

Polk County Public Schools

Scott Lake 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	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

Scott Lake Elementary School

1140 COUNTY ROAD 540A E, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

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.

Scott Lake Elementary promotes opportunities for all students to achieve to their maximum potential in all aspects of life - academic, social, emotional, and physical for the purpose of educating the whole child.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To educate all students to the highest levels of academic achievement, to enable them to reach and expand their potential, and to prepare them to become productive, responsible, ethical, and compassionate members of society.

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
Durham, Tangela	Principal	<p>The Principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. She leads and assists in setting up structures for high impact instruction, data-based decision-making, and a collaborative culture. She monitors the progress of intentional planning by attending weekly grade level collaborative planning sessions as well as PLCs. She also conducts daily walkthroughs, provides consistent formative feedback to support the professional growth of all teachers, and openly communicates with parents to build positive relationships.</p>
Kaufmann, Ron	Assistant Principal	<p>Assistant Principal: Assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, in the assessment of school staff, and assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas. He provides commentary on a weekly basis and works with the principal to make schedule adjustments as needed. The assistant principal also provides and supports common vision for PBIS by enforcing protocol and policy. The Assistant Principal will also ensure that classrooms have the necessary materials/furniture/arrangements that are conducive to learning based on teacher discretion.</p>
Husted, Shelby	Instructional Coach	<p>Participates in grade level collaborative planning with a standards-focus, monitoring for the rigor of the standards, and teaching with the most effective instructional strategies. Delivers professional development aligned with our priorities, provide grade-level, and one-on-one coaching as well as additional support to both teachers and students in meeting the rigor of the standards. Also, gathers resources for support within all three tiers, follow up on individual student progress and identify professional development needs in order for interventions to be successful and provide coaching/mentoring support to strengthen core. Monitors data to identify professional development needs in order for interventions to be successful and provide coaching/mentoring support to strengthen core. Participates in daily walk-throughs with administration and analyzes data from walkthrough tool.</p>
Single, Tracy	Other	<p>LEA Facilitator: Coordinates educational placement and appropriate services for students with disabilities. Also serves as the lead representative at staffing meetings and IEP (Individual Education Plan) meetings and provides direct support to students with disabilities and their general education and ESE teachers to promote inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education environment.</p>
Collins, Emily	Other	<p>Analyzes reading and math data in order to identify students in need of extra support; uses supplemental resources to increase achievement; meet with targeted students; plan with teachers to determine additional needs/ improvements of students, and provide small group instruction to students in the lowest quartile. Participates in grade level collaborative planning with a standards-focus, monitoring for the rigor of the standards, and teaching with</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mewborn, Trena	School Counselor	<p>the most effective instructional strategies aligned with Marzano's framework. Delivers professional development aligned with our priorities, provide grade-level, and one-on-one coaching as well as additional support to both teachers and students in meeting the rigor of the standards. Also gathers resources for support within all three tiers, follow up on individual student progress.</p> <p>School Counselor: Provides training and support in the MTSS process annually and as needed; works with teachers through the problem solving cycle; facilitates leadership meetings related to MTSS. Teaches students through classroom guidance lessons, provides classroom guidance lessons; works with the Principal and/or Assistant Principal on issues of behavior; acts as a parent contact for parents who have academic and/or social and emotional concerns related to their child. Spearheads all aspects of PBIS..</p>

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.

Leadership Team will be an integral part of developing the final draft based on each leader's area of focus. Throughout the year SAC members will be given updates on progress of each area of focus as well as constant updates on progress monitoring data.

SIP Monitoring

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

Leadership Team will monitor during weekly meetings paralleling the time line of applicable assessments.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	41%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	80%

Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) 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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	40	29	24	39	26	32	0	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	11	4	4	4	5	4	0	0	0	32
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	22	30	25	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	36	33	0	0	0	85
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	13	16	14	21	34	23	0	0	0	121

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	9	12	9	24	39	34	0	0	0	127

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	28	26	28	31	24	28	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	1	4	4	2	1	7	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	13	30	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	12	30	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	4	6	7	3	3	0	0	0	26

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	28	26	28	31	24	28	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	1	4	4	2	1	7	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	13	30	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	12	30	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	4	6	7	3	3	0	0	0	26

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	56	45	53	56	47	56	56		
ELA Learning Gains				60			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			45		
Math Achievement*	60	49	59	69	42	50	68		
Math Learning Gains				67			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			54		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	57	41	54	55	49	59	58		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	53	54	59	50			52		

* 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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	286
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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454
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	26	Yes	1	1
ELL	33	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	41			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	44			

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	51			
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	49			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	62			
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	56			60			57					53
SWD	27			31			19				4	
ELL	23			38							4	53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			55			64				4	
HSP	44			44			45				5	43
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	64			66			61				4	
FRL	43			46			40				5	43

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	56	60	35	69	67	62	55					50
SWD	35	62	48	48	67	60	36					
ELL	27	23		45	46							50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	65	40	45	50	55	50					
HSP	46	52	29	61	63	47	50					43
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	61	63	37	75	70	73	54					
FRL	40	53	39	55	56	53	38					50

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	56	53	45	68	61	54	58					52
SWD	32	45	33	46	61	60	33					
ELL	30	38		47	75		50					52

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	39	33		55	44		35					
HSP	47	48	50	60	69		67					45
MUL	40											
PAC												
WHT	64	63		73	61	60	62					
FRL	44	34	35	57	61	50	49					44

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	60%	43%	17%	54%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	53%	4%	58%	-1%
03	2023 - Spring	61%	42%	19%	50%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	76%	51%	25%	59%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	56%	-3%	61%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	56%	44%	12%	55%	1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	55%	39%	16%	51%	4%

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.

At 58% proficient, Science is the lowest performing component. Although Science is the lowest at 58%, the proficiency rate actually increased from 55% in 2022 to 58% in 2023.

~ It was difficult to gage student capacity within the science curriculum as the progress monitoring tool did not align.

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

The lowest decline was Math. The proficiency rate dropped from 69% in 2022 to 63% in 2023.

~ The state of Florida made a shift in 2021-2022 to the BEST standards for primary grades, but did not make this

shift in upper grades until 2022- 2023.

~ Students were assessed based on the BEST standards.

~ Assessment platform changed from paper based to computer based.

~ Change in math teachers:

~ One in 3rd grade (first year teacher)

~ One in 4th grade (teacher from lower grade level)

~ One in 5th (first year teacher)

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.

Fourth grade math at 52% proficient as compared 61% last year.

~ This cohort of students has historically performed beneath the proficiency level of the state. However, this year they were at the same as the state at 52%

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

ELA increased from 56% proficient to 60%.

~ Implemented an addition set time in the master schedule for Acceleration/Intervention.

~ Small group instruction was discussed and planned during weekly collaborative planning.

~ Administration and Coaches conducted daily targeted walk-throughs to monitor the fidelity of implementation. ~

~ Academic Coach and School Counselor monitored MTSS plans along with small group plans bi-weekly. ~ ~

~ Administration and School Counselor monitored grades to ensure students not showing adequate progress

were targeted immediately.

~ Quarterly data chats with instructional staff were held with administration with a focus on small group/ MTSS

documentation.

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

1. Attendance
2. Number of Level 1 students in both ELA and Math

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

1. Intervention Programs
2. Support/planning
3. Monitoring
4. Culture and Climate
5. Sub-group awareness

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

According to Spring 2023 FAST data, 40% of students school wide are not proficient in ELA, 37% are not proficient in math, and 42% not proficient in science.

Measurable Outcome:

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

State data will show a minimum of 1% increase as well as 10% of students who fall just below the proficiency line will become proficient in ELA, Math, and Science.

Monitoring:

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

Daily classroom walkthroughs to monitor the fidelity of implementation, feedback from coaches, analysis of student work samples, discussions through weekly collaborative planning, as well as progressing through the seven steps of the Learning Arc, monthly data chats with teachers, formative assessments, progress monitoring from STAR Early Literacy, STAR, Istation and AR.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@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.)

Engage teachers in standards-based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework to appropriately plan for equivalent experiences and appropriate interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

There is a relationship between academic success and ensuring students are provided the opportunities to engage in grade level standards-based expectations and tasks.

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.

- ~ Classroom observations by the administration using the Standards Walkthrough Tool to ensure the implementation of the standards and the assigned tasks.
- ~ Analysis of student products, formative and summative assessment data, to ensure tasks are at grade level.
- ~ Weekly collaborative planning with Instructional Coaches, utilizing the Learning Arc Framework to ensure grade level tasks are being used in

classrooms.

~ Instructional Coaches will meet with each grade level for a Collaborative Planning Day once per year.

~ Teachers, paras and/or support staff will work with small groups of students daily in all grade levels in the areas of ELA and Math to support instruction of standards using grade level materials.

Person Responsible: Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net)

By When:

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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 FSA and progress monitoring results, students who are English Language Learners are below 41% as compared to other subgroups. This subgroup did not make adequate growth; therefore, they are targeted for intensive instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase ELL subgroup proficiency by at least 10%.

Monitoring:

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

Daily classroom walkthroughs to monitor the fidelity of implementation, feedback from coaches, analysis of student work samples, discussions through weekly collaborative planning, as well as progressing through the seven steps of the Learning Arc, monthly data chats with teachers, formative assessments, progress monitoring from STAR Early Literacy, STAR, Istation and AR.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@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.)

Students will be identified through initial test scores, STAR, and AR Diagnostic Data and monitored through the MTSS process as well as the usage of Ellevation strategies. Additionally, they will be provided small group instruction from the classroom teacher, ESE Inclusion Teacher, Interventionist, Alpha Teacher, support staff, media para, academic coaches, and/or administration.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this strategy is to close the achievement gaps among a diverse population. The data indicates that students are not internalizing information at a tier one level. In order for students to master grade level standards, students must receive intensive instruction/interventions to meet their academic needs.

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.

- ~ Teachers and support staff will identify students who are in the targeted subgroup.
- ~ Teachers will be provided professional development in small group instruction.
- ~ Intermediate grades will be provided with iReady/Leveled Literacy
- ~ Intervention materials to help facilitate standards based instruction during small group time.
- ~ Daily monitoring by administration and Academic Coaches.
- ~ Small group planning will take place during collaborative planning with a focus on the targeted subgroup.
- ~ Weekly collaborative planning will focus on data analysis and creating small group plans and implementing STEM strategies.

Person Responsible: Tangela Durham (tangela.durham@polk-fl.net)

By When:

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Feeling safe and valued is important to a child's development. When a school community is characterized by positive relationships between both students and teachers, genuine respect is the norm, students feel they belong, and can excel because they have ownership of their learning and actions. At Scott Lake, we believe in developing the whole child by allowing students and teachers to build positive relationships while cultivating a classroom and schoolwide culture in which students challenge their own growth, take ownership of their own learning, self-regulate their actions, and continually to positively grow emotionally through positive recognition in both academics and behavior. Teachers will assist students in creating individual academic and behavioral goals in which they will analyze monthly. MTSS procedures will be put in place and supports established to help students struggling to meet their behavior goals. As a result, during the 2023-2024 school year, we will see a decrease in our office discipline referrals by at least 2% from the total (126) submitted during the 2022-2023 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With monthly individual academic and behavioral goals and the implementation of MTSS behavior supports, we will see a 1% decrease in the total number (126) of office referrals submitted and suspensions for the 2023-2024 school year, which will allow for more in class instructional time for all students.

Monitoring:

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

Student goals will be reviewed monthly to ensure that all data is being analyzed with students, goals are being set, and action steps are being developed. Teachers will also submit monthly PBIS data documenting which students earned participation in the monthly PBIS reward. Monthly data chats will be held with teachers to discuss students who are consistently not earning participation in the PBIS reward, and MTSS Behavior plans will be developed. MTSS behavior plans will be monitored, reviewed, and adjusted as needed each month to ensure they are being followed with fidelity and students are making progress towards their goals. Monthly discipline data will also be reviewed through data chats with teachers and the schoolwide leadership team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Trena Mewborn (trena.mewborn@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.)

Evidence of student PBIS/behavior data will be tracked and monitored by the teacher, school counselor and administration. Schoolwide PBIS and discipline data will be tracked through an excel spreadsheet that will be monitored by administration and PBIS Team. MTSS plans will be implemented by the teacher and monitored by school counselor and administration.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this strategy is to keep students aware of their actions and assist in the development of their responsibility for those actions.

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.

- ~ We will teach leadership skills to assist students in taking ownership of their learning and actions.
- ~ We will start with a general overview of skills in August and then have a focus habit each month.
- ~ Students will track their academic and PBIS/behavior data, set goals for themselves, and develop actions steps to achieve those goals.
- ~ Schoolwide PBIS and discipline data will be tracked and reviewed with all stakeholders.
- ~ Implementation of MTSS behavior plans will be monitored for fidelity.
- ~ Data and student performance will be discussed monthly and plans will be adjusted to ensure student success
- ~ Sanford Harmony professional development (review) will be held for all staff members to develop their understanding, student leadership, and student ownership of learning and behavior.

Person Responsible: Trena Mewborn (trena.mewborn@polk-fl.net)

By When:

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

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.

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.

Review Parent and Family Engagement Plan and Compact for suggestions:

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

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

- Building Capacity Events
- Staff Capacity Building Professional Development Conferencing
- family/school relationship
- Family/Community Input
- Data Chats/Conferences
- Webpage
- Annual Meeting
- Preventing Barriers

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

- Supplemental Staff (academic coach, interventionist, paraprofessionals)
- Supplemental Resources
- Extended Learning
- Professional Development
- Collaborative Planning
- MTSS – Tier Support for Students

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

- Data Com
- School Improvement Planning Trainings
- Regional (area) Meetings
- Summer Leadership Academy
- Title I Technical Assistance – Use of Funds, PFE Input, Back to School Meeting
- Comprehensive Needs Assessment Technical Assistance
- ESE, Early Childhood, Work Force

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))

- Dual Enrollment
- IB/Cambridge
- Career Academies
- Vocational Schools
- Building Capacity of Events – Transition events

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

- PBiS
- RTI
- MTSS
- Mental Health Counselors, School Counselors,

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

- Professional Learning Communities to improve instruction and data
- Data Com
- RTD
- UniSIG Supplemental Teacher/Administrator Allocation
- Collective Bargaining Stipends – Title I, 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/>
- Head Start
- VPK (Title I, ESE and non-Title I)
- Kindergarten Round Up
- Kindergarten Readiness Camps
- Books Bridge Bus
- Migrant Early Childhood Services

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes