

Polk County Public Schools

Oscar J. Pope 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 | 11 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 22 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 22 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 25 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 27 |

Oscar J. Pope Elementary School

2730 MAINE AVE, Lakeland, FL 33801

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

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.

"Oscar J. Pope Elementary School has support from the staff, parents, and the community. Our students are successful and actively engaged in active, purposeful, hands on activities. Our teachers are enthusiastic and all classrooms present a warm and inviting atmosphere where the love of content area reading and writing is consistently encouraged. Learning experiences that involve critical thinking and problem solving are evident. Technology is used to help students access knowledge and to practice the skills necessary for success in the workforce. All students demonstrate respect for school rules. Our campus provides a safe and orderly environment for all."

Provide the school's vision statement.

"At Oscar J. Pope Elementary all students will be exposed to learning opportunities that are challenging and engaging through rigorous, relevant and authentic problem-solving tasks."

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Perry, Swanyetta | Principal | The job duties and responsibilities of the Principal include, but are not limited to: ensure an academic focus to promote a quality education for all students; manage school operations; monitor data to improve student achievement; create and sustain a positive climate and culture; guarantee safety and inclusive practices; encourage parent involvement; monitor, develop and revise systems and procedures; maintain an accurate and efficient budget; recruit, hire and retain staff; oversee facilities; all other duties as assigned by the Superintendent, his designee and/or as needed. |
| Bermudez, Amy | Assistant Principal | The job duties and responsibilities of the Assistant Principal include, but are not limited to: support and participate in daily school functions; develop the master schedule; prepare for and organize all aspects of testing; enforce positive behavior of students; communicate with staff, students and parents as it relates to discipline; collaborate with teachers during common planning to ensure curriculum alignment; facilitate professional development as needed; all other duties as assigned. |
| Machado, Lucas | School Counselor | As the School Counselor, Mr. Machado will support students in grades K-5 by conducting weekly counseling lessons. Mr. Machado will also coordinate with the reading coach and assistant principal to lead SST meetings to identify interventions for students that require additional supports and/or wraparound services. |
| Phillips, Catherine | Math Coach | As the mathematics coach, Ms. Phillips works collaboratively with teachers to create lessons and activities designed to reach the depth of the BEST standards while aligning the benchmarks to tasks. Additionally, Ms. Phillips conducts coaching cycles to model best practices for teachers identified as Tier 2 and Tier 3 instructional staff. Ms. Phillips also supports teachers as they continue working through the Learning Arc process. |
| Shell, Ronald | Teacher, K-12 | As the Math Interventionist, Mr. Shell will work collaboratively with teachers to meet the needs of struggling students. He will support third, fourth, and fifth grade students targeted for proficiency to remediate and accelerate math instruction. |
| Hoppe, Serena | Reading Coach | As the reading coach, Ms. Hoppe works collaboratively with teachers to create lessons and activities designed to reach the depth of the BEST standards while aligning the benchmarks to tasks. Additionally, Ms. Hoppe conducts coaching cycles to model best practices for teachers identified as Tier 2 and Tier 3 instructional staff. Ms. Hoppe also supports teachers as they continue working through the Learning Arc process. |

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.

Stakeholders are involved in the SIP development process through SAC, PTO, Title I parent evaluations, needs assessments, and staff surveys. Core partners include, Somos Church, Winn Dixie, Florida Presbyterian Homes, Grace Lutheran Church, and Stinson Carpet. Other businesses partner at various points throughout the school year, including Junior League of Greater Lakeland and the Kiwanis Club of Lakeland to offer one-time donations. These partnerships are critical as they provide essential supports and services to encourage teachers, strengthen families and educate the whole child. We will continue to work closely with Reba Coil, the Community Liaison for our school. Together, we have identified two areas of focus for the upcoming school year: Strengthening Our Partnerships and Student Incentives.

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))

Teachers will continuously share student weekly performance data via SharePoint; including common assessments, unit assessments, and district/state assessments. This will allow teachers to analyze student student outcomes related to specific benchmarks and provide immediate, individualized intensive instruction to students who are not demonstrating mastery. The performance data sheet will also contain ESSA subgroup indicators for monitoring. This performance data will allow administration to monitor progress towards increasing student achievement in reading, math, and science. More importantly, it will be used to close achievement gaps among our African American and SWD population. The leadership team will conduct consistent walkthroughs using the district tool which will allow the team to see trends in the classroom. Walkthrough data will be shared with staff as we work to ensure teaching and tasks are aligned to the state benchmarks. The SIP will be reviewed quarterly by the leadership team to make any adjustments necessary. District support staff will be included in the adjustment process to provide feedback.

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 | 75% |
| 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: 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 | 39 | 26 | 30 | 28 | 16 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 | |
| One or more suspensions | 7 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | |
| 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 | 20 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 17 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 17 | 16 | 21 | 24 | 10 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 10 | 7 | 13 | 32 | 10 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 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 | 33 | 24 | 37 | 28 | 39 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 194 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 22 | 32 | 38 | 24 | 25 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 | |

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 | 2 | 14 | 12 | 15 | 31 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| 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 | 33 | 24 | 37 | 28 | 39 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 194 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 22 | 32 | 38 | 24 | 25 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 | |

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 | 2 | 14 | 12 | 15 | 31 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| 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* | 39 | 45 | 53 | 33 | 47 | 56 | 24 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 63 | | | 42 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 57 | | | 38 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 50 | 49 | 59 | 33 | 42 | 50 | 34 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 54 | | | 52 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 43 | | | 47 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 40 | 41 | 54 | 32 | 49 | 59 | 21 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 56 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 45 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 39 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 32 | 54 | 59 | 67 | | | 40 | | |

* 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 | 40 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 201 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 48 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 382 |
| 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 | 20 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL | 31 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 40 | Yes | 2 | |
| HSP | 38 | Yes | 1 | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |

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% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| WHT | 46 | | | |
| FRL | 38 | Yes | 1 | |

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD | 35 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 44 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 44 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 52 | | | |
| FRL | 48 | | | |

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 | 39 | | | 50 | | | 40 | | | | | 32 |
| SWD | 19 | | | 19 | | | 7 | | | | 5 | 21 |
| ELL | 26 | | | 32 | | | | | | | 4 | 32 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | | | 57 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| HSP | 35 | | | 45 | | | 31 | | | | 5 | 32 |

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 |
|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 46 | | | 53 | | | 58 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 36 | | | 48 | | | 39 | | | | 5 | 31 |

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 | 33 | 63 | 57 | 33 | 54 | 43 | 32 | | | | | 67 |
| SWD | 16 | 47 | 50 | 12 | 46 | 42 | 19 | | | | | 47 |
| ELL | 26 | 63 | | 30 | 59 | | 20 | | | | | 67 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 61 | | 27 | 56 | | 9 | | | | | |
| HSP | 32 | 57 | 43 | 30 | 46 | 38 | 33 | | | | | 69 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 34 | 75 | 67 | 40 | 65 | 42 | 41 | | | | | |
| FRL | 33 | 65 | 60 | 32 | 54 | 42 | 29 | | | | | 65 |

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
|--------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| All Students | 24 | 42 | 38 | 34 | 52 | 47 | 21 | | | | | 40 |
| SWD | 10 | 40 | | 19 | 50 | | 29 | | | | | 28 |
| ELL | 20 | 44 | | 35 | 52 | | 0 | | | | | 40 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 24 | 50 | | 24 | 43 | | 36 | | | | | |
| HSP | 21 | 44 | 40 | 35 | 47 | | 10 | | | | | 40 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 29 | 35 | | 39 | 71 | | 33 | | | | | |

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 |
|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| FRL | 22 | 39 | 33 | 34 | 56 | 53 | 16 | | | | | 39 |

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 | 23% | 43% | -20% | 54% | -31% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 64% | 53% | 11% | 58% | 6% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 36% | 42% | -6% | 50% | -14% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 42% | 51% | -9% | 59% | -17% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 66% | 56% | 10% | 61% | 5% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 44% | 2% | 55% | -9% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 35% | 39% | -4% | 51% | -16% |

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 data component reflecting the lowest performance is reading. The trends show that students are not achieving proficiency in reading. Spring 2023 data reveals third and fifth grade students earned 36% and 25% proficiency in reading, respectively. This indicates that more than 60% of students in those grades did not meet grade level expectations. The contributing factors were inconsistent classroom instruction, lack of teacher capacity, and poor student attendance.

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

Although we increased in each data component, there is a significant need to improve reading proficiency among ELL, African American and ESE subgroups. This decline is attributed to historical data, which shows reading deficiencies across all grade levels in prior years.

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 and fifth grade reading demonstrated the greatest gaps compared to the state average. The contributing factors that led to this need for improvement were lack of teacher capacity and opportunities for instructional coaching.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was math.

New actions included:

1. Ensuring equivalent experiences using common planning and the Standards-Based Walkthrough Tool.
2. Intentional small group instruction using technology and research-based resources (i.e. Numbers World, Freckle) to remediate and accelerate learning.
3. Ongoing progress monitoring of benchmark and formative assessments were utilized to refine instructional practices.

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

The two potential areas of concern are student attendance and school-wide reading deficiencies.

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

1. Reading Proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. Science Proficiency
4. ESSA Sub Groups
5. Parent Engagement

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 ELA**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.

As evidenced by spring FAST data, more than 60% of students in grades 3 and 5 did not earn an achievement level of 3 or higher in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

State data will show a minimum of +5% proficiency increase as well as 20% increase of the students just below the proficiency line becoming proficient.

Monitoring:

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

School administration and the leadership team will monitor all classrooms on a daily basis. As trends are discovered, they will be addressed via the coaching model with school and district-based coaches and/or school administration. Regularly scheduled progress monitoring will also take place throughout the year. As data is gathered, teachers will make adjustments to instruction following data chats with administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Swanyetta Perry (swanyetta.perry@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.)

To address reading deficiencies we will use Corrective Reading to target students performing below grade level. Students will receive additional push-in support from ESE, ESOL and support staff to provide intensive, individualized instruction to close achievement gaps. Specifically, all students will be provided with equivalent experiences in all content areas to improve student outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When students are consistently exposed to grade-level content and provided equivalent experiences proficiency will increase. Teachers must be provided with varying opportunities for professional development to reflect and refine instruction such as collaborative planning, curriculum alignment, and peer mentorship.

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.

1. Weekly meetings using the Learning Arc framework.
2. Implement and utilize data-driven interventions (i.e. Corrective Reading) to address student needs.
3. Professional learning for teachers and support staff to close foundational gaps for all students, specifically ESSA subgroups.

Person Responsible: Swanyetta Perry (swanyetta.perry@polk-fl.net)

By When: April 1, 2024.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

As evidenced by spring FAST data, more than 50% of students in grades 3 through 5 earned an achievement level of 3 or higher in math, however only grade 4 students earned 50% proficiency overall.

Measurable Outcome:

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

State data will show a minimum of +5% proficiency increase as well as 20% increase of the students just below the proficiency line becoming proficient.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring data offered by district level assessment platforms will be used to ensure students are mastering Benchmarks being taught after implementation of standards-based lessons. School administration and the leadership team will monitor all classrooms on a daily basis. As trends are discovered, they will be addressed via the coaching model with school and district-based coaches and/or school administration. Regularly scheduled progress monitoring will also take place throughout the year. As data is gathered, teachers will make adjustments to instruction following data chats with administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Swanyetta Perry (swanyetta.perry@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Monitor students engaging in equivalent experiences aligned to state expectations using the Standards-Based Walkthrough Tool. Small group instruction and technology (i.e. Number Worlds, Freckle) will be used to remediate and enrich students at their instructional levels. Ongoing progress monitoring of benchmark and formative assessments will be utilized to provide professional development to teachers and refine instructional practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When students are consistently exposed to grade-level content and provided equivalent experiences proficiency will increase. Teachers must be provided with varying opportunities for professional development to reflect and refine instruction such as collaborative planning, curriculum alignment, and peer mentorship.

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.

1. Weekly meetings using the Learning Arc framework.
2. Implement and utilize data-driven interventions (i.e. Number Worlds, Math Interventionist) to address student needs.
3. Professional learning for teachers and support staff to close foundational gaps for all students, specifically ESSA subgroups.

Person Responsible: Swanyetta Perry (swanyetta.perry@polk-fl.net)

By When: April 1, 2024

#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.

Research shows that there is a direct link between regular school attendance and student achievement outcomes. In the 2022-23 school year, the average daily attendance for students in grades 3 through 5 was 88%, which was an increase from the prior school year by two percentage points, but still not at our goal of 95% daily student attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Attendance data will show a +7% increase in daily attendance for students in grades 3 through 5.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will be based on student and parent participation in school programs, after-school sponsored events, and strategically scheduling school-wide celebrations on student early dismissal days. We will also track parent participation on SAC and PTO.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Bermudez (amy.bermudez@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.)

Using our school-based calendar, we will increase student engagement through extracurricular activities (i.e. chorus, chess, A-Team, STEM).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing ample opportunities for students to become involved in school programs and events, students will attend school regularly, which will in turn, increase student attendance and parent involvement opportunities.

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.

1. Increase the number of parent and community volunteers.
2. Develop an effective PTO and SAC.
3. Schedule PBIS activities on early student dismissal Days.
4. Collaborate with community partners to create mentorship opportunities.
5. Monitor and track parent and community involvement in school activities.

Person Responsible: Amy Bermudez (amy.bermudez@polk-fl.net)

By When: April 1, 2024

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).

The process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs are through the following resources:

Data Com

SIP Training/Meetings

Transformation Office Principal Meetings

Summer Leadership Academy

Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)

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

Students will use Florida Wonders and the district-approved Corrective Reading intervention program to develop necessary skills to improve reading and writing. Data-driven small-group instruction to address individual student needs using research-based resources and teaching strategies will also be used to close achievement gaps across subgroups.

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

Florida Wonders Tier 2 instructional resources will be used to support struggling readers and accelerate learning for Tier 1 students. Data-driven small-group instruction to address individual student needs using research-based resources and teaching strategies will also be used to close achievement gaps across subgroups.

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

STAR PM3 2023:

Kindergarten Early Lit Proficiency: 43%

Grade 1 Reading Proficiency: 49%

Grade 2 Reading Proficiency: 40%

Measurable Outcome: State data will show a minimum of +5% proficiency increase as well as 20% increase of the students just below the proficiency line becoming proficient.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

FAST 2023:

Grade 3 Reading Proficiency: 36%

Grade 4 Reading Proficiency: 69%

Grade 5 Reading Proficiency: 25%

Measurable Outcome: State data will show a minimum of +5% proficiency increase as well as 20% increase of the students just below the proficiency line becoming proficient.

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.

Ongoing progress monitoring using accountability spreadsheets to track student progression towards mastery of benchmarks.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Perry, Swanyetta, swanyetta.perry@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?

Evidence-based practices; literacy remediation through Power Hour.

Evidence-based programs; Corrective Reading.

The aforementioned program has been identified as a strong evidence-based intervention to target specific skills needed for grade-level proficiency.

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?

Yes, the evidence-based program addresses the identified need.

The practice of one hour targeted interventions have a proven record of effectiveness for the targeted population.

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 |
|---|--|
| The Principal and Literacy Coach will lead professional development in effective small group instruction for teachers and paraeducators to close foundational gaps and ensure adequate student growth | Perry, Swanyetta, swanyetta.perry@polk-fl.net |
| Ensure that students are writing daily in response to text with teachers modeling and providing specific feedback using grade-appropriate rubrics | Bermudez, Amy, amy.bermudez@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.

The methods for disseminating Title I information to families include, but are not limited to: school web page, PEN notebook (available in front office), family and community input meetings, and the 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))

The school builds positive relationships with parents, families and community stakeholders by encouraging parents to become part of their child's education through volunteering, providing input as necessary, and participating in programs. (i.e., PTO, SAC, Parent Portal) and parent-teacher conferences.

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)

Continue utilizing the Learning Arc process to enhance teacher understanding of on-grade level benchmarks/ standards, alignment to tasks, and on-grade level texts. Model the implementation of the instructional framework (gradual release model) to include teacher and student use of the benchmark/ objectives for teaching and learning. The math interventionist will provide daily small group instruction (i.e., Equivalent Experiences) and the math coach will provide daily small group instruction to address

student deficiencies. (i.e., Number Worlds, Fact Fluency) The reading coach will also provide push-in support students identified as having a reading deficiency.

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))

This plan is developed to identify needs and set goals for the school using the following resources:

Data Com

SIP Training/Meetings

Regional Principal Meetings

Summer Leadership Academy

Title I Technical Assistance Meetings

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Technical Assistance Meetings

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))

Through the support of the school counselor and mental health team, students identified as high-needs receive daily or weekly wraparound services (i.e., individual counseling, food packs, mentors). Students and families identified as needing additional support are referred to an outside agency to receive services. Bi-weekly and monthly meetings are held to promote transparency and open communication regarding the continuous improvement of programs and services, which includes integrated student supports, needs assessments, and educating the whole child.

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))

N/A

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).

High impact PBIS and behavior practices are addressed throughout the year during leadership, faculty and PBIS team meetings. Bi-monthly SST meetings are held to address the needs of students performing below the proficiency line. Established business partners frequently assist with incentives and rewards to improve attendance, strengthen families and increase academic performance.

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))

Instructional and non-instructional staff, including Pre-K and Headstart personnel regularly participate in team building and professional development activities to identify measurable objectives and maintain a positive culture. (i.e., RTD) Our commitment to a safe and supportive learning environment is displayed through ongoing collegial support, collaborative leadership and practice, shared values, and collective trust and responsibility.

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

Head Start, VPK, and Kindergarten Registration are offered to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education to elementary school.

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: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$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.

No