

Polk County Public Schools

Garden Grove 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	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	25
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Garden Grove Elementary School

4599 CYPRESS GARDENS RD, Winter Haven, FL 33884

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

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.

Believing all children can learn, we will work together in a safe and caring environment, guiding each individual toward lifelong learning and responsible productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Garden Grove Elementary is to develop well rounded, confident and responsible individuals who aspire to achieve their full potential by providing an environment where all children feel loved, respected, and encouraged to reach their full potential.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Neidringhaus, Laura	Principal	The primary focus of the principal is being the instructional leader at the school. Planning is a focus point, with monitoring implementation of B.E.S.T. Benchmarks, and serving as a coach for teachers and students to increase the level of proficiency of all students. The Leadership team will focus on the three described in the School Improvement Plan.
		The Leadership team will review all progress monitoring data such as STAR Literacy, STAR Early Literacy, STAR Math, FAST, iStation, Freckle, Accelerated Reader, Smarty Ants, Formative and Summative Assessments, and MTSS data.
		The role of the principal will include leading the School-Based Leadership Team. This role will include scheduling and facilitating meetings, assigning roles, monitoring the implementation of initiatives identified by the school-based leadership team.
		The role of the principal will be to monitor student and staff data to assist in the decision-making process based on academic needs, instructional practices, student engagement, and discipline.
		The principal will work with teachers by providing resources, providing input during collaborative planning, reviewing data, and assisting with using the Learning Arc Framework for planning. The principal will collect data to share with the school-based leadership team to help guide decision making to assist with the alignment of task to benchmark and ensure all students have equivalent learning experiences. The principal will assist the implementation of the Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading Intervention Program.
		Being an active community member, the principal will serve as the communicator with all stakeholders to build and maintain relationships inside and outside the school setting.
Monitor Early Warning Systems and ESSA Group data.		
Gavin, Jessica	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will focus on Exceptional Student Education (ESE) compliance and implementation of ESE and 504 plans. In addition, the Assistant Principal will assist the Principal with the facilitation of School-Based Leadership Team meetings.
		The Assistant Principal will monitor discipline and the implementation of PBIS schoolwide to decrease the number of discipline referrals and out-of-school suspensions.
		The Assistant Principal will monitor attendance.
Riggeal, Susan	Instructional Coach	The literacy coach will work with teachers by providing resources, providing input during collaborative planning, reviewing data, and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		assisting with using the Learning Arc Framework for planning. The coach will also work with identified teachers through the coaching cycle. The coach will collect data to share with the school-based leadership team to help guide decision making to assist with the alignment of task to benchmark and ensure all students have equivalent learning experiences. The coach will also assist the implementation of the Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading Intervention Program.
Greene, Stephanie	Other	Works with small groups of students who have been identified with a reading deficit. Will assist the implementation of the Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading Intervention Program.
Bataille, Amanda	Teacher, ESE	Works with small groups of students who have been identified as gifted and work with teachers to develop meaningful lessons to challenge students who are performing at grade level or higher. Will assist the implementation of the SRA Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading Program.

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.

At the end of the 2022-2023 school year, the leadership team met with a group comprised of parents and business partnerships to discuss barriers and needs of the school. This group made suggestions, and those along with result from a parent survey were used to create the Title I Parent Involvement Plan, The Title I Home/School Compact. These documents were presented to our School Advisory Council which consist of parents, business partners, and school staff as to make suggestions for strategies and initiatives to overcome identifies barriers to increase the level of proficiency for our students and create a positive school culture.

SIP Monitoring

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

The school will use a variety of data to monitor the implementation of the plan. We will use F.A.S.T data and STAR data as an initial baseline. We will use Progress Monitoring 1 and summative assessments that are aligned with the state benchmarks to monitor the plan. Using the continuous improvement model, the leadership team will meet to analyze the data and make the necessary changes to improve the plan. We will follow the same process after Progress Monitoring 2. Throughout the year, we will analyze work samples, review summative and formative assessments. We will also walkthrough (observation) data to ensure the plan is being implemented with fidelity.

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	60%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	49	122	117	127	93	103	0	0	0	611	
One or more suspensions	49	40	24	41	30	23	0	0	0	207	
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	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.	37	21	21	34	20	24	0	0	0	157	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	3	25	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	42	41	31	29	23	32	0	0	0	198	
One or more suspensions	0	7	10	11	19	22	0	0	0	69	
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	38	31	19	0	0	0	88	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	44	27	17	0	0	0	88	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	56	104	88	86	102	0	0	0	436	

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	17	20	17	27	53	0	0	0	134

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	8	13	31	7	11	0	0	0	75
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	42	41	31	29	23	32	0	0	0	198
One or more suspensions	0	7	10	11	19	22	0	0	0	69
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	38	31	19	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	44	27	17	0	0	0	88
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	56	104	88	86	102	0	0	0	436

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	27	87	10	59	26	293	0	0	0	502

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	3	25	7	11	0	0	0	50
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

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*	38	45	53	42	47	56	42		
ELA Learning Gains				56			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			39		
Math Achievement*	41	49	59	49	42	50	51		
Math Learning Gains				72			45		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			37		
Science Achievement*	30	41	54	36	49	59	38		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	75	54	59	53			59		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	219
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	53

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
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	14	Yes	4	1
ELL	35	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	16	Yes	4	1
HSP	42			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	34	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	33	Yes	3	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	3	
HSP	50			

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	47			

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	38			41			30					75
SWD	12			20			6				4	
ELL	24			31			9				4	75
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22			22			4				4	
HSP	35			37			24				5	75
MUL	58			42							2	
PAC												
WHT	46			54			47				4	
FRL	29			33			13				5	73

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	42	56	48	49	72	64	36					53
SWD	17	35		22	48		44					
ELL	27	65		28	63		27					53
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	25	40	35	26	58	58	17					
HSP	40	62	36	43	73	67	32					50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	54	63	75	66	79		49					
FRL	34	51	39	42	73	63	22					53

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	42	41	39	51	45	37	38					59
SWD	12	38	30	27	23		15					
ELL	39			36								59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22	39		27	33		18					
HSP	42	41		41	56		28					60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	50	36		65	47		47					
FRL	40	47	40	43	45	30	38					62

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	44%	43%	1%	54%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	53%	-4%	58%	-9%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	32%	42%	-10%	50%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	37%	51%	-14%	59%	-22%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	56%	-7%	61%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	44%	13%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	32%	39%	-7%	51%	-19%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Third grade ELA had the lowest performance. The contributing factors was a lack of stability in teaching staff. Out of eight classroom units, only six were filled. Two teachers moved out of the area in the fall of the year and two (non-education majors) took positions, but left after a month. This created a hard learning environment for the students because they did not have stability and routine in the learning environment.

In addition, we had a large percentage of students missing the necessary foundational skills to be successful at reading.

In reviewing 2021-2022 ESSA Subgroup Data:

SWD and Black subgroups are below the 41% Federal Index range. In comparison to the FSA all subgroups have stayed below the 41% from the 22 FSA level compared to the STAR Spring Scores of 2022. The greatest need for improvement is still overall proficiency in all content areas.

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

All three content areas showed a decline in proficiency. ELA approximately 1%, Math approximately 2%, and Science approximately 4%. Factors contributing to this decline in a lack of consistency in staffing

and a certified teaching shortage. Covering class with long-term substitute teachers does not provide strong consistent instruction.

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.

Please complete

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

All three content areas showed a decline in proficiency. ELA approximately 1%, Math approximately 2%, and Science approximately 4%. Implementing intervention programs such as Corrective Reading and Numbers Worlds played an important role in slowing the decline in spite of the instability with staffing.

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

The greatest area of concern is in our ELA Proficiency, especially in third grade. Third grade had the lowest proficiency percentage and the greatest number of retained students. We will analyze each student to identify the most effective intervention program, using programs such as Corrective Reading and intentionally planned push-in support.

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

1. ELA Proficiency and learning gains for all students.
2. Math Proficiency and learning gains for all students.
3. Increase fifth-grade science proficiency.
4. Closing the achievement gap for SWD.
5. Closing the achievement gap for our black students.

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.

We will increase our instructional practice in order to specifically provide standards aligned instruction to all students. This data will be based on their performance on STAR, formatives, and the PM 3 F.A.S.T. Proficiency percentage from 22-23 data. All students will receive grade level standards-based instruction to improve student achievement in core content areas, along with additional scaffolding to meet the needs of each learner based on their specific skill set.

Our current Progressing Monitoring data (F.A.S.T. and STAR) shows that our overall need for increasing reading proficiency must be done with pervasive skills-based instruction during whole group and small group instruction with fidelity checks in fluency and comprehension weekly. Our overall proficiency levels demonstrate the need to have students reading on level and be able to analyze the content in order to increase student achievement levels in all grade levels. Previously, students received instruction that was misaligned, or content was not delivered as planned to the intent and rigor of the grade level standard. Tasks were also below level or not aligned to the proper DOK level in order to increase student thinking or comprehension. In 2022-2023, 59% of students in ELA scored a Level 1 or 2, and 53% of the students scored a Level 1 or 2 in Math, with 68% scoring a level 1 or 2 in science. Looking at our 2021-2022 ESSA subgroups, two of the ESSA subgroups (Black and SWD) in 2021-2022 scored below the required 41% Federal Index.

This year, students will be exposed to rigorous instruction through acceleration practices and suggestions. The focus will be on Instructional Planning (Learning Arc) that truly aligns standards with tasks and intended outcomes so students can reach proficiency in all core content areas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As a result of instructional practice focused on standards aligned instruction, at minimum 55% of students will earn a level 3, 4, or 5 on the state reading assessment, 57% of students will earn a level 3, 4, or 5 on the state math assessment; 51% of students in 5th grade will earn a level 3, 4, or 5 on the state science assessment. All ESSA subgroups will perform at a minimum 41% overall. Student learning will be monitored and adjusted throughout the year through grade level formative assessments and district progress monitoring tools.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team (Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach, Reading Interventionist, and District Support Coaches) will monitor teacher delivery of instruction during core instruction and the implementation of small group instruction as designed during collaborative planning. During PLC's the Learning Arc, student samples, K-5 vertical alignment and planning will also ensure that planning is data driven and adjusted based on real time and feedback. Teachers will plan with administration and coaches using the Learning Arc template to breakdown the benchmarks and create aligned task that provide equivalent experiences, utilize current student data, District Curriculum Maps, BEST Standards to plan with fidelity and consistency schoolwide.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Neidringhaus (laura.neidringhaus@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.)

Garden Grove Elementary will use a variety of research-based interventions to address the achievement gaps in students K-5. For our students in grades 3-5, Corrective Reading will be implemented for students who are performing below grade level. Student levels are based on baseline testing. The interventions will be provided in a dedicated Intervention Block that is part of the Master Schedule to ensure consistency and fidelity. Interventions in grades K-2 will include Reading Mastery and Language of Learning. For students whose scores are not high enough to be placed in a level with Reading Mastery or Corrective Reading, SIPPS will be used to provide foundational reading skills to reduce the achievement gap so they can place in Reading Mastery or Corrective Reading. Leveled Literacy Intervention is another research-based program that will be used for students who do not meet the parameters of Reading Mastery or Corrective Reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To close achievement gaps, students need consistent intervention programs that are implemented with fidelity. Language for Learning, Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading, SIPPS, and LLI provided scripted lessons that follow a research-based systematic approach to lesson delivery and assessment. Students who do not have the basic skills for be placed into Language of Learning, Reading Mastery, or Corrective Reading, will be provided interventions using SIPPS or LLI depending on the learners need. These programs will provide the necessary learning tools for students to develop the foundational reading skills of learning to read to reading to learn.

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.

During PLC's and K-5 Collaborative planning, the Leadership Team will use the Learning Arc Template in order to plan for standards based aligned tasks and adapt lessons based on current data (SRA Reading Mastery, SIPPS, PBIS tools, Corrective Reading in Grades 3-5.) We will measure the effectiveness of this step by the success of the students using weekly test scores, MTSS, and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Laura Neidringhaus (laura.neidringhaus@polk-fl.net)

By When: December 6th we will meet to discuss and revise/change what is working and what is not.

K-5 grade level teams will focus on standards aligned instruction to increase student proficiency by providing high yield reading strategies that increase phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. During planning teachers will focus on data driven decisions to plan for instructional deliver to include: Learning Arc, Corrective Reading, SRA, etc. We will measure this by weekly MTSS data, classroom test scores, and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Susan Riggeal (susan.riggeal@polk-fl.net)

By When: December 6th we will meet to revisit the action step.

K-5 grade level teams will focus on standards aligned instruction to increase student proficiency by providing high yield math strategies to increase fact fluency and the ability for students to choose a variety of math strategies for problem solving. During planning teachers will focus data driven decisions to plan

for instructional delivery to include: Number Worlds, visual tools, technology based programs, and manipulatives to provide the differentiation that is needed. We will measure the success of this step by student success on benchmark tests, progress monitoring tests, etc.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Greene (stephanie.greene@polk-fl.net)

By When: December 6th we will meet to revisit this step.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

As a result of overall reading proficiency percentages of less than 50%, intervention time will be built into the master schedule to ensure intention delivery of targeted interventions to students in grades K-5 with fidelity. In the master schedule, the Intervention block will be scheduled to allow support staff and trained paraeducators to push into classrooms to assist with targeted small groups. To maximize the use of highly effective teachers, students who are performing below grade level will be grouped based on learning needs. Grade level bands will be: Kindergarten/first grade, second/third grade, and fourth/fifth grade. One trained paraeducator will be assigned to each grade level band. In addition, a highly qualified support person will be assigned to each grade level band.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As a result of the instructional practice of targeted intervention programs, a minimum of 65% of students retained third grade students and students in grades four and five will show learning gains as measured in by Progress Monitoring 3 of the F.A.S.T. Assessment. Student learning will be monitored and adjusted throughout the year based upon Progress Monitoring 1 and 2, grade level formative and summative assessments, and intervention program assessments. The Leadership team will collect data through classroom walks to ensure intervention programs are being implemented with consistency and fidelity. All collected data will be reviewed monthly by Leadership team uniting the Continuous Improvement Model to made necessary adjustments to current data.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team (Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach, Reading Interventionist, ESE Teacher, Media Specialist) and District Support Coaches will monitor teacher delivery of intervention programs during the Intervention Block. Monitoring will include following the design and script of the intervention programs, implementation fidelity, and consistency of implementation. Students in grade-level bands will be grouped to maximize the use of high-qualified teachers and ensure the Intervention Block is used to provide the necessary interventions for student success. Feedback will be provided to teachers and trained paraeducators each week from administration. Coaching will be provided by administration, the Literacy Coach, and the Reading Interventionist as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Neidringhaus (laura.neidringhaus@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.)

Garden Grove Elementary will use a variety of research-based interventions to address the achievement gaps in students K-5. For our students in grades 3-5, Corrective Reading will be implemented for students who are performing below grade level. Student levels are based on baseline testing. The interventions will be provided in a dedicated Intervention Block that is part of the Master Schedule to ensure consistency and fidelity. Interventions in grades K-2 will include Reading Mastery and Language of Learning. For students whose scores are not high enough to be placed in a level with Reading Mastery or Corrective Reading, SIPPS will be used to provide foundational reading skills to reduce the achievement gap so they can place in Reading Mastery or Corrective Reading. Leveled Literacy Intervention is another research-based program that will be used for students who do not meet the parameters of Reading Mastery or Corrective Reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To close achievement gaps, students need consistent intervention programs that are implemented with fidelity. Language for Learning, Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading, SIPPS, and LLI provided scripted lessons that follow a research-based systematic approach to lesson delivery and assessment. Students who do not have the basic skills for be placed into Language of Learning, Reading Mastery, or Corrective Reading, will be provided interventions using SIPPS or LLI depending on the learners need. These programs will provide the necessary learning tools for students to develop the foundational reading skills of learning to read to reading to learn.

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.

During PLC's and K-5 Collaborative planning, the Leadership Team will use the Learning Arc Template in order to plan for standards based aligned tasks and plan interventions based on small group needs (SRA Reading Mastery, SIPS, PBIS tools, Corrective Reading in Grades 3-5.) We will measure the effectiveness of this step by the success of the students using weekly test scores, MTSS, and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Laura Neidringhaus (laura.neidringhaus@polk-fl.net)

By When: December 6th we will revisit this step.

K-5 grade level teams will focus on standards aligned instruction to increase student proficiency by providing high yield math strategies to increase fact fluency and the ability for students to choose a variety of math strategies for problem solving. During planning teachers will focus data driven interventions to plan for instructional delivery to include: Number Worlds, visual tools, technology based programs, and manipulatives to provide the differentiation that is needed. We will measure the success of this step by student success on benchmark tests, progress monitoring tests, etc.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Greene (stephanie.greene@polk-fl.net)

By When: December 6 we will revisit this step.

K-5 grade level teams will focus on standards aligned instruction to increase student proficiency by providing high yield reading strategies that increase phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. During planning teachers will focus on data driven interventions to plan for instructional delivery to include: Learning Arc, Corrective Reading, SRA, etc. We will measure this by weekly MTSS data, classroom test scores, and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: December 6 we will revisit this action step.

#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.

At Garden Grove Elementary, we strive to have a positive school culture and environment with a specific focus on our student, staff, and parent stakeholder groups. We are working on strengthening our relationships with all stakeholders with a primary focus on our learners and ensuring a learning environment where all students are successful.

At the end of the 2022-2023 school year, Early Warning Data showed the following:

- Average Daily Attendance 91%
- Percent of students with 0-1 office referrals 89%
- Percent of students with 2-5 office referrals 8%
- Percent of students with 6+ office referrals 3%
- Total number of Office Discipline Referrals 393
- Total number of In-School Suspension days 47
- Total number of Out-of-School Suspension days 543

For the 2023-2024 school year, we will revisit our Positive Behavioral Interventions & Support Project (PBIS) and address ways to provide support for students and staff. We will look at developing a more consistent In-School Suspension Program to reduce the number of Out-of-School Suspension days and provide opportunities to not miss instruction when out of school.

A yearlong PBIS Implementation plan will be developed prior to the start of the 2023-2024 school year to ensure the plan is implemented with consistency and fidelity.

We will also provide professional development for teachers on effective classroom management to reduce the number of office referrals.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Garden Grove Elementary has three goals based on the Early Warning Data:

1. Improve average daily attendance from 91% to 95%. Incentives will be provided to students and parents based on perfect quarterly attendance and improved attendance.
2. Decrease office referrals by 25%. Professional development will be provided for teachers and staff on effective classroom management. Flow charts for classroom and office managed behaviors will be reviewed with teachers and staff to ensure office referrals are office managed.
3. Reduce the number of Out-of-School Suspension days by 40%. We will develop a more consistent In-School Suspension program that will allow the school to provide academic services to students in the In-School Suspension setting.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly meetings with the Leadership Team and the PBIS Team will be scheduled and made part of the PBIS Implementation Plan. Monthly discipline data will be reviewed and looked at for trends. Teachers will be tiered to provide support with the implementation of the PBIS expectations and coaching cycles will be provided as needed. During classroom walks, observational data will be collected and shared with teachers, along with discipline data through staff meetings and staff newsletters provided by the principal.

Attendance will be monitored by the Attendance Secretary, administration, and the district assigned Truancy Officer. Parent meetings will be held to address attendance concerns, as well as tardy and early check-outs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Gavin (jessica.gavin@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

PBIS is a research based project to address student behavioral concerns. Lesson plans based on the data will be provided for teachers to address areas of concern as identified by the data collected on a monthly basis. Classroom intervention systems for students will be taught as needed. Intervention systems include self-regulating tools, such as "Yoga Breathing", "Appropriate ways to ask for a break." In addition, when necessary, calm down items, or areas in the room, and Reflection Journals will be implemented for students based on identified need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows an increased concern of students social and emotional health. An increase in students lack of coping skills and is showing in the increase in student discipline referrals and disruptions to the learning environments in school. The PBIS Interventions provide ways for students to increase their feeling of self-worth, learn ways to cope, and help create a consistent and successful learning environment for all learners.

The PBIS Implementation Plan provides a road map for students and staff and will help create a more positive learning environment where all students are successful and all stakeholders; students, staff, families, and community come together.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

PBIS will meet monthly to review data and meet with the staff to discuss trends, goals, and next steps.. The measure of the PBIS program will be measured by the decrease of referrals and classroom behavior infractions.

Person Responsible: Jessica Gavin (jessica.gavin@polk-fl.net)

By When: December 6th we will meet to revisit this step.

Attendance staff committee will meet monthly to review attendance data, look for students with early warning signs, and make a plan to address attendance infractions. Also, the committee will reward students with monthly incentives for perfect attendance. We will measure this by a decrease in absences.

Person Responsible: Laura Neidringhaus (laura.neidringhaus@polk-fl.net)

By When: December 6 we will revisit this step.

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).

Data Com - Data Com is used to review data and barriers to identify school and students needs. Funds are allocated to address the needs to create a healthy school environment and increase student achievement.

Summer Leadership Academy - During the Summer Leadership Academy sessions are designed to look at the school as a whole. Sessions are selected based on the needs of the school to plan for the upcoming year. Resources are identified based on school need and funding availability.

The PURE Process is used to identify resources that are aligned with state benchmarks and student safety. We will use Title I funds for resources that are on the PURE list.

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

At Garden Grove Elementary, all students will receive benchmark-based grade-level instruction using the Florida B.E.S.T. Benchmarks. Students will receive instruction aligned to state benchmarks and at the intended rigor to provide equivalent experiences for all students. Foundational skills will be the focus in grades Kindergarten - Second to build the necessary foundations of reading so students are prepared for upper grades and increased text complexity. Reading Mastery will be used as an intervention tool for students in K-2.

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

At Garden Grove Elementary, all students will receive benchmark-based grade-level instruction using the Florida B.E.S.T. Benchmarks. Students will receive instruction aligned to state benchmarks and at the intended rigor to provide equivalent experiences for all students. In addition, students will be provided with differentiated instructional interventions that will build on their current instructional level closing the gap in proficiency. Corrective Reading will be used as an intervention tool for students in grades 3-5.

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Students in grades K-2 will perform at a minimum of 50% overall proficiency as measured with progress monitoring. Data from Florida Progress Monitoring 3 indicated students performing below the 40th percentile were 65% in Kindergarten, 48% in grade 1, and 47% in grade 2. Student learning will be monitored and adjusted throughout the year through grade level formative assessments and district progress monitoring tools, as well as state progress monitoring.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

According to House Bill 7011 Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence, Garden Grove Elementary meets the criteria of being identified as a R.A.I.S.E. school as a result of less than 50% of students in grades 3-5 scoring below a level 3 on the 2023 statewide ELA assessment. Based on the 2023 ELA portion of the F.A.S.T. Assessment, students in grades 3-5 scoring below a level 3 were 68% in grade 3, 53% in grade 4, and 57% in grade 5. This data indicates a critical need to improve instructional strategies by implementing aligned tasks to ensure the intended rigor of the benchmark is met.

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.

The Leadership Team (Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading and Math Coaches) will monitor teacher delivery of instruction during core instruction and the implementation of small group instruction as designed during collaborative planning. During PLC's and planning with teachers, the focus will be around High Quality Early Literacy Instruction such as effective read alouds, reading and writing foundational skills, Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading Training,. We will monitor all grade levels in reading fluency rates, high frequency words, vocabulary and comprehension skills regularly through progress monitoring tools, formatives and feedback from teachers during data chats.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Neidringhaus, Laura, laura.neidringhaus@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?

Strategies that support research based literacy development would include read-alouds, modeling, graphic organizers , students using their own unique experiences, and opportunities to work with their peers. Research based materials will include the use of Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading for small group instruction, Accelerated Reader, Florida Wonders, Smarty Ants, and iStation. Teachers will emphasize foundational skills such as print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics, word analysis, and fluency.

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?

Through the implementation of these evidence-based strategies, we will increase literacy and writing proficiency when used with fidelity and consistency in the classroom. District led initiatives, along with previously modeled practices and strategies from DOE and the Learning Arc were used as the criteria for selection.

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
Data will be used identify students needing Reading Mastery or Corrective Reading. Staff will be trained on Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading. Administration will monitor the implementation of the programs and measure the fidelity of the implementation. The leadership team will also work with the district coach and staff to monitor the programs and train on the various aspects of the programs as a new tool.	Neidringhaus, Laura, laura.neidringhaus@polk-fl.net

Title I Requirements

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))

Garden Grove Elementary ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skill using the following programs:

<https://polkschoolsfl.com/mentalhealth/>

- Individual Counseling
- Group Counseling
- School Consultations
- Drumbeats
- Collaboration with community providers – Peace River Center, Sweet Center – Winter Haven Hospital Support Groups
- Grief Support
- Children's Home Society

These services will be provided as needed to the students.

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))

- Building Capacity of Events – Our school hosts a 4th/5th grade transition night. Local Middle Schools set up booths, give presentations, and explain application procedures to our families.

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-We use a schoolwide PBiS model for positive behavior.
- MTSS-The MTSS process for Academics and Behavior is implemented schoolwide and monitored by Administration.
- Mental Health Counselors-Assigned to our school and see students based on parent permission.

School Counselors are on campus to oversee a variety of behavior, academic, and documentation processes.

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 in scheduled collaborative planning.
- Data Com-Progress monitoring data is regularly discussed
- 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))

We assist preschool children during the transition from the early childhood school to kindergarten through the following:

- Early Childhood - <https://polkschoolsfl.com/earlychildhood/>
- Head Start
- ESE PK (Title I, ESE and non-Title I)
- Kindergarten Round Up

We use these programs above in order to better prepare our Pre-K students for their transition into Kindergarten.