Me mini lessons and book study.

Ongoing PLCs to focus on rolling out PBIS initiatives and supporting handling classroom-managed behaviors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Leader in Me is an evidence-based, social emotional learning process—developed in partnership with educators—that empowers students with the leadership and life skills they need to thrive in the 21st century. It is based on secular principles and practices of personal, interpersonal, and organizational effectiveness.

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.

Prepare books and lessons for teachers to use.

Person Responsible: Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

By When: 1st quarter

Monthly, meet as a leadership team to update school wide PBIS plan and review discipline data, by subgroup, grade level, and teacher.

Person Responsible: Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly and ongoing

Create a classroom managed behavior tracking form and restorative practice flow chart. Provide faculty training on tracking form (100%). On a weekly basis dean will track behavior incidents by subgroup, grade level, and teacher.

Person Responsible: Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

By When: 1 month

Provide teachers with training on managing classroom discipline and updated PBIS implementation and school wide expectations within the 1st month of school. Dean will provide monthly updates on PBIS implementation and rewards to the leadership team and faculty.

Person Responsible: Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

By When: 1st quarter and ongoing

Pull data weekly and meet with leadership team to review progress. A summation of the PBIS plan will be discussed monthly during the leadership team meetings.

Person Responsible: Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

By When: 1st month and ongoing

ESSA Goal: Improve ESSA subgroup proficiency in SWD and AA categories by 10-15%. Dean will create staff-student check-in opportunities for high-risk intervention (top 5%). Leadership team members will conduct monthly monitoring of benchmark achievement data in math and ELA and use the GAP analysis method to identify deficit trends. Daily, all teachers will utilize best practices from the 7 habits text to build a campus wide growth mindset learning culture. Administration will strategically schedule targeted subgroups to enable access to high impact educators who demonstrate an ability to close achievement and opportunity gaps in core subjects.

Person Responsible: Suzie Nelson (suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net)

By When: End of the 1st quarter and ongoing.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

Title I/UniSIG Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)

Data Com

Summer Leadership Academy/Retreat

School Improvement Plan Meetings/Trainings

PURE Process

Regional and Office of School Transformation review SIP plans.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

- Prioritizing Teacher Assignment in Reading
- Intentionality in Creating Master Schedule
- Prioritizing Subgroups of Students for Reading Schedules
- Common Beginning of the Year Diagnostics
- School Year Cycles for MTSS-Common Intervention Tools and Assessments
- Scheduled Data Chat Cycles on Student Performance
- Learning Arc to Deepen Understanding of Benchmarks
- Common Planning with Coaching Support of Instructional Team
- K-2 Literacy Pathways Initiative

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

- Prioritizing Teacher Assignment in Reading
- Intentionality in Creating Master Schedule
- Prioritizing Subgroups of Students for Reading Schedules
- Common Beginning of the Year Diagnostics
- School Year Cycles for MTSS-Common Intervention Tools and Assessments
- Scheduled Data Chat Cycles on Student Performance
- Learning Arc to Deepen Understanding of Benchmarks
- Common Planning with Coaching Support of Instructional Team

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Our 3rd (48%) and 5th (42%) grade students scored below the 50% on 22-23 assessment. The fifth-grade cohort of 22-23, scoring below a 50%, has proceeded to middle school. For the current 5th grade students our proficiency goal is 70% and for our 3rd grade students (60%).

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.

- Integrating technology for reading assessments will allow for timely feedback and remedial opportunities.
- School Year Cycles for MTSS-Common Intervention Tools and Assessments
- Scheduled Data Chat Cycles on Student Performance
- Intentional Weekly Conversation with the Leadership Team About Specific Student Behavior and Academics

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Nelson, Suzie, suzie.nelson@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?

- Renaissance
- Reading Wonders
- iStation
- Phonics for All: Curriculum Associates
- Corrective Reading

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?

-Each component above has a data collection and analysis component providing information on skill/ benchmarks to remediate.

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
Create a master schedule that includes intentional collaborative planning.	Nelson, Suzie, suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net
Assign and train instructional leaders in the learning arc.	Nelson, Suzie, suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net
Create a calendar for leadership team calibration walks.	Nelson, Suzie, suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net
Train leadership team on walkthrough tool in first two calibration walks.	Nelson, Suzie, suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net
Conduct calibration walks until team until team shows 90-100% calibrated consistency with rationale.	Nelson, Suzie, suzie.nelson@polk-fl.net
Monitor impact between data review from SWT and planning per content/course/ grade level.	Nelson, Suzie, suzie.nelson@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.

Monthly SAC Meetings.
Title-I Open House Night (K-5)
Monthly K-5 Newsletters (School events and Academic Standards)

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))

Family/Community Events: Mom take your kids to school, Dads take your kids to school events, Fall Festival (display of science, math, ELA content activities), monthly SAC meetings, quarterly content area data conferences, Open house events. At all events, opportunities for parents to sign -up for Parent Portal.

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))

Supplemental Resources: iReady, corrective reading 3rd-5th, and the K-2 reading pathways initiative.
Professional Development: Spectacular Science, Writing Training, Principal data chats, Studio PD (peer-to-peer classroom observations).
Collaborative Planning: Math and ELA coaches plan weekly with the grade levels utilizing the learning ARC process.
RTD-Science content area-focused instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3-Science Context Resources.
MTSS-Tier Support for Students-Home communications and monthly meeting with LEA, Guidance Counselor, Assistant Principals K-5.

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))

N/A

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))

Weekly, a district mental health counselor visits to conduct individual and group counseling sessions.
The school dean conducts weekly check-in visits with high-risk behavior students.
Collaborate with outside agencies who support our students (Registered Behavior Therapist).

School counselor monitors attendance teacher recommendations for initial referrals (academic and behavior).

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))

Annual Career Field Trips 4th & 5th grade:

Aerospace Museum and Circle-B Ranch. Students visit industry professionals to learn about the career opportunities.

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-Dean host monthly events to celebrate student who demonstrate positive behavior.(otter of the month, PBIS celebrations)

-MTSS-Team (admin, LEA, Guidance) meets weekly to evaluate academic and behavior progress of targeted students. Data source-K-2 STAR and 3-5 FAST assessments.

-Mental Health Counselor-meet weekly with student to provide strategies according to individual needs. School Counselors-monitors students with certain risk factors and makes appropriate referrals.

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))

Coaches facilitate induction programs targeted to new teacher retention.

Monthly professional learning communities to Improve Instruction. Quarterly Data Con Event (content area teams & admin meet monthly to discuss District assessment data). New & Novice teachers: bi weekly opportunities to observe highly effective teachers in the classroom..

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Early Childhood- <https://polkschoolsfl.com/earlychildhood/>

VPK (Title I, ESE and Non-Title I)

Kindergarten Round-Up

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

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