Purcell Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Purcell Elementary School

305 1ST AVE NE, Mulberry, FL 33860

http://www.polk-fl.net/purcell

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.

The mission of Purcell Elementary School is to provide engaging, rigorous, and relevant instruction using research-based curriculum and strategies to bolster success for the students we serve. Our goal is to ensure that Purcell scholars are foundationally prepared to build academic and social success in order to positively contribute to society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Purcell Elementary School will be a premier learning organization. We will educate and cultivate the whole child. Our students will become scholars by using benchmark-driven instruction, high-yield character development strategies, and rigorous academic activities that will help our them reach their full potential.

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
Richardson, Myra	Principal	To maintain faculty and student safety. To ensure that all stakeholders connected to our educational organization, effectively and efficiently implement academic strategies to positively affect student achievement. To ensure that all stakeholders connected to our educational organization, effectively and efficiently implement social growth strategies to cultivate positive relationships. Monitoring and improving systems of organizational operations which ultimately will improve our school grade.
Lamb, Ashlee	Assistant Principal	To maintain faculty and student safety. To ensure a positive behavioral system is implemented with fidelity at Purcell Elementary to ensure positive student behavior and interaction. To praise and reward great student achievement and behavior while redirecting undesirable behavior. To build positive relationships with all stakeholders. To monitor and improve academic instruction in all content areas on all grade levels.
McLachlan, Denise	Instructional Coach	To improve the instructional efficacy of Reading teachers campus wide. To provide modeling for teachers who need an extra level of support. To ensure that teachers master the art of benchmark aligned lesson planning and task creation. To provide push in support for students who are struggling to close gaps. To support administration with campus activities to positively impact campus culture.
Claudio, Heidi	Instructional Coach	To improve the instructional efficacy of math teachers campus wide. To provide modeling for teachers who need an extra level of support. To ensure that teachers master the art of benchmark aligned lesson planning and task creation. To provide push in support for students who are struggling to close gaps. To support administration with campus activities to positively impact campus culture.
Faniel, Tavarous	Teacher, K-12	To improve the instructional efficacy of Reading teachers on his grade level. To provide modeling for teachers who need an extra level of support, as time permits. To ensure that teachers master the art of benchmark aligned lesson planning and task creation on his grade level. To support administration with campus activities to positively impact campus culture.
Brink, Erica	Instructional Coach	To improve the coaching efficacy of our math coach as this is year one and she is a novice to leadership. To provide modeling for new math coach who may need an extra level of

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		support. To ensure that coach the masters the art of benchmark aligned lesson planning and task creation. To support administration with campus activities to positively impact campus culture.
	Instructional Coach	To improve the coaching efficacy of our reading coach. To provide modeling of the coaching cycle for our reading coach who may need an extra level of support. To ensure that the coach masters the art of benchmark aligned lesson planning and task creation. To support administration with campus activities to positively impact campus culture.

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

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

The School Advisory Council and the school leadership team met on several days to discuss our concerns and areas that need to be improved concerning campus operations. Once the teams have a list of challenges, we brainstorm and collaborate on strategies to improve upon the concern.

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 students with the greatest achievement gaps will be monitored using a research-based programs. Once assessed for proper placement, the students will participate and engage with the program, at regular intervals, to close the gap of a particular skill. The data will be reviewed quarterly, and adjustments will be made with respect to student placement. Then the process will repeat until the students' gaps are closed. The student will then be moved out of the program.

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	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	36	30	33	21	23	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	17	10	4	0	0	0	38
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	2	2	1	3	4	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	1	2	2	1	3	6	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	17	13	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	18	19	20	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	6	22	16	0	0	0	0	44
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	11	26	40	22	12	0	0	0	112

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	1	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	0	33	26	21	29	30	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	4	8	0	0	0	16
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	28	36	27	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	36	32	39	0	0	0	107
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	33	26	21	29	30	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	4	8	0	0	0	16
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	28	36	27	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	36	32	39	0	0	0	107
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	35	45	53	37	47	56	33		
ELA Learning Gains				46			45		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			55		
Math Achievement*	41	49	59	44	42	50	42		
Math Learning Gains				49			59		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36			39		
Science Achievement*	24	41	54	39	49	59	35		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	59	54	59	59			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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	197
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	363
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	18	Yes	4	3
ELL	28	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	36	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	40	Yes	1	
FRL	39	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	3	2
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	44			
MUL				
PAC				

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%
WHT	45			
FRL	43			

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	35			41			24					59
SWD	16			16			6				5	44
ELL	20			30			14				5	59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			43							2	
HSP	29			39			16				5	59
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	44			42			37				4	
FRL	35			41			24				5	59

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	37	46	53	44	49	36	39					59
SWD	11	29	37	26	30	21	14					43
ELL	25	40	54	38	51	44	27					59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	30		42	39		64					
HSP	27	45	60	40	49	46	26					59

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
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	48	55	43	50	52	21	44					
FRL	33	43	50	42	48	36	32					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
All Students	33	45	55	42	59	39	35					62
SWD	2	33	30	14	47		7					63
ELL	24	58	63	41	66		42					62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28			41								
HSP	30	55	63	41	61		32					61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	38	35		43	59		43					
FRL	25	48	53	36	54	33	29					69

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	35%	43%	-8%	54%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	53%	-1%	58%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	42%	-11%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	41%	51%	-10%	59%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	56%	-11%	61%	-16%
05	2023 - Spring	41%	44%	-3%	55%	-14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	23%	39%	-16%	51%	-28%

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 science data indicates the lowest performance. Lack of ability to switch to benchmarks aligned delivery system.

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

Science. Inability to demonstrate concepts, build vocabulary, and engage in the scientific process stifled our growth in science this year.
Creating and building a sense of urgency for science across grade levels.

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

Science. The aforementioned also explains the vast difference between school and state.

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

The most improvement from PM1 to PM3 was in the area of Math. Ensuring alignment between benchmark, task, and instructional delivery.

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

Students with disabilities would be an area of concern.
Student attendance would also be of concern.

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

School Culture
Reading
Science Instruction
Students with Disabilities

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Approximately one-third of our instructional staff left our campus this year to other schools. In order to improve student achievement, specifically for students with disabilities, teachers will need to build efficacy and remain on our campus to improve and continue critical benchmark aligned instruction.

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

Teachers will shift their thinking about the culture and climate here at Purcell. Teachers will want to teach here. This will be evident by fewer than 6 teachers leaving for other PCPS campuses.

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

There will be several surveys during the school year to get an indication of teachers motives and feelings concerning Purcell Elementary School being their work home. This will give us an indication of what needs to be improved and what we can continue that is working well.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Myra Richardson (myra.richardson@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.)

We will use praise, reward, and celebrate to increase positive/desired responses from faculty and staff.

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

Positive behavior intervention strategies work for student and have evidence-based results. The same concept will be implemented here at Purcell. We will differentiate for adult interactions.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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

Our score decreased 16 percentage points in science proficiency from 2022 to 2023.

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

We plan to improve our current science score by 25 percentage points. This will give us a science proficiency score of 41 percent. We plan to improve math by 5 percentage points. A five percent increase will bring our math score to 48 percent. Reading will also improve 5 percentage points. Bring the overall reading score to 47 percentage points.

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

We will monitor benchmark aligned tasks by participating in PLC with 4th and 5th science teachers.
We will monitor research-based instructional delivery strategies by classroom walks.
We will monitor the transfer of knowledge by reviewing student tasks and assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Myra Richardson (myra.richardson@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.)

We will continue to the Stemscope curriculum when designing and facilitating lessons.
We will implement the 5E delivery model as often as possible to encourage and cultivate critical thinking.
We will use a hands on approach to labs and scientific concepts to allow students to engage with the learning process.

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

Students will need to be able to critically process information and concepts to be proficient in the area of science. The 5E delivery model has evidence supporting improved critical thinking.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

Once title one funds have been released, the leadership team will align our campus needs to our funding an create at least two different budgets that can be discussed with our SAC committee. The SAC committee will approve the budget that will best meet the needs of our campus. The funds will be allocated and spent accordingly.

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

Our area of focus is phonemic awareness with our K - 2 students. Building their decoding skills and fluency will allow our students to become better readers and writers. Using our STAR Early literacy and STAR reading assessment, we have determined that a vast majority of our students are unable to decode multisyllabic words. Our progress monitoring data indicates that sixty-three percent of our students are not proficient in reading in grades K - 2.

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

Our area of focus is building fluency and comprehension. Our 3 - 5 students have gaps in their ability to phonemically decode multisyllabic words to read with fluency and comprehension. This also hinders our student's ability to write a cohesive essay. Our progress monitoring data indicates that fifty-seven percent of our students are not proficient at reading in grades 3 - 5.

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

Kindergarten is the only grade level (K-2) with more than 50% of the students scoring at or above proficiency. However, measures will be put in place to improve all primary grade levels, including kindergarten. We will improve all primary grade levels (K-2) to 50 percent proficiency.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Since two of the three grade levels were less than 50% in the intermediate grade levels (4th grade was 52%), we will be implementing improvement measures campus wide. We will improve each grade level to improve the campus average to 50%. This will require a 14% increase in 3rd grade and a 16% increase in 5th grade.

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.

Our areas of focus, phonemic awareness, decoding multisyllabic words, fluency, and comprehension will be monitored by frequent walkthroughs of power hour and monitoring the implementation and fidelity of the teacher's instructional delivery.

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

Richardson, Myra, myra.richardson@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?

We have identified two evidence-based programs that meet Florida's definition limits of moderate and/or promising levels of evidence: Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading. These programs align with B.E.S.T. standards and with fidelity will close achievement gaps.

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

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

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

These programs, if used with fidelity, will address the needs of decoding, fluency, and comprehension. These two programs will close gaps for primary and intermediate students.

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
Our district coaches and campus coach will prepare our teachers to use both programs. Teacher training will include, but is not limited to identifying the materials, knowing how to implement the lessons, and how to assess students' knowledge.	McLachlan, Denise, denise.mclachlan@polk-fl.net
Monitoring implementation will occur as the administration walks the classrooms to evaluate instructional deliver will be conducted daily.	Richardson, Myra, myra.richardson@polk-fl.net
Progress Monitoring will take place in a pre-test/post-test model to ensure student growth using the program. As students' progress through the program, they will be excited from the program but will be monitored for continued improvement.	Lamb, Ashlee, ashlee.lamb@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.

During staff development week, the leadership team will review the data and the school goals that were derived from the data. The faculty and staff will be given an opportunity to ask questions concerning the direction of our campus with respect to our goals. Parents and community stakeholders will be able to hear, view, and question the same information shared with the staff during our Title One parent night and during ongoing School Advisory Council meetings.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Our plan to build positive relationships with our parents and community stakeholders involves monthly opportunities for our stakeholders to engage with our campus concerning Academics, Arts, Holiday events, etc.
Parents and community partners will have, during school and afterschool, opportunities to engage.

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))

We are implementing the district adopted intervention programs for reading (Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading) and math (number worlds). This progress monitoring system will allow us to close gaps and improve grade level understanding of all content areas.

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))

When we encounter students who are struggling with coping strategies, we refer them to our mental health facilitator. Depending on the severity of the student concern we can start with our facilitator and/or progress to contracted counselors at Peace River Center.

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))

We participate in the Great American Teach-in which allows all stakeholders to engage with our students. This gives students the opportunity to investigate and question entrepreneurs and employees of all kind which builds curiosity and interest for different career paths.

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).

We employ a Positive Behavior Intervention System which allows us opportunities to celebrate desired behavior while building systems to redirect undesirable behavior.

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 opportunities occur outside of and inside of the district. Most often the district uses the train the trainer model. This model allows key individuals to be trained. Those individuals in turn bring the information back to the district and/or campus. Teachers also have options to register for self-directed courses through Netconnect. These self-directed courses are based on the teachers' personal needs.

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))

We employ a kindergarten readiness program. This program allows students who are transitioning from PreK to Kindergarten the opportunity to practice academics and social skills prior to the beginning of the school year.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**

Budget Approval

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

Yes