
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Spessard L Holland Elementary

2342 EF GRIFFIN RD, Bartow, FL 33830

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

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 Spessard L. Holland Elementary is to provide high quality education for all students in an environment where students are eager to learn, willing to serve, and preparing to lead.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our school prepares students for success by engaging them in student-centered learning that challenges all students and promotes academic, emotional, and social well-being.

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
Golden, Lacey	Principal	
Rodgers, Erin	Dean	
Johnson, Chandra	Assistant Principal	

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.

School data is shared with staff members and the School Advisory Council at the end of the previous school year. That data is used to create the goals and focus of the upcoming school year. At the beginning of the year, the goals are discussed with staff and the School Advisory Council and edited as needed based on feedback.

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 is monitored and discussed quarterly throughout the year in School Advisory Council meetings. Data is presented to support the goals and they are discussed and revised as needed.

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	57%
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) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: 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	31	38	34	52	32	30	0	0	0	217
One or more suspensions	2	15	25	19	15	20	0	0	0	96
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	34	32	24	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	45	31	44	0	0	0	120
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	11	37	17	28	28	19	0	0	0	140

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	4	17	15	47	33	36	0	0	0	152

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	7	1	18	0	0	0	0	0	26
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	40	43	32	39	27	29	0	0	0	210
One or more suspensions	7	10	6	15	9	13	0	0	0	60
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	35	27	21	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	37	34	25	0	0	0	96
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	28	47	61	21	15	4	0	0	0	176

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	15	22	18	16	25	37	0	0	0	133

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	40	43	32	39	27	29	0	0	0	210
One or more suspensions	7	10	6	15	9	13	0	0	0	60
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	35	27	21	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	37	34	25	0	0	0	96
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	28	47	61	21	15	4	0	0	0	176

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	15	22	18	16	25	37	0	0	0	133

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	21
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*	46	45	53	55	47	56	49		
ELA Learning Gains				62			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			26		
Math Achievement*	45	49	59	54	42	50	47		
Math Learning Gains				60			27		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			12		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	47	41	54	45	49	59	45		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	84	54	59	81			59		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	270
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	453
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	24	Yes	4	2
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	25	Yes	4	1
HSP	53			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	46			

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	31	Yes	3	1
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	3	
HSP	59			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	50			

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	46			45			47					84
SWD	24			19			23				4	
ELL	28			32							3	84
AMI												
ASN	80			70							2	
BLK	29			19			24				4	
HSP	40			43			43				5	88
MUL	67			50							2	
PAC												
WHT	57			59			59				4	
FRL	35			34			43				5	83

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	55	62	50	54	60	46	45					81
SWD	14	42	45	23	42	44	6					
ELL	38	64		43	64							81
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	50	41	26	43	36	16					
HSP	61	67	43	55	65	53	51					80
MUL	42	45		58	64							
PAC												
WHT	58	65	69	61	61	44	54					
FRL	45	56	48	43	54	42	32					82

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	49	40	26	47	27	12	45					59
SWD	11	8	0	16	0	0	8					
ELL	29	36		25	18		9					59

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	29	33	20	25	12		31					
HSP	48	33	33	42	20	9	25					58
MUL	44			63								
PAC												
WHT	58	43		57	34	21	57					
FRL	33	30	22	31	25	16	36					55

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	51%	43%	8%	54%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	53%	-5%	58%	-10%
03	2023 - Spring	44%	42%	2%	50%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	43%	51%	-8%	59%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	56%	0%	61%	-5%
05	2023 - Spring	42%	44%	-2%	55%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	39%	6%	51%	-6%

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.

4th ELA has the lowest performance at 38% proficient. Contributing factors to this performance would be a staff attendance due to illness and learning the new benchmarks and aligning our tasks to those. Our lowest category is Reading Across Genres & Vocabulary.

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

4th ELA also showed the greatest decline from PM1 to PM3. Contributing factors to this performance would be a staff attendance due to illness and learning the new benchmarks and aligning our tasks to those.

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.

3rd grade Math has the biggest gap when compared to the state average. The contributing factors are learning the new benchmarks and aligning our tasks to those along with changing our curriculums mid-year.

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

4th grade math showed the most improvement with 49% proficient. 4th grade teachers took a proactive approach to the new benchmarks and used their focus boards to drive their instruction.

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

Our area of concern would be the difference between our number of course failures in comparison to the number of Level 1s on the state assessment. There doesn't seem to be in alignment in the data.

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

My first priority will be to ensure students have benchmark aligned Tier 1 instruction in every subject area. My next priority will be to ensure we are progress monitoring students in instruction and intervention so we are aware of growth and can adjust instruction as needed.

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.

With proficiencies slightly dropping from 21-22 to 22-23, we want to ensure our Tier 1 instruction is aligned to the benchmark and experiences that are equivalent to the FAST progress monitoring. We want to ensure we are meeting the needs of SWD and black students while teaching to the depth of the standard. We will use the Learning Arc in collaborative planning to ensure alignment of instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase proficiency in ELA and Mathematics by 5%. We also plan to increase the federal index with SWD and black students by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through the use of the School Based Walkthrough tool designed by the district. We will conduct walkthroughs daily and discuss them weekly at our leadership team meetings on Mondays.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@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.)

Collaborative planning will be organized through the use of the Learning Arc and established planning roles. Tier 1 instruction will include research based curriculums such as Reading Wonders, Being a Writer, and UFLI.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Cornell University states "the benefits of collaborative learning include:
Development of higher-level thinking, oral communication, self-management, and leadership skills.
Promotion of student-faculty interaction.
Increase in student retention, self-esteem, and responsibility.
Exposure to and an increase in understanding of diverse perspectives.
Preparation for real life social and employment situations."

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

During the first scheduled collaborative planning meeting, administration will set year long expectations and norms for planning. New norms will include the expectation of all stakeholders including ESE self-contained and ESE inclusion teachers to attend weekly.

Person Responsible: Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@polk-fl.net)

By When: First collaborative planning meeting in August

Using the Learning Arc and collaborative planning roles, equivalent experiences and aligned tasks will be produced and monitored within the classroom. Leadership team will use the district created Walkthrough Tool to monitor implementation.

Person Responsible: Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly planning meetings and daily walkthroughs

Data from the Observation Tool will be discussed during leadership team meetings to revise planning structures or initiate coaching cycles.

Person Responsible: Chandra Johnson (chandra.johnson@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly at leadership team meetings

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

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

When analyzing the data, a need for increased learning gains is evident. Our average growth in ELA for students in grades 3-5 for 13%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Since we will have learning gain scores this year, our goal is that 60% of students will have one year's growth in ELA. Additionally, our goal is to have 50% of our SWD and 55% of our black students achieve one year's growth this school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this growth by looking at the learning after each progress monitoring period to total 3 times this year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@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've had a focus on formative assessments for the past 2 years. In order to ensure all students are learning, we are going to elevate our goal not only to create and implement formative assessments but now to analyze them to inform instruction in ELA, Math, Science, and MTSS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics state "formative assessment produces greater increases in student achievement and is cheaper than other efforts to boost achievement, including reducing class sizes and increasing teachers' content knowledge." Formative assessments were selected due to their high effect size and low cost of implementation. Important factors in Hattie's 2018 research to influence learning include- "Response to intervention, deliberate practice, and evaluation and reflection."

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

During collaborative planning teachers will use Step 4/5 of the Learning Arc to create and implement formative assessments.

Person Responsible: Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly during planning

During planning meetings, teachers will bring the designated formative assessments to analyze and discuss next steps for small group.

Person Responsible: Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly during planning

During MTSS meetings, teachers will bring their progress monitoring data to collaboratively analyze and discuss next steps for intervention.

Person Responsible: Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly at MTSS meetings

During the half day planning sessions each semester, teachers will participate in PD as needed on progress monitoring, analyzing data, and how it informs instruction.

Person Responsible: Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@polk-fl.net)

By When: Once each semester

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Referrals increased from 276 in 2021-2022 to 512 in 2022-2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Referrals of all students (including those SWD and black students) will decrease by 45% in the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Discipline data will be analyzed and present at the first meeting of each month.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Rodgers (erin.rodgers@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.)

In order to solidify PBIS, we want to get more stakeholders involved. We will include PBIS processes on our website for parents and community members. We will also send home a beginning of the year newsletter to introduce our PBIS program and how it works each month. Our faculty handbook has been updated to include a PBIS section and all staff members will receive a copy of the handbook in the staff calendars.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS is shown to decrease referrals and increase motivation in academics. By ensuring all stakeholders take an active role in our PBIS program, we are increasing our chances of seeing the research.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

During Pre-planning week, teachers will be trained on our PBIS procedures and will locate the PBIS section in the faculty handbook.

Person Responsible: Erin Rodgers (erin.rodgers@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 11, 2023

During the first week of school, parents will receive a PBIS newsletter and our website will be updated to include our PBIS system and monthly experiences.

Person Responsible: Erin Rodgers (erin.rodgers@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 18, 2023

Each month the PBIS team will analyze the number of students participating in PBIS and teachers will be identified for coaching cycles based on participation.

Person Responsible: Erin Rodgers (erin.rodgers@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly

Each month, discipline data will be analyzed by the leadership team, trends will be discussed, and plans will be made to troubleshoot.

Person Responsible: Erin Rodgers (erin.rodgers@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).

- Title I/UniSIG Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)
- Data Com
- Summer Leadership Academy/Retreat
- School Improvement Plan Meetings/Trainings
- PURE Process
- Regional and Office of School Transformation review SIP plans

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

50% of our first grade students scored below the 40th percentile on STAR Early Literacy. Our area of focus this school year will be systematic phonics and phonemic awareness instruction.

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

53% of 3rd graders and 52% of 4th graders scored below a level 3 on FAST. Our area of focus this school year will be a focus on MTSS interventions using a systematic approach to phonics and phonemic awareness.

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

Using a systematic approach to phonics, we will ensure 50% of students are scoring 40th percentile or above on the STAR Early Literacy assessment in grade 1.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Using a purposeful plan for intervention, we will ensure 50% of students are scoring a level 3 or higher on the PM3 for FAST in grades 4 and 5.

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.

After each progress monitoring period, the data will be analyzed for growth. Students who aren't making growth will be discussed using a school based problem solving team to include the teacher, coaches, and administration.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Golden, Lacey, lacey.golden@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?

We plan using a combination of Heggerty and SIPPS to provide students systematic phonics instruction in 1st grade.

We also plan on using SIPPS for intervention in grades 3 and 4 along with our Reading Interventionist.

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 current needs for reading intervention is in the area of decoding and phonics. They two programs provide teachers a scope and sequence that is research based to fill in the gaps that our core curriculum might be lacking.

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
Professional development from Collaborative Classroom for SIPPS for grades K-5.	Golden, Lacey, lacey.golden@polk-fl.net
Clear expectations and collaboration on using the programs within the designated blocks of ELA (Gr. 1) and Intervention (Gr.3-4).	Golden, Lacey, lacey.golden@polk-fl.net
Monthly meetings to discuss student progress and problem solve.	Golden, Lacey, lacey.golden@polk-fl.net
Data analysis after each progress monitoring period (September, December, and May).	Golden, Lacey, lacey.golden@polk-fl.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
 List the school’s webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Our SIP is disseminated in many ways including our School/District Webpage, PEN Notebook, Parent/Family/Community Input Meetings, Annual Meeting, and our SAC meeting quarterly.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school’s mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child’s progress.
 List the school’s webpage* where the school’s Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Building family engagement is a priority here at Spessard. We build relationship with stakeholders in many ways including Building Capacity Events almost monthly, Staff Capacity Building Professional Development 1/2 days, Conferencing, family/school relationships, Family/Community Input at all events, Data Chats/Conferences, Webpage/ Social Media, Annual Meeting and Preventing Barriers.

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

We plan to strength our academic program by working on the SIP goals outlined here. We also use Title I funds for Supplemental Staff (academic coaches and interventionists), Supplemental Resources (Being a Writer), • Professional Development for teachers, Collaborative Planning for teachers, and purposeful implementation of MTSS – Tier Support for Students.

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

Many different programs and stakeholders have been involved in the development of this SIP including Data Com, School Improvement Planning Trainings, Regional (area) Meetings, Summer Leadership Academy, Title I Technical Assistance – Use of Funds, PFE Input, Back to School Mtg, and Comprehensive Needs Assessment Technical Assistance.

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))

Without any school counselors this year, we will continue to strive to ensure all students receive the help they need through the webpage <https://polkschoolsfl.com/mentalhealth/>, Individual/ Group Counseling by the School Psychologist, School Consultations, and Collaboration with community providers – Peace River Center, Sweet Center – Winter Haven Hospital.

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))

At the elementary level, we bring awareness of postsecondary opportunities through Building Capacity of Events – Transition events.

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

Our schoolwide program with prevent and address behavior includes PBiS, MTSS, and Mental Health Counselors and a Dean.

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))

We have frequent professional learning using data to adjust instruction through Professional Learning Communities.

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

We assist preschool children through Early Childhood - <https://polkschoolsfl.com/earlychildhood/>, VPK (Title I, ESE and non-Title I), Kindergarten Round Up, Kindergarten Readiness Camps, and Books Bridge Bus.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

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

Budget Approval

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

No