Bartow Elementary Academy School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Bartow Elementary Academy

590 WILSON AVE S, Bartow, FL 33830

http://www.bartowacademy.com/

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Bartow Elementary Academy is a family partnership dedicated to inspiring and preparing learners to become productive global citizens. Our desire is for everyone to use life skills, technology, and innovative experiences to build tomorrow's leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bartow Elementary Academy is a family partnership inspiring today's learners to become tomorrow's leaders.

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
Van Hook, Sara	Principal	The principal sets the vision for Bartow Elementary Academy through input from stakeholders while ensuring resources are utilized in a way to ensure an ultimate educational experience is taking place for each student. In addition, the principal is responsible for providing instructional leadership during planning, coaching and ensuring a safe and inclusive environment is present school-wide. In managing the safe operations of the school both academically and operationally, other job duties and responsibilities of the principal include but are not limited to: -communicating a common vision of standards/benchmark-based instruction -setting and monitoring expectations for instruction, progress monitoring and learning environments -maintaining high visibility at school and in the community -recruiting, retaining and developing a highly qualified and diverse faculty and staff -establishing and monitoring a process for data review and ensuring resources are funneled to support the areas that the data shows require remediation -recognizing faculty, staff and students for good work -utilizing distributive leadership -monitoring teacher practices and providing timely feedback to help increase professional practice -facilitating professional development based on the needs of the staff/students -utilizing a consistent process of communicating with stakeholders regularly -making decisions with students as the focus, ensuring that student learning is the top priority
Jones, Nikki	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal serves as an instructional leader at Bartow Elementary Academy whose job duties and responsibilities include but are not limited to: -assisting the principal in communicating a common vision with stakeholders -assisting the principal in communicating a common vision of standards/ benchmark-based instruction -assisting the principal in setting and monitoring expectations for instruction, progress monitoring and learning environments -participating in weekly collaborative planning meetings with teachers and provide direction, as needed. -coordinating with instructional coach to ensure professional development and supports are provided with fidelity in a timely manner to staff members -monitoring and providing monthly discipline data to the staff and SAC and provide support to teachers regarding Tier 2 and 3 behavior plans
Wolfe, Shari	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach's job duties and responsibilities are to support the instructional staff in ways including but not limited to: -facilitating weekly instructional planning sessions utilizing the district's Learning Arc as a guiding tool -conducting coaching cycles with teachers as selected by the administrators to help improve instructional efficacy

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		-providing professional development related to research-based instructional strategies -serving on the MTSS team and regularly monitoring the progress of students within this team using the data analysis tools, documentation, grades, etc. to guide teachers in decision making -conducting collaboration walks with administration using the Qualtrics walkthrough tool to track trends and using those trends as discussion points during collaborative planning to make changes, as needed
Hubbard, Jennifer	School Counselor	Mrs. Hubbard serves our students in addressing academic, social, developmental and academic concerns to ensure students achieve in all areas. She provides support through individual and small group social skill sessions based on student needs. Mrs. Hubbard serves as the facilitator for the MTSS meetings and serves as a resource for the teachers for the MTSS process for both academic and behavioral needs. She serves on the risk and threat assessment team, ensuring student safety is a priority at all times.
Sanchez, Rachel	Other	This position consists of working with students that need enrichment and working with classroom teachers with students that need acceleration or enrichment. Assisting the leadership team to review schoolwide data of our enrichment students is one of the responsibilities of this position as well as identifying students that need to be tested for our gifted program.
Crowley, Lori	Other	This position consists of working with students that need enrichment and working with classroom teachers with students that need acceleration or enrichment. Assisting the leadership team to review schoolwide data of our enrichment students is one of the responsibilities of this position as well as identifying students that need to be tested for our gifted program.
Katsoulis, Patty	Instructional Technology	Mrs. Katsoulis serves as the instructional technology teacher and network manager. She supports teachers in integrating and implementing technology-based lessons in all subject areas while supporting students as they learn new technology skills. Mrs. Katsoulis works with small groups of students to help remediate their skills based on data reviewed in SBLT meetings. She conducts technology mini-lessons to support classroom teachers in integrating technology in ways that help remediate and accelerate learning.
Albritton, Shawn	Other	Ms. Albritton provides knowledge of availability and suitability of resources to support curriculum initiatives, engages in the developmental process with the SBLT using knowledge of school curriculum and professional resources, facilitates the use of presentation tools in print, technology, and media for dissemination efforts, and serves as an expert in organizing, synthesizing, and communicating information. Ms. Albritton serves as a resource member on the MTSS committee and mentor for new teachers.

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.

Developing the team to construct the School Improvement Plan starts with inviting the school-based leadership team members to our School Improvement Planning meeting. This initial team reviews our data and develops the initial plan around which the data shows the most improvement is needed and the team sets actionable steps to meet our goals. That plan is taken to our initial SAC meeting, which is made up of community members, parents and additional teachers. It is important to note that all parents are invited to attend this SAC meeting to review and help make adjustments to the initial SIP. At this meeting, the SAC members review school data, address barriers. and provide input to revise the plan, as needed. The SIP is reviewed at every School Advisory Council meeting throughout the school year to track student achievement and progress toward meeting our goals.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The goals from the SIP will be monitored at the last School Based Leadership Team meeting of each month. If it is noted that the achievement of students is not increasing, especially for those with the greatest achievement gap, adjustments will be made and additional strategies implemented to support that subgroup. As a team, we will reflect on not only the student data, but our actionable steps to ensure that each team member (administration, support staff, teachers, etc.) have carried out their roles with fidelity and if not, put supports in place to ensure those steps are taking place as planned.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	48%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	75%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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)* 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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	16	16	8	9	14	13	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	8	4	4	3	7	7	0	0	0	33
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	14	20	19	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	21	26	0	0	0	54
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	9	2	8	16	14	0	0	0	54

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	4	4	0	9	20	20	0	0	0	57

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	2	5	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	9	2	12	6	3	12	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	5	3	2	6	3	11	0	0	0	30
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	9	12	5	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	9	15	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	12	5	0	0	0	26

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	5	3	11	13	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	9	2	12	6	3	12	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	5	3	2	6	3	11	0	0	0	30
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	9	12	5	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	9	15	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	12	5	0	0	0	26

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	5	3	11	13	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
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*	58	45	53	73	47	56	72		
ELA Learning Gains				68			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			29		
Math Achievement*	60	49	59	61	42	50	55		
Math Learning Gains				60			20		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			13		
Science Achievement*	57	41	54	57	49	59	60		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	246
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	428
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	2	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	63			
MUL	23	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	71			

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%
FRL	48			

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	29	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP	61			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	62			
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	58			60			57					
SWD	16			32							3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			43			44				4	
HSP	56			61			53				4	
MUL	18			27							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	69			69			60				4	
FRL	44			50			41				4	

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	73	68	56	61	60	53	57					
SWD	29			29								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	62	64		45	58	55	38					
HSP	69	82		53	61		40					
MUL	50			50								
PAC												
WHT	78	65	58	67	58	44	65					
FRL	57	60	47	52	51	38	41					

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	72	46	29	55	20	13	60					
SWD	27			18								
ELL	64			55								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	62	30	10	44	20	25	42					
HSP	67	42		48	21		58					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	76	52		60	18		67					
FRL	61	31		56	19	27	58					

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	56%	43%	13%	54%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	53%	2%	58%	-3%
03	2023 - Spring	71%	42%	29%	50%	21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	84%	51%	33%	59%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	56%	3%	61%	-2%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	44%	0%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	57%	39%	18%	51%	6%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The lowest performing data component for our school was science proficiency. Though the 2023 score of 57% proficient is the same as the prior year, we attribute the low proficiency to inconsistent instructors for the students including the last quarter being taught by a substitute. Though support was provided by our administrative team, instructional coach and district science coach, the entire grade level was affected by the turnover and inconsistent teachers. After stability was reset each time, we did see students' scores begin to stabilize, but a lack of consistency was a large contributor.

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

When comparing our data in grades 3-5 combined, our ELA proficiency has declined dramatically by thirteen percentage points, but in examining our data closer, our 3rd grade ELA had a ten point gain while both our 4th and 5th grade ELA proficiency dropped by 24 points each. Teachers were not confident in the transition to the new benchmarks and the implementation of the Learning Arc process. Collaborative planning time was scheduled, but not always protected and used to ensure adequate preparation and planning was taking place between the ELA teachers in these grades and the instructional coach.

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.

Fifth grade math proficiency had the greatest gap, with an eleven point deficit, when compared to the state average. There has been an ongoing decline in fifth grade math proficiency over the past four years. There has been a need for additional small group instruction and plans for remediation for students with misconceptions.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is the third grade math proficiency. We attribute some of the growth to consistent collaborative planning, with this team showing up even on optional days. Another factor that helped in this area is that the teachers ensured to protect their math block and focused on small group and remediation for their students based on formative data that was planned for in collaborative planning.

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

In reflecting on our EWS data, the area that stands out as the greatest area of concern is that 75 of our students were absent for 10% or more of the school year. In addition, 33 of our students have received one or more suspensions.

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

1. Increasing ELA proficiency in grades 4 and 5.
2. Increasing math proficiency in grades 4 and 5.
3. Decreasing the number of students who are absent 10% or more of the school year.
4. Decreasing the number of students with one or more suspensions.

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.

All students will receive grade level benchmark-based instruction in English language arts and math and will be taught with fidelity to the full intent. Tasks planned will reflect the full depth of each benchmark. Teachers will build formative assessments into each lesson to measure each student's understanding and plan for remediation prior to moving further along the benchmark. The general education teacher will collaborate with the inclusion teacher to ensure that all students with disabilities are receiving their accommodations and services with every lesson. The teachers will build and remove scaffolds as necessary to support SWD based on the data collected during formative assessments.

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

FAST data will show a 5% increase in ELA and math proficiency for third, fourth and fifth grade students including SWD.

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

Monitoring of our goal will occur using weekly collaborative planning with administration and our instructional coach with the Learning Arc guiding Tier 1 instructional planning and student tasks. The administrative team will also utilize the district's standardized walkthrough tool, Qualtrics data dashboard to monitor instructional trends within third, fourth and fifth grade ELA and math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sara Van Hook (sara.vanhook@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.)

Weekly collaborative planning sessions facilitated by the instructional coach and supported by administration with a focus on benchmark-aligned instruction, guided by the Learning Arc.

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

The factor related to student achievement with the highest effect size is collective teacher efficacy (1.57), which is why we utilize collaborative planning. Through collaborative planning, walkthroughs to collect trend data, and instructional coaching, we will build collective efficacy and 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.

Create a master schedule that is supportive of a collaborative planning structure.

Person Responsible: Sara Van Hook (sara.vanhook@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 3, 2023

(Re)train faculty on the Learn Arc Framework and establish expectations for planning and instructional delivery.

Person Responsible: Sara Van Hook (sara.vanhook@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Conduct calibration walks and individual administrative walks utilizing the SBI walkthrough tool weekly and review trend data (12 total).

Person Responsible: Sara Van Hook (sara.vanhook@polk-fl.net)

By When: October 13, 2023

Collaborative planning facilitated by the instructional coach and supported by administrators. Planning will be guided by the Learning Arc with a focus on meeting the full intent of the targeted benchmark. Additional focus will be on planning formative assessments and ensuring scaffolds are in place for students who are not yet meeting the benchmark, especially SWD.

Person Responsible: Shari Wolfe (shari.wolfe@polk-fl.net)

By When: October 13, 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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.

All students' progress monitoring data will be monitored. Those identified as the bottom quartile will carefully tracked and referred for tier 2 intervention. First through third grade teachers will utilize the UFLI program for intervention while fourth and fifth will utilize differentiated genre passages to guide students in close reading.

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

Of our bottom 25% of students, we plan to see learning gains from 60% or more.

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

Our MTSS team will meet monthly to review MTSS data on the bottom 25% of student in class. At that time, the students will be monitored to track progress and the impact of the programs being used as well as student attendance, and other factors will be monitored. Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs during MTSS time to ensure interventions are taking place with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sara Van Hook (sara.vanhook@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.)

Response to intervention utilizing UFLI will be implemented in first, second and third grade; close reading strategies utilizing Differentiated Genre Passages will be used in grades 3-5.

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

According to John Hattie's research, Response to Intervention has an effect size of 1.29. The UFLI program that will be utilized in first through third grade is a foundational phonics program with an effect size of 0.70 and the intermediation comprehension program reflects a 0.47 effect size based on Hattie's research.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Create a master schedule that includes time for daily intervention block.

Person Responsible: Nikki Jones (nikki.jones@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 11, 2023

Provide professional development and resources for the UFLI program for first, second and third grade teachers to implement the new intervention program.

Person Responsible: Sara Van Hook (sara.vanhook@polk-fl.net)

By When: September 1, 2023

Facilitate monthly MTSS meetings to review student data and progress.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Hubbard (jennifer.hubbard@polk-fl.net)

By When: October 17, 2023

Conduct administrative classroom walkthroughs, ensuring fidelity of interventions.

Person Responsible: Sara Van Hook (sara.vanhook@polk-fl.net)

By When: October 17, 2023

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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

A school-wide Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports system will be implemented as a Tier 1 support for all students. Students will have the ability to earn five positive points throughout the day, and those earning 80% of their points for the month will be able to participate in the incentive for the month. Last year 76 students were absent for 10% or more days of the 22-23 school year and 33 students had one or more suspensions.

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

The number of students with one or more suspensions will decrease and the number of students with 10% or greater absences will decrease.

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

The PBIS team will meet monthly to track overall PBIS data as well as current school discipline and attendance data. In addition, the school-based leadership team will track both sets of data weekly including tier 2 behavior and attendance plans. The teams will make adjustments, as needed based on the data reviewed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rachel Sanchez (rachel.sanchez@polk-fl.net)

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

The program Positive Behavior Intervention of Supports will be utilized as the Tier 1 system for this initiative. PBIS provides support, prevention and behavior analysis that is evidence-based to promote student attendance and positive decision-making. Positive praise with feedback using consistent expectations will be used across campus by all.

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

PBIS methods are proven to significantly reduce the occurrence of problem behaviors in the school, resulting in a more positive school climate and increased academic performance. "PBIS is consistent with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, which advocates the use of positive behavior interventions and school-based disciplinary strategies that reduce or eliminate the need to use suspension and expulsion as disciplinary options" (http://flpbs.fmhi.usf.edu/ whatispbs_def.cfm).

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.

PBIS team will participate in initial training provided by USF.

Person Responsible: Sara Van Hook (sara.vanhook@polk-fl.net)

By When: June 2023

PBIS team meets to plan professional development for staff for initial implementation of program.

Person Responsible: Rachel Sanchez (rachel.sanchez@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 3, 2023

Schedule PBIS team meetings to monitor student data and plan for supports.

Person Responsible: Nikki Jones (nikki.jones@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 11, 2023

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
In the 22-23 school year, Students With Disabilities fell below 41% proficiency, with a rating of 29 in the Federal Percent of Points Index.

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.

• School/District Webpage
• PEN Notebook
• Parent/Family/Community Input Meetings
• Annual Meeting

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 Building Professional Development (Conferencing, family/school relationship)
• Family/Community Input
• Data Chats/Conferences
• Webpage
• Annual Meeting
• Preventing Barriers

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 Staff (academic coach, paraprofessional) - Instructional practice specifically related to benchmark-aligned instruction
• MTSS -Instructional practice specifically related to intervention
• Collaborative Planning- Instructional practice specifically related to benchmark-aligned instruction

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
• School Improvement Planning Trainings
• Regional (area) Meetings
• Summer Leadership Academy
• Title I Technical Assistance – Use of Funds, PFE Input, Back to School Mtg
• Comprehensive Needs Assessment Technical Assistance
• ESE

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 Counseling
• Group Counseling
• School Consultations
• Drumbeats
• Collaboration with community providers – Peace River Center, Watson Clinic Behavioral Health, Sweet Center – Winter Haven Hospital
o Support Groups

o Grief Support
o Children's Home Society

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
• Building Capacity of Events – 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
• Mental Health Facilitator, School Counselors

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))

• Professional Learning Communities to improve instruction and data
• Data Com
• Collective Bargaining Stipends – Title I, Highly Effective
• Recruitment and Educator Quality Department - PCPS Culture Ambassador Program

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))

• Kindergarten Round Up
• Kindergarten Readiness Camps
• 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: Intervention	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00

	Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes