
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	24
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Clarence Boswell Elementary School

2820 K VILLE AVE, Auburndale, FL 33823

<http://www.schools.polk.net/boswell>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Mission of Boswell Elementary School is to grow students who will pursue opportunities of learning and knowledge to increase academic achievement for life-long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision today and for the future is that all students, parents, and teachers at Boswell Elementary School will reach their full potential through educationally sound standards based instruction.

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
Gainey, Dru	Principal	As the leader of the School Based Leadership Team I set the mission and vision within the school. I work with the leadership in the development of strategies, academic data, social/emotional data, and data for Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets. I develop clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, and Relationship). I provide information on how to understand and break barriers, determine the effectiveness of the strategies and determine the next steps needed to move the school forward
Scott, Sheila	Assistant Principal	As the support leader of the School Based Leadership Team I support the principal in the mission and vision within the school. I work with the leadership in the support of development of strategies, academic data, social/emotional data, and data for Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets. I support clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, and Relationship). I provide information on how to understand and break barriers, determine the effectiveness of the strategies and determine the next steps needed to move the school forward.
Andrikowich, Megan	Reading Coach	Reading Coach as well as interventionist for the bottom 25%. They will work as a colleague with classroom teachers to support student learning in all content areas. The Reading Coach will focus on individual and group professional development that will expand and refine the understanding of research-based effective instruction.
Youngs, Amanda	Math Coach	Instructional Math and Science Coach as well as interventionist for the bottom 25%. They will work as a colleague with classroom teachers to support student learning in all content areas. The Instructional Coach will focus on individual and group professional development that will expand and refine the understanding of research-based effective instruction.

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 Boswell Elementary, our approach to stakeholder involvement in the SIP development is systematic and collaborative. We initiate the process with a comprehensive series of School Leadership Team (SLT) meetings, where the primary focus is to discuss and align on the school improvement objectives.

Teachers and staff are integrated into the process through professional learning communities (PLCs), department meetings, and dedicated sessions. These meetings enable us to gather their insights and perspectives, which are vital in shaping our instructional strategies.

To engage our wider school community, we utilize our School Advisory Council (SAC). The SAC includes representatives from all required stakeholder groups - teachers, school staff, parents, families, and local business or community leaders.

Teachers and staff representatives on the SAC are selected from various departments to ensure a broad representation of perspectives. They bring their classroom experiences, insights, and suggestions to the SAC meetings, which were instrumental in shaping our instructional strategies.

Parent and family involvement is prioritized through the SAC. Parent and family representatives are chosen to voice their unique perspectives on school performance and improvement suggestions. Their participation helps us ensure our strategies align with the expectations and needs of the families we serve.

Moreover, local business and community leaders are included in the SAC, providing invaluable perspectives on the broader community's expectations from our school. Their involvement helps us align our SIP with skills and values our students need to contribute effectively to the community.

The SAC plays a pivotal role in synthesizing these diverse viewpoints and using them to shape the SIP. The input from each stakeholder group is instrumental in facilitating a truly community-based approach to our school's improvement.

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 monitoring of the SIP is an ongoing process, firmly integrated into our school's routines. Our SLT will conduct monthly review meetings to assess progress against the plan's objectives and goals. Using a data-driven approach, we will evaluate student achievement data, attendance records, behavior incidents, and teacher feedback.

Our focus will be to closely track the progress of all students, especially those who have historically shown the greatest achievement gap. Interventions will be planned and implemented in a targeted manner for these students, and their progress will be scrutinized to evaluate the effectiveness of these strategies.

Revisions to the plan, as necessary, will be undertaken with full transparency and stakeholder involvement. We will utilize a continuous improvement process, which will include reassessment of our goals, strategies, and activities based on the evidence gathered during our monitoring process. Regular updates will be communicated to all stakeholders, ensuring the revision process is transparent, inclusive, and aligned with our school's goals and community's expectations.

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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	60	52	50	42	31	43	0	0	0	278
One or more suspensions	4	4	4	6	5	15	0	0	0	38
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	37	18	48	0	0	0	103
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	20	31	0	0	0	81
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	19	11	26	28	17	43	0	0	0	144

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	15	6	14	44	21	50	0	0	0	150

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	51	46	32	33	31	30	0	0	0	223
One or more suspensions	2	3	6	9	6	13	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	0	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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.	33	46	48	35	18	11	0	0	0	191

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	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	51	46	32	33	31	30	0	0	0	223
One or more suspensions	2	3	6	9	6	13	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	0	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
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.	33	46	48	35	18	11	0	0	0	191

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	39	45	53	39	47	56	37		
ELA Learning Gains				52			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			47		
Math Achievement*	50	49	59	53	42	50	45		
Math Learning Gains				68			65		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69			67		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	20	41	54	25	49	59	39		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	46	54	59	41			69		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	200
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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	401
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	20	Yes	1	1
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	29	Yes	2	1
HSP	42			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	41			
FRL	37	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	46			
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	47			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	39			50			20					46
SWD	14			29			0				5	41
ELL	29			43			14				5	46
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			34			13				4	
HSP	37			55			25				5	48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	46			54			19				4	
FRL	37			51			19				5	39

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	39	52	54	53	68	69	25					41
SWD	19	49	60	25	71	75	22					47
ELL	31	50	50	44	77	82	14					41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21	39		48	61		15					
HSP	37	51	50	48	71	65	13					43
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	49	60	64	62	69		41					
FRL	37	52	55	51	66	63	20					43

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	37	47	47	45	65	67	39					69
SWD	15	20		25	40		20					81
ELL	27	37		41	68		27					69

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27			42								
HSP	30	44	40	40	72		32					68
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	47	48		50	59		46					
FRL	35	47	42	41	63	64	37					74

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	16%	43%	-27%	54%	-38%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	53%	6%	58%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	38%	42%	-4%	50%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	48%	51%	-3%	59%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	56%	8%	61%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	39%	44%	-5%	55%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	20%	39%	-19%	51%	-31%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The data component with the lowest performance was 5th grade Science. The primary factors contributing to this low performance were unfilled teaching positions that were filled with substitutes majority of the year, and inconsistent student attendance, which meant that students missed crucial instructional time. We've seen a downward trend in performance in this area, which reinforces the urgency to address these issues.

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

5th grade Math saw the greatest decline from the prior year, with proficiency dropping from 50% to 37%. This significant decrease is largely attributable to the same factors that affected 4th grade ELA: vacant teaching positions and poor student attendance. We've seen that without consistent teacher-student interaction and regular student attendance, student comprehension and retention in math are being adversely impacted. Previous year, 21-22 this cohort of 5th graders also had lots of substitute teachers in and out throughout the year.

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.

When compared to the state average, the greatest gap was found in 4th grade reading. This gap can be traced back to the cohort of students entering at a lower academic level, as well as unfilled teaching positions and student attendance issues. These factors, combined with the higher state average, have led to a considerable gap in this area.

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

3rd grade math demonstrated the most improvement over the past year. This significant improvement is likely due to our shift to departmentalization. By allowing teachers to focus and become experts in their assigned subjects, we've seen enhanced instruction quality and effectiveness, particularly in math. The expertise and focused instruction of the teachers have enabled them to address student needs more effectively, leading to improved student performance in this subject area.

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

Analyzing the EWS data from Part I, we've identified attendance as a significant area of concern. Most of our grade levels have about 50% of students with less than 90% attendance. This directly impacts student learning and performance across all subject areas.

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

Our highest priorities for the upcoming school year are as follows:

- Implement a rigorous Reading intervention to increase our ELA data. With 3rd grade at 43% proficient, 4th grade at 29% proficient, and 5th grade at 37% proficient, there is significant room for improvement.
- Scaffold instruction intentionally to build understanding and confidence through the learning arc. This

approach will allow students to make meaningful connections and improve their learning outcomes.
- Utilize Collaborative student structures to increase engagement and foster student ownership of their learning. This will empower students and encourage active participation in the learning process.

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.

Data from the 2023 FAST in ELA Show a trend less than 50% proficient in meeting state benchmarks. Data from 2023 FAST shows a trend of less than 41% proficiency in ELA for Black students.

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% proficiency increase for all grades/content as well as 10% of the students just below the proficiency becoming proficient.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring data offered by district level assessment platforms will be used to ensure students are mastering benchmarks being taught after planning is properly implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dru Gainey (dru.gainey@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.)

1. Monitor students engaging in equivalent experiences aligned to state expectations using the district walkthrough tool.
2. Engage teachers in standards-based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework.
3. Develop and engage in school wide data analysis protocol to conduct a correlation between standards walkthrough tool and learning arc planning as well as a data analysis protocol to use with students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The evidence-based strategy being used is the practical instructional model ensuring that students are able to engage in grade level standards-based expectations. This will provide staff with professional learning on developing purposeful tasks that meet the intent and rigor of the benchmarks when teachers have a full understanding and implementation of these standards. Through the understanding of taxonomy levels, teachers will create tasks that align to benchmarks, and/or clarifications. This will create benchmark task alignment through the development of a purposeful task. As well as, implementation of student-led teams. There will also be a focus on daily instructional strategies for accelerating learning. This training and job-embedded coaching ensures that standards-based benchmarks and objectives are the focus of student learning and teachers success of planning competency-based instruction through the Learning Arc framework.

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.

Weekly Leadership team will go on calibration walks using paper copy of district walkthrough tool. Will use data from SWT to determine primary focus with teachers during planning and classroom support.

Person Responsible: Dru Gainey (dru.gainey@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing - Weekly

Monthly during grade level meetings, Leadership will share and use data collection from walkthrough tool with classroom teachers to plan next steps and lesson plans.

Person Responsible: Dru Gainey (dru.gainey@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing - Monthly

Leadership will utilize steps 1-7 of the Learning Arc Framework during planning with teachers. Align instructional materials to meet the full intent of the benchmark. Last year focus was what we are doing and this year will focus more on how we are doing it.

Person Responsible: Dru Gainey (dru.gainey@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing - weekly

Leadership will monitor implementation of Learning ARC through classroom walkthroughs using the SWT tool: Leadership will share and use data collection of walkthroughs to plan next steps and planning with teachers.

Person Responsible: Dru Gainey (dru.gainey@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing - daily/weekly

After data is shared with teachers monthly, teachers will work with leadership team and determine primary focus for their grade level and next steps for learning.

Person Responsible: Dru Gainey (dru.gainey@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly

For new teachers or teachers needing additional support in the Learning Arc process, coaches will meet quarterly to review and support in the creation of.

Person Responsible: Amanda Youngs (amanda.youngs@polk-fl.net)

By When: Quarterly

Use two parent involvement nights to focus on reading strategies that parents can use at home to support students who are struggling in reading.

Person Responsible: Megan Andrikowich (megan.andrikowich@polk-fl.net)

By When: Host 1 family night each semester.

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

We've identified teacher recruitment and retention as a crucial need based on the current openings in our school and the nationwide teacher shortage. This has been exacerbated by a significant number of teachers leaving the profession. By focusing on creating a positive culture and environment, we aim to attract and retain talented educators who can provide quality learning experiences for our diverse student population, including those identified as part of low-performing subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to fill all current openings within the first semester of the school year. Furthermore, we aim to reduce our teacher turnover rate by 10% by the end of the academic year.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this area of focus through HR reports detailing recruitment efforts, interviews conducted, and hires made. Additionally, we will work with the HR Recruitment Office to conduct surveys to measure job satisfaction and potential retention issues, with an emphasis on the school environment and culture.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sheila Scott (sheila.scott@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

We will implement a mentorship program for new teachers based on evidence that such programs significantly improve teacher retention. This program will provide support, advice, and training to help integrate new teachers into our school environment and promote their professional growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We chose this intervention strategy based on research indicating that mentorship programs help new teachers overcome initial challenges, reduce feelings of isolation, and foster a sense of belonging. By providing this support, we expect to improve job satisfaction, which in turn should enhance retention rates.

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.

Define the structure, and goals of the mentorship program.

Person Responsible: Dru Gainey (dru.gainey@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 31, 2023

Ensure that each new hire is paired with a mentor from their respective grade level or subject area.

Person Responsible: Sheila Scott (sheila.scott@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 31, 2023

Identify suitable experienced teachers who can serve as mentors to new hires.

Person Responsible: Sheila Scott (sheila.scott@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 31, 2023

Mentors will have weekly check-ins with their mentees and will report on their progress monthly. Teachers who are identified as needing more support than weekly, will have daily check-ins/support.

Person Responsible: Sheila Scott (sheila.scott@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing - weekly and/or daily as needed.

In collaboration with HR and the PD department, ensure that mentors are provided with ongoing training and support to help them effectively guide their mentees.

Person Responsible: Sheila Scott (sheila.scott@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Continuously monitor teacher turnover rates and analyze these in conjunction with feedback on the mentorship program to assess its impact

Person Responsible: Sheila Scott (sheila.scott@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing - End of year

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**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.

The key area of focus identified from the data is to improve the academic performance of our Black student subgroup, which currently stands at 37%, falling below the Federal Percent of Points Index (PPI) of 41%. The necessity for this focus has been determined through comprehensive data analysis revealing a significant achievement gap. An inclusive and equitable learning environment calls for us to address this gap and make efforts towards ensuring every student has equal opportunities for academic success. 37% of these students also had an attendance issue with less than 90% attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The measurable outcome will be to increase the percentage of Black students scoring at or above proficiency level by 10% by the end of the next academic year. This goal, although ambitious, is achievable and quantifiable, allowing for clear assessment of the effectiveness of our interventions.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be regularly monitored through formative assessments, benchmark testing, and progress reports. Teachers will engage in professional learning communities (PLCs) to discuss data, share best practices, and adjust instruction as needed. Additionally, administrators will conduct periodic classroom observations to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional strategies and offer feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dru Gainey (dru.gainey@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.)

The chosen intervention for this area of focus is the Corrective Reading program. This program offers a robust, systematic approach to addressing deficiencies in reading skills. It emphasizes direct instruction techniques, offers differentiated levels based on student needs, and is designed to significantly improve reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Corrective Reading program was selected due to its evidence-based nature and proven effectiveness in improving literacy skills. Research indicates that a structured and systematic approach to reading instruction is beneficial for students who are struggling in this area. Furthermore, the Corrective Reading program provides intensive, direct instruction, which is particularly effective for our target population. The program's success, backed by a wealth of empirical evidence, makes it an ideal choice for addressing our school's specific 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.

We will ensure all teachers are thoroughly trained in the Corrective Reading program. They will attend professional development workshops focusing on the structure, methodology, and best practices of the program. The workshops will also include strategies for adapting the program to meet the specific needs of their students.

Person Responsible: Dru Gainey (dru.gainey@polk-fl.net)

By When: By August 30th, 2023

The Corrective Reading program will be used as a supplement with the existing curriculum for English Language Arts. Teachers will devote specific time slots during the day for implementing this program, ensuring consistency and structure for students.

Person Responsible: Dru Gainey (dru.gainey@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 30th, 2023

Students will be assessed to identify their current reading levels, which will be used to form homogeneous groups for targeted instruction within the Corrective Reading program. This step will ensure each student receives instruction that matches their current reading ability.

Person Responsible: Megan Andrikowich (megan.andrikowich@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 30th, 2023

Regular formative assessments will be conducted to monitor student progress. If students are not making the expected progress, necessary adjustments will be made to their instruction and/or placement. This might include changing the level of the Corrective Reading program they are working on or providing additional individualized support.

Person Responsible: Megan Andrikowich (megan.andrikowich@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Track student attendance for these students and provide incentives for improvement as well as follow up for those in need of attendance support.

Person Responsible: Sheila Scott (sheila.scott@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly

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).

Reviewing school improvement funding allocations is a continuous process involving various components. School and district personnel are key players in this, engaging in the Title I/UniSIG Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) to identify areas for improvement. This assessment, coupled with the input from the District Data Com, provides a solid foundation for understanding our school's unique needs.

Throughout the year, multiple avenues like the Summer Leadership Academy and School Improvement Plan Meetings allow for ongoing discussion and decision-making about resource allocation, based on identified needs within our School Improvement Plan.

The District PURE Process is also an integral part of the resource allocation, ensuring that approved resources are used optimally and in alignment with the identified strategies in the SIP.

In the backdrop of these activities, the continuous monitoring of progress and adjustments is done to ensure effective resource utilization.

Simultaneously, the Regional and Office of School Transformation are involved in reviewing the SIP plans. Together we work to make sure the plans comply with ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C) and are effective in meeting our students' needs. As part of this dynamic process, the review and potential reallocation of resources is done based on an ongoing, data-driven assessment of progress and needs.

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

Based on the STAR Early Literacy assessments, proficiency levels in kindergarten were 63% proficient, 61% proficient in 1st grade, and just over half, 51% of 2nd graders achieved proficiency.

The coordinated screening and progress monitoring system data indicates that a significant portion of our K-2 students are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide ELA assessment.

These data points underline a critical need to bolster instructional practices in Phonics, Vocabulary, and Comprehension for our youngest learners.

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

The 2022-2023 ELA FAST data shows only 42% of 3rd graders, 56% of 4th graders, and 39% of 5th graders achieved proficiency. This means a majority of students in these grades are not meeting the state standards.

Furthermore, the STAR progress monitoring echoes these concerns, showing a significant deficiency in reading.

Since over 50% of the student in both 3rd and 5th grades scored below a Level 3 on the statewide ELA assessment, there's an imperative need to rectify and enhance instructional practices in these grades.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year using the new screening and progress monitoring system 50% or more of our K-2 students will be on level to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 50% or more of our 3-5 students will demonstrate proficiency, as measured by the 2024 ELA FAST Assessment.

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.

Student learning will be monitored by Teacher, Coaches, and Administration through grade level formative assessments and district progress monitoring tools such as STAR, IStation, Freckle, Writing Quarterlies, plus the state progress monitoring system, FAST. As well as teacher daily monitored student standard progress using standard tracking tools. Students not showing adequate growth will be monitored weekly using benchmark-based tasks and assessments.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Gainey, Dru, dru.gainey@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?

In response to the identified needs of students in our schools, we have chosen specific evidence-based practices/programs. For students in grades K-2, we will employ the SRA Reading Mastery program. For those in grades 3-5, the SRA Corrective Reading program will be utilized. These programs focus specifically on students who are performing below Level 1 and 2. Instructional teams, consisting of teachers, coaches, and interventionists, will harness these programs in small-group settings. Their aim is to construct a solid reading foundation using the SRA programs, complemented by ability grouping with guided leveled readers. This combination promotes an emphasis on the "Fab 5" reading components: phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. The ultimate goal is to enable instructors to differentiate and scaffold their instruction to meet individual student needs. It's pertinent to note that our chosen intervention materials align seamlessly with both the state and district's evidence-based reading plans.

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?

The decision to implement these specific practices/programs stems from the recognized need to adopt flexible grouping strategies. By using tools such as STAR, IStation, Freckle Reading, ELA FAST, and teacher-monitored tracking tools, we can form dynamic, ability-based groups. This approach ensures that students receive targeted instruction that addresses the identified benchmarks. Moreover, using SRA Reading Mastery and SRA Corrective Reading for ability grouping allows instructors to zone in on fundamental reading skills. These practices not only cater to the unique needs of our students but also have a proven track record of effectiveness, making them suitable choices for our target population.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Literacy Leadership team and Administration will meet with teachers during PLC's to break down the understanding of the benchmark using the Learning Arc, analysis data, work samples, and reviewing progress monitoring data. From there, students will be identified that need additional reinforcement on specific standards, targets and/or success criteria and placed either in SRA Corrective Reading, SRA Reading Mastery or RTD small group intensive instruction. District will provide training for SRA Corrective Reading and SRA Reading Mastery with follow-up on implementation.</p>	<p>Andrikowich, Megan, megan.andrikowich@polk-fl.net</p>
<p>Literacy Leadership team will work with district team and teachers to establish diagnostic testing of all Level 1 and 2 students to determine placement in the SRA Corrective Reading Class grades 3-5 and SRA Reading Mastery Class grades K-2 for remediation.</p>	<p>Andrikowich, Megan, megan.andrikowich@polk-fl.net</p>
<p>Literacy Leadership team and Teachers will then use data from SRA to create both flexible and ability groups within the ELA and MTSS blocks. Instructors will focus on both scripted programs as well as leveled text, graphic organizers, and questioning techniques (questions that align to the standard) to increase students' comprehension.</p>	<p>Andrikowich, Megan, megan.andrikowich@polk-fl.net</p>
<p>Literacy Leadership team, teachers and administration will also work in PLC's to review work samples and ELA assessments for progress and rigor of standard. Progress monitoring diagnostics will also be administered for the SRA programs for growth.</p>	<p>Scott, Sheila, sheila.scott@polk-fl.net</p>
<p>Administration will monitor instruction in all classrooms weekly using the district walkthrough tool to ensure that instruction is being implemented at rigor and compliance. Plus, administration will conduct data chats with teachers to discuss student progress and intervention steps, actions, and progress monitoring. Walkthroughs will also be done during the Intervention block to make sure implementation of SRA is done correctly.</p>	<p>Gainey, Dru, dru.gainey@polk-fl.net</p>

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.

We will be disseminating the SIP, and SWP to stakeholders via our school website, as well as through parent/family/community input meetings and the annual Title 1 meeting. Furthermore, we plan to provide translation services, where necessary, to ensure the information is accessible to all parents.

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

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

Our school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders through building capacity events, staff capacity building professional development, conferencing, and family/community input. We will keep parents informed about their child's progress through data chats/conferences. Our Family Engagement Plan can be found on our website as well as in the front office. We also aim to hold regular SAC meetings to foster communication and engagement.

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)

To strengthen the academic program, we intend to hire supplemental staff such as academic coaches, and interventionists. We will also invest in supplemental resources and extend learning opportunities outside of the regular academic day. Regular professional development sessions will be held for staff, focusing on innovative teaching methods and curriculum enrichment. Additionally, we plan to initiate collaborative planning for better student outcomes. Our area of focus will be the development of the RTD and MTSS 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))

We've been very proactive in implementing a multi-tiered approach in developing this plan. Our school improvement planning trainings have been instrumental in providing the foundational elements of our plan. These sessions have allowed us to identify areas of need and establish strategic goals.

Moreover, regional meetings with various stakeholders have contributed significantly to our planning process. The meetings have facilitated exchange of ideas, shared decision-making, and consolidation of resources towards our common goals.

We have also capitalized on the opportunities provided by the Summer Leadership Academy, which has helped us to engage in educational leadership, professional development, and school improvement planning.

Further, ongoing Title I Technical Assistance has been crucial in our planning process. With their guidance, we've been able to align our strategies with federal requirements, ensure effective use of

funds, establish a comprehensive parent and family engagement program, and conduct a thorough needs assessment for our school.

All of these concerted efforts have helped us in constructing a plan that is focused, inclusive, and well-integrated with other federal, state, and local services and programs.

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))

A high priority is placed on the well-being of our students. We provide a range of counseling services including individual counseling, group counseling, and school consultations. Programs Grief Support are available to assist students coping with specific issues. Furthermore, we collaborate with local community providers such as Peace River Center, Watson Clinic Behavioral Health, and Sweet Center – Winter Haven Hospital to offer specialized support services. Our partnership with the Children's Home Society aids in providing mentoring services.

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))

To raise awareness about postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, we host events like College and Career Week, allowing students to learn about a variety of career paths and educational opportunities. Additionally, the Great American Teach-In provides students with direct exposure to professionals from various fields, fostering early interest in potential career paths. These experiences broaden our students' horizons and help them to start considering their future pathways at an early stage.

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).

A schoolwide tiered model, PBIS, has been implemented to prevent and address problem behavior. This is supplemented by our MTSS initiative. Our Behavior Interventionist, Academic Coaches, Mental Health Counselors, School Counselors, and Admin work in unison to provide early intervening services. These activities and services are carried out in coordination with those under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

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))

A culture of continuous learning is fostered, not just for our students but also for our staff. Teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel regularly participate in Professional Learning Communities to improve instruction and data usage. Incentives such as Collective Bargaining Stipends – Title I, Critical Shortage Area, Highly Effective – are provided to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. Our association with the Recruitment and Educator Quality Department bolsters our 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))

The transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs is of great importance to us. We facilitate this process through programs like VPK (Title I, and ESE). Events like Kindergarten Round Up and Kindergarten Readiness Camps offer a smooth transition for preschoolers. Other initiatives such as the Books Bridge Bus aim to assist preschool children in making the important step to elementary school.