Polk County Public Schools

Valleyview Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Valleyview Elementary School

2900 STATE RD 540A E, Lakeland, FL 33813

http://schools.polk-fl.net/valleyview

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 Valleyview Elementary is to create a caring environment in which students, parents, faculty, staff, and administration eagerly combine their knowledge, abilities, and resources toward enhancing self-confidence, promoting critical and cognitive thinking, developing healthy minds and bodies, and creating independent, life-long learners who have respect for themselves, others, and the world around them.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide a high quality education for all students in a safe and orderly environment.

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
Rogers, Jennafer	Principal	
Vern, Angela	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The job duties and responsibilities of our MTSS coach include working with targeted students as identified by FAST Progress Monitoring data as well as Tier 2 and Tier 3 data. In addition, our MTSS coach works with instructional staff providing support for identifying targeted Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions as well as monitoring the documentation and progress of these interventions.
Fleming, Levi	Dean	The job duties of the dean are to collect, interpret, and analyze discipline data as well as facilitating and monitoring behavior intervention plans. The dean will also serve as the PBIS team leader monitoring the implementation of our schoolwide PBIS system.
Wiggins, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	The job duties and responsibilities of the assistant principal include serving as an instructional leader through monitoring a safe and secure environment for all students. As a member of the instructional team, the assistant principal supports the principal in providing a common vision for the instructional program and making data-based decisions to improve student achievement. The assistant principal provides feedback to instructional staff, actively participates in collaborative planning for ELA, and assists in facilitating Professional Learning Communities and/or professional development.
	Reading Coach	The job duties and responsibilities of the Reading Coach include assisting teachers in planning instruction and assessments that meet the full intent of the state benchmarks. In addition, the reading coach will guide teachers in using formative and progress monitoring assessment data to improve instruction ensuring it meets the needs of all students. The Reading coach also provides teacher to teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring, and collaboration to support teachers in their instructional delivery.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Advisory Council is comprised of representatives from all stakeholder groups. After analyzing the data and determining the needs to write the plan, it is presented to the School Advisory Council. They are then given the opportunity to provide input on the areas of focus and any budgetary concerns.

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 SIP goals are reviewed following each progress monitoring period after the data for each grade level has been disaggregated. If changes to the areas of focus or action steps are needed at that time, they will be revised.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	44%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	65%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Asian Students (ASN) 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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	39	24	33	22	20	27	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	2	5	4	3	1	7	0	0	0	22
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	4	9	9	6	7	2	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	3	2	3	7	6	3	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	11	31	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	10	22	0	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	17	23	15	17	13	19	0	0	0	104
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	11	9	7	19	15	30	0	0	0	91

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	2	1	6	1	1	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	33	30	35	27	25	26	0	0	0	176
One or more suspensions	5	3	4	3	3	5	0	0	0	23
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	6	17	11	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	18	17	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	51	104	150	125	137	138	0	0	0	705

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	17	11	12	8	17	22	0	0	0	87

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	7	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	33	30	35	27	25	26	0	0	0	176
One or more suspensions	5	3	4	3	3	5	0	0	0	23
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	6	17	11	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	18	17	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	51	104	150	125	137	138	0	0	0	705

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	17	11	12	8	17	22	0	0	0	87

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	7	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	23
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*	66	45	53	74	47	56	73		
ELA Learning Gains				66			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			35		
Math Achievement*	76	49	59	75	42	50	77		
Math Learning Gains				70			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			46		
Science Achievement*	65	41	54	67	49	59	64		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	67	54	59	86			75		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	341
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	531
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	35	Yes	1	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	59			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	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%
SWD	41			
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	51			
HSP	60			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	52			

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	66			76			65					67
SWD	30			43			39				4	
ELL	35			47							3	67
AMI												
ASN	73			96							2	
BLK	33			52			29				4	
HSP	56			66			56				5	58
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	76			84			79				4	
FRL	44			57			44				5	60

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	74	66	44	75	70	49	67					86
SWD	37	46	37	45	58	42	24					
ELL	38	44	30	58	59		42					86
AMI												
ASN	86	73		89	67							
BLK	55	57	50	50	62	58	25					
HSP	63	67	40	67	67	58	60					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80	67	45	81	73	36	76					
FRL	56	53	34	56	62	47	58					

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	73	65	35	77	58	46	64					75
SWD	35	37	30	47	32		44					
ELL	44			67								75
AMI												
ASN	75			92								
BLK	48	58		45	50		33					
HSP	67	67		75	61		74					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80	67	30	83	59	58	69					
FRL	62	56	33	61	50	38	57					

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	62%	43%	19%	54%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	53%	26%	58%	21%
03	2023 - Spring	66%	42%	24%	50%	16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	38%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	82%	51%	31%	59%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	56%	26%	61%	21%
05	2023 - Spring	70%	44%	26%	55%	15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	63%	39%	24%	51%	12%

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.

In 2022-2023, ELA was our lowest performing area at 67% proficient. When you disaggregate proficiency by grade level, 5th grade was the lowest performing grade achieving only 61% proficiency. During this school year, new benchmarks were implemented as well as a new statewide assessment. With new benchmarks, resources that met the full intent of the benchmark were limited and often had to be created. In addition, teachers struggled with many unknowns regarding how things would be assessed on the new state assessment. Finally, students were transitioned from paper pencil assessments to computer based, forcing them to quickly learn and adapt the strategies they have been taught to an electronic platform.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was English Language Arts dropping to 67% from 74% in 2021-2022. The factors that contributed to this again, were new benchmarks, a new assessment, and the shift from paper pencil to an electronic testing platform.

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.

At the time this plan was submitted, the state average was not available.

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

The data component that showed the greatest improvement was Math increasing 3% overall to 78% from 75% in 2021-2022. The factor that contributed to this growth was more accountability with Math planning across all grade levels. In previous years, administration has focused on Reading planning. During the 2021-2022 school year, administration divided planning with one attending Reading and one attending Math to ensure that lessons and tasks that met the full intent of each benchmark were being implemented. In addition, two fourth grade teachers conducted before school tutoring. Fourth grade was the highest performing grade level in Math achieving 83% proficiency.

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

Students who are absent 10% of school days is an area of concern. In addition, students in 5th grade with more than one indicator is another area of concern.

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

Valleyview Elementary' s top priorities for the 2023-2024 school year would be:
1. Continued accountability in planning with administration attending both ELA and Math planning.
2. Utilize the learning arc framework during planning to ensure that lessons and tasks are meeting the full intent of the benchmark.
3. Conduct standards-based walkthroughs with fidelity to ensure students are being exposed to the full intent of each benchmark.

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.

Through the implementation of benchmark aligned instruction, all students will receive an equitable learning experience that aligns to progress monitoring and grade level specific summative assessments.

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

Our outcomes would be to see a 3% increase in overall proficiency in ELA, increasing from 67% to 70%, and a 2% increase in overall proficiency in Math, increasing from 78% to 80%.

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

Instructional coaches and administration will plan collaboratively with teachers each week using the learning arc framework to ensure that lessons and tasks that reach the full intent of the benchmark are being planned. In addition, progress monitoring data will be disaggregated to ensure that students are mastering grade level benchmarks. Student artifacts and work samples will also be reviewed and analyzed during collaborative planning to monitor student progress and achievement as well as look for areas of growth in student learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennafer Rogers (jennafer.rogers@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. During collaborative planning, instructional coaches and administration will support teachers in developing learning arcs, lessons, and tasks that meet the full intent of grade level benchmarks and include engagement strategies that provide a framework for all learners to process and master new learning.
2. Implementation of these rigorous, benchmark aligned lessons and tasks will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs documented in the district provided Qualtrics system, a system that allows walkthrough data to be analyzed for trends and areas of growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale is to provide students with rigorous core instruction that reaches the full intent of each grade level benchmark, so they are able to achieve mastery on state progress monitoring assessments. Through data analysis, identify the students who are not making progress towards mastery and implement interventions through small group instruction to close the achievement gap.

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.

Implement the learning arc framework during weekly collaborative planning to develop benchmark aligned lessons and tasks.

Person Responsible: Jennafer Rogers (jennafer.rogers@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing August to May

Create a calendar for classroom walkthroughs which includes time for leadership calibration.

Person Responsible: Jennafer Rogers (jennafer.rogers@polk-fl.net)

By When: the first of each month

Analyze classroom walkthrough data to identify trends and areas of growth to be addressed during weekly collaborative planning sessions.

Person Responsible: Jennafer Rogers (jennafer.rogers@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly beginning in August

MTSS instructional coach will provide on-going support to teachers as it relates to implementing the appropriate intervention for closing achievement gaps.

Person Responsible: Jennafer Rogers (jennafer.rogers@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly beginning August

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

Discipline referrals during the 2022-2023 school year increased by 11% from 61 total referrals to 68 total referrals for the school year. Discipline data shows that students need continuous modeling of positive interventions and supports in the classroom and on the school bus. Our schoolwide goal is to provide a safe and orderly environment that allows ALL students to learn.

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

The outcome would be to see a 5% decrease in office referrals for a total of 64 or less referrals for the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Our schoolwide STAR (Strive for Success, Take Responsibility, Actively Learn, and Respect myself and others) will be taught in all classrooms and campus areas to include the cafeteria, PE field, recess, and all dismissal areas. Discipline data will be reviewed weekly with the Leadership team and monthly with the PBIS team. Administration will include planned and unplanned classroom walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of the schoolwide expectations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennafer Rogers (jennafer.rogers@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.)

Schoolwide expectations are taught and reinforced in all areas. Students have the opportunity to earn STARS throughout the course of each month. Those who earn a minimum of 15 stars each month will be eligible to participate in the monthly PBIS celebrations. Meetings are held each month with administration and the PBIS team to review data, look for trends and areas of concern, and to identify students who need Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teaching and reinforcing schoolwide expectations ensure that all staff and students have a common understanding of expected behaviors. Sanford Harmony lessons are implemented in all classrooms and provide students with opportunities to build classroom culture while creating a safe learning environment that allows them to take academic risks and maximize their learning. Analyzing monthly data allows for the identification of trends and areas of concerns to ensure interventions are put into place.

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.

Sanford Harmony (Social Emotional Skills Development Program) will be implemented daily in all classrooms.

Person Responsible: Jennafer Rogers (jennafer.rogers@polk-fl.net)

By When: Beginning August through the end of the school year.

Schoolwide STAR expectations will be taught to all students in all areas of the school and will be reviewed regularly.

Person Responsible: Jennafer Rogers (jennafer.rogers@polk-fl.net)

By When: Beginning August and ongoing throughout the school year.

Monthly meetings with administration and PBIS team to review discipline and PBIS data to identify trends and areas of concern.

Person Responsible: Jennafer Rogers (jennafer.rogers@polk-fl.net)

By When: Beginning September and ongoing throughout the school year.

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).

When considering any resources to purchase, in addition to being research based, they must contribute to the achievement of one of our school improvement goals. In addition, resources must go through the PURE process and be approved by the district prior to purchasing.