

Polk County Public Schools

Polk Full Time Eschool School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Polk Full Time Eschool

604 S. CENTRAL AVE, Lakeland, FL 33815

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

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.

To provide a high-quality education to all students allowing them to excel as successful and responsible online learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Polk Virtual School is to deliver a high-quality technology-based education that guides students to grade level proficiency, high school graduation and college and/or career preparation.

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
Williams, Deron	Principal	<p>The Principal's duties are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure a safe online learning environment for all students - Ensure a safe working environment for all staff - Ensure online course providers are approved by the state - Ensure the online curriculum meeting state standards - Analyze student data to determine achievement and opportunities for growth - Provide and/or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development - Provide students are enrolled and properly scheduled - Monitor student pace and progress - Ensure TIER interventions are in place - Ensure MTSS is implemented accurately - Conduct observations and supervise teacher instruction
Taylor-Brown, Syrita	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal's duties are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure a safe online learning environment for all students - Ensure a safe working environment for all staff - Ensure online course providers are approved by the state - Ensure the online curriculum meeting state standards - Analyze student data to determine achievement and opportunities for growth - Provide and/or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development - Provide students are enrolled and properly scheduled - Monitor student pace and progress - Ensure TIER interventions are in place - Ensure MTSS is implemented accurately - Conduct observations and supervise teacher instruction
Nicolodi, Donna	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal's duties are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure a safe online learning environment for all students - Ensure a safe working environment for all staff - Ensure online course providers are approved by the state - Ensure the online curriculum meeting state standards - Analyze student data to determine achievement and opportunities for growth - Provide and/or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development - Provide students are enrolled and properly scheduled - Monitor student pace and progress - Ensure TIER interventions are in place

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	----------------	---------------------------------

- Ensure MTSS is implemented accurately
- Conduct observations and supervise teacher 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.

The initial SIP is developed and reviewed. Through the continuous improvement model, the SIP is shared with teacher leadership team and community/parent group. Each time the SIP is shared, feedback and recommendations are collected, edits are made, changes are implemented, and progress is evaluated.

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))

Data on student progress in courses, formative assessments, and progress monitoring will be collected by teachers and administration to be shared and discussed during monthly meetings. Based on the collected data, SIP action steps may be added or edited as needed to meet the needs of the students. Administration and leadership team will review teacher supports and program protocols for needed changes and implementations.

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)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	0%
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: I 2018-19: I
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	0	2	4	1	3	0	3	6	4	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	16
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	13	5	1	1	3	14	5	42
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	14	5	16	13	10	14	8	80
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	14	5	9	8	9	29	19	93

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	13	5	1	1	3	14	5	44

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	5	1	2	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	7	7	7	6	2	4	4	7	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	5	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	2	4	12	10	17	104
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	15	13	28	20	28	167
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	4	2	4	12	10	17	104
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	6	9	1	5	9	12	16	118

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	7	7	7	6	2	4	4	7	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	5	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	2	4	12	10	17	49
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	15	13	28	20	28	111
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	4	2	4	12	10	17	49
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	6	9	1	5	9	12	16	60

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	50	48	53	51	51	55	57		
ELA Learning Gains				49			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			32		
Math Achievement*	32	49	55	29	37	42	40		
Math Learning Gains				42			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			28		
Science Achievement*	63	47	52	41	48	54	46		
Social Studies Achievement*	69	68	68	50	53	59	67		
Middle School Acceleration	60	61	70	41	43	51	48		
Graduation Rate	77	54	74	69	46	50	93		
College and Career Acceleration	25	39	53	38	71	70	45		
ELP Progress		50	55		55	70	62		

* 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	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	432
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	77

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	494
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	85
Graduation Rate	69

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	37	Yes	2	
ELL	31	Yes	2	2
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	51			
MUL	27	Yes	1	1
PAC				

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%
WHT	60			
FRL	35	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	34	Yes	1	
ELL	27	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	47			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	52			
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	50			32			63	69	60	77	25	
SWD	31			17			31	43		6	6	
ELL	44			17							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44			28			50	64		6	6	
HSP	50			28			63	61	50	29	8	

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
MUL	27										1	
PAC												
WHT	57			40			73	79	55	32	8	
FRL	39			15			38	42		14	6	

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	51	49	36	29	42	48	41	50	41	69	38	
SWD	29	45	40	7	31	36	26	33		75	17	
ELL	30	32	14	25	28		31					
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	36	25	23	39	50	34	52		67	30	
HSP	51	48	43	27	40	43	51	68		63	36	
MUL	71	60		50	50							
PAC												
WHT	59	56	31	39	47	56	54	74	45	72	37	
FRL										60	40	

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	57	48	32	40	33	28	46	67	48	93	45	62
SWD	28	35	30	20	22	22	19	44				
ELL	41	47	36	29	26	38	15					62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	39	24	19	21	15	24	42				
HSP	58	48	32	36	32	38	46	58	29	85	27	67
MUL	56	40		31	38							
PAC												
WHT	62	51	34	50	37	28	53	73	58	95	51	

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
FRL	49	42	26	29	28	29	36	61	27	89	38	

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
10	2023 - Spring	53%	40%	13%	50%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	43%	10%	54%	-1%
07	2023 - Spring	57%	36%	21%	47%	10%
08	2023 - Spring	39%	39%	0%	47%	-8%
09	2023 - Spring	56%	39%	17%	48%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	53%	16%	58%	11%
06	2023 - Spring	49%	35%	14%	47%	2%
03	2023 - Spring	61%	42%	19%	50%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	42%	38%	4%	54%	-12%
07	2023 - Spring	50%	35%	15%	48%	2%
03	2023 - Spring	19%	51%	-32%	59%	-40%
04	2023 - Spring	21%	56%	-35%	61%	-40%
08	2023 - Spring	44%	42%	2%	55%	-11%
05	2023 - Spring	35%	44%	-9%	55%	-20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	46%	33%	13%	44%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	71%	39%	32%	51%	20%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	45%	37%	8%	50%	-5%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	32%	37%	-5%	48%	-16%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	50%	23%	63%	10%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	65%	6%	66%	5%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	49%	14%	63%	0%

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.

Students demonstrated less than 41% proficiency in the core content area of math for grades 3-5 including Geometry.

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

The data components show an improvement in each category, except social studies which remained constant at 66% proficient across the grade levels. While the math proficiency percentage did not decline, the increase was only eight percentage points moving from 32% (21-22) to 41%(22-23) which is four percentage points below our 22-23 goal of 45% proficiency.

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.

State and district data is not available as of 7/19/23 for accurate and appropriate comparison. Once the data is available, comparison data will be entered.

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

The greatest improvement was seen in two areas, (1) mathematics, grades 3-5 and (2) middle grades acceleration.

Although our mathematics is still below 41% for grades 3-5, each grade level improved at least 10 percentages points from the previous year. We contribute the growth to our use of formative assessments during "live lessons" and small group interventions.

Middle grades acceleration proficiency percentage increased over 35 percentage points due to proper scheduling in acceleration math courses based on math assessment trend data over a single test score.

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

The areas for potential concern are math proficiency in grades 3-8 and geometry as well as the number of 2nd and 7th grade students that are indicated as having a substantial reading deficiency.

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

1. Math proficiency levels
2. ELA proficiency levels
3. ELL student proficiency levels

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 Math**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.

Students demonstrated overall less than 41% proficiency in the core content area of math for grades 3-8, including Geometry.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The overall math proficiency in the core content area of math for grades 3-8 including, algebra and geometry will increase from 41% proficient in 22-23 to 45% for the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Review the progress monitoring data from PM1 and PM2 to determine growth and student needs for remediation.

Review student course work every 3 weeks to determine proficiency levels and plan for intervention support to close learning gaps using RTD and formative assessments.

Teachers will review standards expectations, compare the FLVS content to the state standards in an effort determine if lessons are aligned. If they are not aligned, teachers will provide instruction that fills the gap to meet the full extent of the standard and equivalent practice opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deron Williams (deron.williams@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.)

Resources and articles state that using progress monitoring through formative assessments for improved instructional strategies and small group intervention facilitates improved student academic achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Formative assessment strategies allow teachers to use collected data to plan instruction to meet the students' specific needs in their math courses for whole and small group standards specific instruction.

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.

A schoolwide schedule for whole group live lessons and small group interventions will be developed and implemented for mathematics classes for all students and teachers. This will provide structure for when live lessons and interventions take place. Our goal is to have high participation in all synchronous lessons.

Person Responsible: Deron Williams (deron.williams@polk-fl.net)

By When: Developed - August 3, 2023 Implemented - August 10, 23 - May 24, 24

Provide professional development in the area of formative assessment strategies for improving learning.

Person Responsible: Deron Williams (deron.williams@polk-fl.net)

By When: On going, August 3, 23 - May 24, 24

Provide professional development in the area of discussion-based assessment strategies for improving learning.

Person Responsible: Deron Williams (deron.williams@polk-fl.net)

By When: On going, August 3, 23 - May 24, 24

Monthly data chats with teachers about data collection and use for instructional planning for whole and small group standards specific instruction to meet the students' specific needs in their math courses.

Person Responsible: Deron Williams (deron.williams@polk-fl.net)

By When: On going, August 3, 23 - May 24, 24

#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.

The state requires that 95% of students participate in State Assessments. We did not meet that criterion for 21-22. Our percent tested was 85% for 21-22.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase our percent of students participating in the state assessment (FAST) to from 85% (21-22) to 95% (23-24).

Monitoring:

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

We will track the number of students that participate in PM1 and PM2. This will help us identify which students may not participate in PM3. With this information, we can communicate and review expectations with these families and help encourage them to participate. In some cases, make-up testing days may be used.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deron Williams (deron.williams@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 strategy used to increase the testing percentage will be communication with parents and families.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We have to help parents understand the importance of participating in State Assessments.

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.

1. All parents must sign and agree with the enrollment agreement which outline testing is a requirement.
2. Parents will receive information about state testing during orientation.
3. Parents will receive an email communication which sharing information about testing. (General information such as (Who tests, What is FAST, When it takes place, and Where).
4. Additional testing information will be placed on teacher homepages and the school's website.
5. Parents will receive specific information about the day/time their students' needs to report to our campus for testing.
6. Students that did not participate on their specific day will be contacted for make-up dates.
7. Students that fail to participate will be notified of the requirement and how it could affect enrollment.

Person Responsible: Deron Williams (deron.williams@polk-fl.net)

By When: Enrollment, beginning of the year and the close of PM1 and PM2 testing windows.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

Within our subgroups for the 21-22 school year, there are 3 that did not meet the ESSA target of 41%. Student with disabilities - 34%, English Language Learners - 27% (also below the ESSA target of 31%), and Black/African American Students - 40%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is that each subgroup meets the ESSA ELA target of 41% proficient for the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Review the progress monitoring data from PM1 and PM2 to determine growth and student needs for remediation. Review student course work every 3 weeks to determine proficiency levels and plan for intervention support to close learning gaps using RTD and formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deron Williams (deron.williams@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.)

Resources and articles state that using progress monitoring through formative assessments for improved instructional strategies and small group intervention facilitates improved student academic achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Formative assessment strategies allow teachers to use collected data to plan instruction to meet the students' specific needs in their math courses.

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.

Provide Professional development in the area of small group strategies for improving learning.

Person Responsible: Deron Williams (deron.williams@polk-fl.net)

By When: On going August 3, 23-May 24, 24

Provide professional development in the area of whole group strategies for improving learning.

Person Responsible: Deron Williams (deron.williams@polk-fl.net)

By When: On going August 3, 23-May 24, 24

Provide professional development in the area of formative assessment strategies for improving learning.

Person Responsible: Syrita Taylor-Brown (syrita.taylor-brown@polk-fl.net)

By When: On going August 3, 23-May 24, 24

Provide professional development in the area of discussion-based assessments strategies for improving learning.

Person Responsible: Syrita Taylor-Brown (syrita.taylor-brown@polk-fl.net)

By When: On going August 3, 23-May 24, 24

ELL Centered Supports

1. ELL student will be assigned to grade band homeroom rooms
2. HS ELL students will be scheduled to a specific Peer Counseling for ELL and if appropriate Spanish for Spanish Speakers.
3. MS ELL students will be scheduled into M/J Critical Thinking or middle grades Spanish as appropriate.
4. Elementary ELL students, if appropriate will be scheduled into elementary Spanish.

Person Responsible: Donna Nicolodi (donna.nicolodi@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 20, 2023

Quarterly conferences for ELL students with course grades less than 70, achievement levels 2 or lower on most recent PM, and/or poor attendance.

Person Responsible: Donna Nicolodi (donna.nicolodi@polk-fl.net)

By When: October 2023, January 2023, and March 2024.

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

Review the progress monitoring data from PM1 and PM2 to determine growth and student needs for remediation and small group intervention. Review student course work weekly to determine proficiency levels on whole group learning and students' need for additional support.

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

Review the progress monitoring data from PM1 and PM2 to determine growth and student needs for remediation and small group intervention. Review student course work weekly to determine proficiency levels on whole group learning and students' need for additional support.

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

65% of the students in first grade based on the 2022-23 Early Literacy or STAR Reading Assessment score below the 40% Percentile. One the 23-24 Early Literacy or STAR Reading Assessment less than 49% of the students will score below the 40%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

53% of the students in fifth grade based on the 2022-23 FAST ELA assessment scored below a level 3. On the 23-24 FAST ELA assessment, less than 45% of the students will score below a level 3.

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.

Utilizing data from PM1 and PM2 to determine student progress and/or areas of support. Students work and formative assessment will be utilized to determine additional intervention to support learning.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Williams, Deron, deron.williams@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?

Utilized practices are Progress Monitoring (PM1 and PM2), formative assessment aligned with the standards, small group intervention aligned with standards (based on the students' needs).

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?

Progress monitoring provides an additional way to assess students' progress. Formative assessments tied to grade level instruction provides the teacher a way of understanding who is and who is not learning. Small group interventions allow teachers to address students learning needs based on progress monitoring and formative assessments.

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
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide PD to teachers regarding small group interventions and instructional supports. 2. Provide PD to teachers regarding formative assessments and how to best insert them into the instruction. 3. Provide PD to teachers regarding teaching to the extent of the standards, reviewing their FLVS lessons to determine alignment to the standard, Using the ARC progress, and using district resources such as Schoology to support instruction. 4. Student progress on class work is monitored weekly by administrator and counselors. 	<p>Williams, Deron, deron.williams@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.

NA

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))

NA

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)

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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).

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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: Math	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$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