

Polk County Public Schools

Edgar L. Padgett 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	0

Edgar L. Padgett Elementary

110 LEELOON RD, Lakeland, FL 33809

<http://www.polk-fl.net/padgett>

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.

Padgett Elementary is a diverse learning community, strongly committed to preparing all students to become problem solvers and lifelong learners through the use of rigorous and relevant learning and in a collaborative effort with teachers, staff, families, and community volunteers to increase student achievement.

We achieve this by showing:

Respect

Effort

Attitude (Positive)

Cooperation

Honesty

Provide the school's vision statement.

Padgett Elementary is committed to providing a quality education to all students. The teachers, staff, families, and community volunteers strive to build life long learners. Padgett Elementary is continuously working on producing technologically proficient students who will make positive contributions to society. We believe all students can learn.

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
Burse, Joette	Principal	School's instructional leader. Leads all instructional practices. Monitors the effectiveness of programs. Provides feedback to teachers. Analyzes data to use to make instructional decisions.
	Assistant Principal	School's instructional leader. Leads all instructional practices. Monitors the effectiveness of programs. Provides feedback to teachers. Analyzes data to use to make instructional decisions. Leader of student services.
Burdick, Davina	Reading Coach	Provides reading support and coaching to teachers. Assists with the implementation of programs. Analyzes data to guide leadership decisions.
Griffin, Keli	Math Coach	Provides math support and coaching to teachers. Assists with the implementation of programs. Analyzes data to guide leadership decisions.
Cloud, Meagan	Other	Provides student acceleration in math. Supports science instruction.
Coughlin, Patrick	School Counselor	Provides student services and facilitates MTSS.

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 Improvement Plan is a collaborative process among Padgett's Leadership Team. Input for the School Improvement Plan will be obtained from the School Advisory Council.

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 School Improvement Plan will be regularly monitored by Padgett's Leadership Team and revisions will be made as necessary based on observations, data analysis, student needs, recommendations and ideas from stakeholders.

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	63%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
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	42	50	57	63	46	45	0	0	0	303	
One or more suspensions	5	12	11	26	7	15	0	0	0	76	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	6	15	13	10	3	0	0	0	49	
Course failure in Math	0	1	7	4	5	4	0	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	44	22	21	0	0	0	87	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	45	15	18	0	0	0	78	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	38	24	35	25	18	0	0	0	150	

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	7	29	15	57	29	30	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	4	4	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	29
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	40	24	43	39	27	35	0	0	0	208
One or more suspensions	7	3	6	13	15	16	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA	0	3	8	0	0	2	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	42	24	21	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	41	29	22	0	0	0	92
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	33	57	47	23	14	0	0	0	174

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	9	25	25	43	31	0	0	0	133

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	40	24	43	39	27	35	0	0	0	208	
One or more suspensions	7	3	6	13	15	16	0	0	0	60	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	8	0	0	2	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	42	24	21	0	0	0	87	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	41	29	22	0	0	0	92	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	33	57	47	23	14	0	0	0	174	

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	9	25	25	43	31	0	0	0	133

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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*	34	45	53	41	47	56	40		
ELA Learning Gains				52			26		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			38		
Math Achievement*	52	49	59	46	42	50	45		
Math Learning Gains				55			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			43		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	39	41	54	29	49	59	26		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	44	54	59	66			55		

* 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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	197
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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	394
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	23	Yes	4	1
ELL	29	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	21	Yes	4	1
HSP	34	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	35	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	34	Yes	3	
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	3	
HSP	46			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	42			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	34			52			39					44
SWD	22			29			15				4	
ELL	24			33			20				5	44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18			33			21				4	
HSP	28			42			24				5	40
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	44			67			59				4	
FRL	29			48			33				5	42

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	41	52	52	46	55	53	29					66
SWD	21	37	42	31	48	62	0					
ELL	31	52		30	36		6					66
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20	44	45	27	47	56	13					
HSP	43	59		41	49		15					69
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	53	54	64	59	67		48					
FRL	33	45	48	36	46	50	15					63

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	40	26	38	45	42	43	26					55
SWD	44	30		46	43	50	21					
ELL	42	28		49	68		31					55

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												
BLK	27	19		37	35		17					
HSP	38	28		36	46		17					46
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	50	36		54	41		38					
FRL	33	22	36	35	33	44	15					55

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	32%	43%	-11%	54%	-22%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	53%	-7%	58%	-12%
03	2023 - Spring	28%	42%	-14%	50%	-22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	37%	51%	-14%	59%	-22%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	56%	8%	61%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	44%	13%	55%	2%

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.

Third grade ELA proficiency showed the lowest performance based on FAST data. Contributing factors include students not coming prepared to 3rd grade, poor attendance, student behavior, and hiring novice teachers.

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

Third grade ELA proficiency showed the greatest decline from the prior year based on FAST data. Contributing factors include students not coming prepared to 3rd grade, poor attendance, student behavior, and hiring novice teachers.

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.

Third grade ELA proficiency had the greatest gap when compared to the state average on FAST. Contributing factors include students not coming prepared to 3rd grade, poor attendance, student behavior, and hiring novice teachers.

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

Fifth grade math proficiency showed the most improvement based on FAST data. We hired a math interventionist to work with our of our 5th grade students. We started a spiral review.

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

A major area of concern is attendance. Every grade level had 40 or more students who were absent 10% or more days. Another area of concern is the 3rd grade suspension rate and the suspension rate in general indicating that student behaviors have been a distraction to the educational process. Additionally, we have 63 students with 2 or more referrals.

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

3rd and 5th Grade ELA proficiency
3rd Grade Math proficiency
5th Grade Science Proficiency
Discipline
Attendance

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on 3rd-5th grade FAST ELA, our proficiency was below 50%. More specifically, our 3rd grade FAST proficiency is at 27% and our 5th grade FAST proficiency is at 35%. Our 3rd grade math proficiency is at 37%. Based on our ESSA data, our Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners and Black/ African American students are underperforming. Our goal is for 3rd and 4th grade ELA proficiency to increase to 40% or higher. Our goal for 3rd grade math is to increase to 45% proficiency or higher and for 4th grade math to increase to 50% proficiency or higher.

We will focus on creating benchmark-based formative and summative assessments that provide an equivalent experience (learning arc step 7). We will use those assessments to progress monitor, create a plan for next steps and execute that plan by providing additional whole group, small group, or individualized instruction for students based on their needs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA and Math proficiency will increase by 5%. Proficiency among our Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Black/ African American subgroups will also increase by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

Creation of the assessments will be observed by the Leadership Team during PLC's. Student learning analysis will be observed by the Leadership Team during PLC's. Administration will observe this area of focus when completing Standards-Based Walk Throughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joette Burse (joette.burse@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.)

TNTP's The Opportunity Myth speaks to the relationship between academic success and ensuring that students are given opportunities to engage in grade level benchmark-based expectations. The study found that when given the chance to try grade level work, students meet the bar more than half of the time. Additionally, students of color and students from low-income backgrounds were about 25% less likely to receive grade appropriate assignments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

TNTP's The Opportunity Myth provides the rationale for why we need to ensure that our formative and summative assessments match the benchmarks and the outcomes are used to plan next steps for teaching. In doing so, we will make certain that we have grade level expectations that match the benchmarks.

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.

Explain the rationale for this SIP goal.

Person Responsible: Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

By When: Pre-planning week

Provide an opportunity for staff to begin to analyze current student data for their new class and create a plan of action.

Person Responsible: Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

By When: Pre-planning week

Provide opportunities for grade level teachers to create benchmark-based assessments in ELA.

Person Responsible: Davina Burdick (davina.burdick@polk-fl.net)

By When: During PLC's

Provide opportunities for grade level teams to analyze student work and create next steps for instruction in ELA.

Person Responsible: Davina Burdick (davina.burdick@polk-fl.net)

By When: During PLC's

Leadership team attends weekly benchmark walkthroughs together using the Classroom Walkthrough Tool.

Person Responsible: Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly

Review walkthrough data and student data at Leadership Team Meetings.

Person Responsible: Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly

Provide feedback to teachers regarding observations, equivalent experience formative and summative assessments, and student data.

Person Responsible: Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

By When: On-going

Regularly review assessments used and teacher data charts.

Person Responsible: Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

By When: On-going

Use essential questions during PLC's as a guide for reflection on instruction and next steps.

Person Responsible: Davina Burdick (davina.burdick@polk-fl.net)

By When: On-going

Work with each grade level to create a math spiral review that is utilized to check for understanding and provide additional instruction when needed.

Person Responsible: Meagan Cloud (meagan.cloud@polk-fl.net)

By When: Initiated during pre-planning

Provide opportunities for grade level teachers to create benchmark-based assessments in Math.

Person Responsible: Keli Griffin (keli.griffin@polk-fl.net)

By When: During PLC's

Provide opportunities for grade level teams to analyze student work and create next steps for instruction in Math.

Person Responsible: Keli Griffin (keli.griffin@polk-fl.net)

By When: During PLC's.

Provide opportunities for grade level teams to analyze student work and create next steps for instruction in Science.

Person Responsible: Meagan Cloud (meagan.cloud@polk-fl.net)

By When: During PLC's, On-going

Use the following data points to progress monitor and provide acceleration based on the data:

K-2 Quarterly Letters, Sounds, and Sight Words

K-5 STAR Reading and STAR Math

3rd-5th FAST

K-5 Monthly Oral Reading Fluency Assessments

Person Responsible: Davina Burdick (davina.burdick@polk-fl.net)

By When: During PLC's throughout the year

Guide teachers on how to use STAR data to group students based on needs and provide additional instruction

Person Responsible: Keli Griffin (keli.griffin@polk-fl.net)

By When: During PLC's throughout the year

Use FAST data to determine and update which students work with the math interventionist.

Person Responsible: Meagan Cloud (meagan.cloud@polk-fl.net)

By When: Last Year- PM3 This Year- PM1, PM2

Use data mentioned above to determine which students are targeted for interventions, targeted for para support, and targeted for Americorps.

Person Responsible: Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

By When: On-going

#2. 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.

PBIS and CHAMPS will be used to establish consistent behavioral expectations, preventative action steps and equitable and consistent response to student behavior.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will decrease the number of students with two or more referrals as well as the number of incidences of out of school suspension.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will observe PBIS and CHAMPS in use in all classrooms. Feedback and coaching will be provided to teachers as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joette Burse (joette.burse@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.)

PBIS focuses on identifying when students are meeting the expectations and rewarding that behavior. Rules and expectations that maintain order and ensure a safe learning environment are implemented, posted and taught to students through PBIS and CHAMPS. Additionally, CHAMPS provides a framework for procedures throughout the day. There is a focus on preventing and de-escalating student behavior. Students are held accountable for their behavior and for meeting the expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS and CHAMPS have been selected because they provide specific action steps for students and staff that will lead to a calm, safe environment where all students will be able to focus on learning.

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.

Communicate PBIS and CHAMPS expectations and procedures.

Person Responsible: Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

By When: Pre-planning

Create a PBIS team and a schedule for meetings.

Person Responsible: Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

By When: Pre-planning

Meet regularly with the PBIS team to analyze student discipline data and plan action steps.

Person Responsible: Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly

Coach teachers on PBIS and CHAMPS and other classroom management strategies.

Person Responsible: Davina Burdick (davina.burdick@polk-fl.net)

By When: As needed

Observe CHAMPS and PBIS in use when completing walkthrough observations and provide feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible: Joette Burse (joette.burse@polk-fl.net)

By When: On going

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

We will consistently implement Reading Mastery with students who are identified for the program based on their assessments.

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

We will consistently implement Corrective Reading (3-5) with students who are identified for the program based on their assessments.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Students will complete at least one Reading Mastery level during the school year. Students who score at or below the 19th percentile during PM1 will progress to the 30th percentile or above by PM3. Students who score at the 30th-40th percentile during PM1 will progress to a 50th percentile or above by PM3. Students who score at or above the 50th percentile during PM1 will maintain or increase their percentile by PM3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Students will complete at least one Corrective Reading level during the school year. Students who score at a level 1 during PM1 will progress to a level 2-5 by PM3. Students who score at a level 2 during PM1 will progress to a level 3-5 by PM3. Students who score a level 3-5 during PM1 will maintain or increase their level by PM3.

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.

We will compare FAST STAR Reading (K-2) and FAST Reading (3-5) scores from PM1 to PM2 and PM3 in order to track student progress. We will analyze PM1 and PM2 data and use the information gathered to set instructional goals and adjust student grouping if needed.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Burdick, Davina, davina.burdick@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?

Both Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading meet Florida’s definition limits of evidence-based practices, align with the district’s evidence-based reading plan, and align to the BEST ELA Standards.

Reading Mastery

The goal of Reading Mastery is to promote proficient reading and success for all students. From the onset of Project Follow Through, Direct Instruction programs including Reading Mastery have been among the most research-validated programs available. Multiple studies conducted over the past 25 years demonstrate

the success of Reading Mastery (which includes the Plus and Classic editions) as compared to a variety of

other reading programs for both general and special education populations.

The WWC reviewed 175 studies on Reading Mastery for adolescent learners. Based on these studies, the WWC found potentially positive effects on reading fluency.

Corrective Reading

Corrective Reading has been rated as Strong by Evidence for ESSA for students in grades three and five. The What Works Clearinghouse reported Potentially Positive Effects for Alphabetics and Fluency, but No Discernible Evidence for building Comprehension skills in 3rd grade Alphabetics, Fluency, and Comprehension in 5th grade.

Twenty-six of the 28 studies found positive results for students who were taught using Corrective Reading and one study found positive results for peer instructors who delivered Corrective Reading programs. For those studies using standardized measures, results indicated that most vocabulary and comprehension scores increased from pretest to posttest with similar increases in oral reading fluency. In fact, many posttest

oral reading fluency measures showed learners to be performing above end-of-program expectations. Clearly, Corrective Reading has been shown to improve students’ reading performance in a variety of different settings. It is also clear that when delivered by peer instructors or paraprofessionals, Corrective Reading has been shown to be a positive way to deal with a limited amount of instructional resources for secondary

students who are at risk for academic failure. According to the NICHD (2000), systematic and explicit phonics instruction is more effective than non-systematic or no phonics instruction.

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?

Both Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading will address the identified need to improve the reading abilities of below level readers. Corrective Reading is designed to help students who have had difficulty learning to read.

Reading Mastery is appropriate for elementary-age children who are above, at, or below grade level in their reading performance. The program also can be used with English language learners and special education students.

Systematic and explicit phonics instruction such as used in Corrective Reading has been found to significantly improve word recognition and spelling skills as well as reading comprehension. It is effective for children across social and economic levels and is particularly beneficial for those students who have difficulty learning to read and for those who are at risk for developing future reading problems (Armbruster et al., 2003). The NICHD (2000) analyzed various types of phonics programs including synthetic phonics and found the largest effects for synthetic phonics instruction (moderate effect size = .45), particularly with at-risk readers.

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
Staff professional development to learn how to teach the programs.	Burse, Joette, joette.burse@polk-fl.net
Assess new students, create groups, and create schedules.	Burse, Joette, joette.burse@polk-fl.net
Implement both programs and monitor implementation.	Burse, Joette, joette.burse@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.

School/District Webpage: <http://padgett.polk-fl.net/>

PEN Notebook

Parent/Family/Community Input Meetings

Annual 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))

Building Capacity Events

Staff Capacity Building Professional Development

Conferencing

Family/school relationships

Family/ Community Input

Data Chats/Conferences

Webpage: <http://padgett.polk-fl.net/>

Annual Meeting

Preventing Barriers

Student Agenda

Newsletter

Emails

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- Reading Coach, Math Coach, Math Interventionist

Supplemental Resources- Correcting Reading, Reading Mastery, Science Materials, One School, One Book, Kagan (if we get funding), Scholastic News, BEST Literature

Extended Learning

Professional Development

Collaborative Planning

Non-Title 1 Initiatives:

RTD

MTSS

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 1 Technical Assistance - Use of Funds, PFE Input, Back to School Meeting
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Technical Assistance
ESE, Migrant, Early Childhood

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

<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
Support Groups
Grief Support
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))

As an elementary school, we do provide an opportunity for acceleration. We also have a partnership with the Lake Gibson High School Teacher Career Academy.

Options for high schoolers:
Dual Enrollment
IB/Cambridge
Career Academies
Vocational Schools
Building Capacity 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

District Behavior Interventionist, Mental Health Counselor, School Counselor

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

RTD

Collective Bargaining Stipends- Title 1, Critical Shortage Area, 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))

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

ESE PreK

Kindergarten Round Up

Kindergarten Readiness Camps

Books Bridge Bus

Migrant Early Learning Services