Polk County Public Schools

Elbert Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Elbert Elementary School

205 15TH ST NE, Winter Haven, FL 33881

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

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 Elbert Elementary School is to ensure all students reach their highest academic potential through a consistent, pervasive, and rigorous teaching while learning through New BEST curriculum that meets the needs of all students. We empower students to take their learning to thoughtful and appropriate actions that affect our local community. We create an environment that instills in our students the insight to value and take responsibility for their own learning, while encouraging them to be curious inquirers as they interact with the world around them.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Elbert Elementary School is to provide a safe school culture in a nurturing environment with a stimulating curriculum that meets the needs of all learners. This will enable all students to effectively continue on the path to graduate High School to become productive citizens of our community, state, nation and world.

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
Wise, Alex	Principal	
Thomas, Julie	Assistant Principal	
Vera, Luciano	Behavior Specialist	
Hayes, Magen	Reading Coach	
Gunter, Elizabeth	School Counselor	
Jodon, Christa	Assistant Principal	
almand, lauren	Math Coach	
adams, cristina	Reading Coach	

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.

Our SAC committee, which includes staff parents, and community stakeholders, are active participants and provide input for the development of our SIP.

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))

Our SIP will be continuously revisited to ensure it meets the needs of our student population.

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	78%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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: F 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	0	59	44	46	49	57	0	0	0	255
One or more suspensions	0	10	5	7	18	24	0	0	0	64
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	8	9	10	6	5	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	3	6	9	2	9	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	51	52	0	0	0	103
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	73	56	0	0	0	129
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	53	54	77	50	35	0	0	0	269

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	23	21	31	29	35	0	0	0	139

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	4	4	36	0	0	0	0	51
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	59	44	46	49	57	47	0	0	0	302
One or more suspensions	10	5	7	18	24	39	0	0	0	103
Course failure in ELA	8	9	10	6	5	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	3	6	9	2	9	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	51	52	66	0	0	0	169
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	73	56	95	0	0	0	224
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	53	54	77	50	35	43	0	0	0	312

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	23	21	31	29	35	43	0	0	0	182

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	4	4	36	0	0	0	0	0	51
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	59	44	46	49	57	47	0	0	0	302
One or more suspensions	10	5	7	18	24	39	0	0	0	103
Course failure in ELA	8	9	10	6	5	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	3	6	9	2	9	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	51	52	66	0	0	0	169
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	73	56	95	0	0	0	224
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	53	54	77	50	35	43	0	0	0	312

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	23	21	31	29	35	43	0	0	0	182

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	4	4	36	0	0	0	0	0	51
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*	40	45	53	30	47	56	39		
ELA Learning Gains				37			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32			46		
Math Achievement*	43	49	59	21	42	50	38		
Math Learning Gains				30			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				29			42		
Science Achievement*	31	41	54	16	49	59	38		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	54	54	59	43			42		

* 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	206
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	30

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	238
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	13	Yes	4	2
ELL	33	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	27	Yes	3	2
HSP	44			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	37	Yes	2	

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	15	Yes	3	1
ELL	21	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	24	Yes	2	1
HSP	27	Yes	1	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%
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	36	Yes	1	
FRL	28	Yes	1	1

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	40			43			31					54
SWD	15			15			13				4	
ELL	26			35			20				5	54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			35			11				4	
HSP	39			49			44				5	59
MUL	44			69							2	
PAC												
WHT	56			40			40				4	
FRL	33			37			24				5	57

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	30	37	32	21	30	29	16					43
SWD	9	23	19	8	15	18	10					
ELL	24	32	17	15	18	15	5					43
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	23	32	35	14	25	26	15					
HSP	35	37	13	21	30	24	10					43
MUL	42	70		39								
PAC												
WHT	33	38	46	28	37	45	24					
FRL	26	36	35	19	23	24	15					48

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	39	41	46	38	40	42	38					42
SWD	14	19		14	35	36	18					27
ELL	25	41		26	38		14					42
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	33	42	25	44	42	23					23
HSP	33	32		38	36		29					50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	59	65		53	35		69					
FRL	32	28	41	31	33	41	29					43

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	41%	43%	-2%	54%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	53%	-4%	58%	-9%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	38%	42%	-4%	50%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	46%	51%	-5%	59%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	56%	2%	61%	-3%
05	2023 - Spring	26%	44%	-18%	55%	-29%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	28%	39%	-11%	51%	-23%

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.

Science
According to our PM3 Science data had the lowest performance at 28% proficient. PM1 and PM2 data also demonstrated underperformance. Contributing factors: our classroom walkthrough data showed a trend of gaps in instruction in the area of science among multiple grade levels.

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

Referral Count
According to our Quarterly Discipline Reports our schoolwide referral data had the greatest decline from the prior year. Referral numbers decreased 55% from the previous year. Contributing factors include PBIS system was implemented with fidelity and routines and procedures were put in place.
School grade component with least gains would be Science. The reason that more growth was not seen, was the benchmarks in previous grades which may not have been taught with fidelity.

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.

According to PM3 data our 5th grade science test scores had the greatest gap compared to the state average of 51%. The district average was 39%. Our average was 28%. Contributing factors: our

classroom walkthrough data showed a trend of gaps in instruction in the area of science among multiple grade levels.

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

According to PM3 data our 3-5 math data had the greatest increase in improvement, from 21% to 41%. Contributing factors, math planning had a heavy focus on benchmark aligned instruction and tasks. Planning allowed teachers to recognize the full intent of the standard through student work analysis.

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

According to our EWS data student attendance remains a concern. 34% of our students are missing 10% of the school year. There is a need to strengthen our MTSS sytem and problem solving in order to ensure that root causes are identified and targeted.

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

The systems identified as needing the most attention for the 23-24 school year are
Science Planning and Walkthroughs for fidelity of instruction
Attendance MTSS and problem solving
Additonal support for specific ESSA subgroups to ensure proficiency/learning gains for all students

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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

There have been inconsistencies with benchmark aligned instruction and tasks. There is work that must be done as we continue our goal towards benchmark aligned instruction and tasks. Our primary and intermediate ELA coaches, and our Math coach will work alongside teachers to develop tasks which consistently align with state benchmarks. Consistent benchmark aligned instruction will help equip our students succeed in achieving our measurable outcomes.

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

After PM1 and PM2 students will continue to show growth consistent with the state.
By January of 2024 students will show growth as follows:
ELA - 42% to 47%
Math - 41% to 47%
Science - 28% to 35%

By May of 2024 students will show growth as follows:
ELA - 42% to 52%
Math - 41% to 52%
Science - 28% to 42%

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

A combination of state and district monitoring tools will be used to measure proficiency. Elbert will use data from our district-wide school based walk through tools. The tool will allow quantification of classrooms which are seeing benchmark-based instruction, tasks which align, and checks for understanding. We will also use progress monitoring data which will allow for us to see which students/subgroups are in need of remediation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alex Wise (alex.wise@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.)

Intervention 1 - Collaborative Planning focused on benchmark task alignment and bechmark assessment alignment
Intervention 2 - Monitoring of classrooms to ensure that students experience the full intent of the benchmark

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

Research provided by TNTP shows the importance that all students receive grade level benchmark based instruciton on a daily basis.

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 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

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.

Our primary and intermediate ELA coaches, and our Math coach will work alongside teachers to develop tasks which consistently align with state benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Magen Hayes (magen.hayes@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Coaches are also supporting teachers in developing a better system to check for understanding. The questioning is systematic to ensure that the full intent of the benchmark is seen.

Person Responsible: Magen Hayes (magen.hayes@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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

66% of students and 80% of teachers had an attendance rate above 90%. Various interventions will be implemented to ensure that a proactive attendance system is supported. Primary and Intermediate Behavior Interventionists will continue to promote our positive behavior system. They will work with students and their families in developing routines that promote consistent school attendance, leading to success.

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

PBS implementation will be evident in 90% of classrooms.
75% of students will be at or above the 90% attendance rate
85% of teachers will be at or above the 90% attendance rate

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

Attendance data will be reviewed and compared by montly analysis to the previous year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Luciano Vera (luciano.vera@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.)

Intervention 1 - Update PBS System to include attendance expectation
Intervention 2 - Implement interventions for Tiered students and staff

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

Well established PBS systems, including expecations, reinforcements and rewards that direclty relate to attendance will be implemented with fidelity.

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?

Yes

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.

Primary and Intermediate Behavior Interventionists will continue to promote our positive behavior system. They will work with students and their families in developing routines that promote consistent school attendance, leading to success.

Person Responsible: Luciano Vera (luciano.vera@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Primary and Intermediate Behavior Interventionist will also work with teachers to assist in the implementation of PBS support and promote fidelity of the system.

Person Responsible: Luciano Vera (luciano.vera@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Primary and Intermediate Behavior Interventionist will also work with teachers to assist in the implementation of PBS support and promote fidelity of the system.

Person Responsible: Luciano Vera (luciano.vera@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Primary and Intermediate Behavior Interventionist will also work with teachers to assist in the implementation of PBS support and promote fidelity of the system.

Person Responsible: Luciano Vera (luciano.vera@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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.

ESSA subgroups fall below the 41% index. We will focus on strategic interventions for our subgroups in the areas of ELA, Math and Science. Our Reading Interventionist, and classroom paras will assist in the role of addressing the needs of our sub-groups through interventions in order to close the achievement gap.

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

We will increase our subgroup index to 41% for the subgroups that are above 25%. For subgroups that are 15-25%, we will increase by 15%.

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

The intervention programs will come with progress monitoring tools that will be utilized to assess growth of students. The district has provided the research-based interventions to be used, such as Corrective Reading, Reading Mastery, and Number Worlds.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Magen Hayes (magen.hayes@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.)

Research based intevention tools will be used on a daily basis.

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

The tools being aquired for our intervention programs have success measures that have been monitored over a number of years.

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?

Yes

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.

Our Reading Interventionist, and classroom paras will assist in the role of addressing the needs of our sub-groups through interventions in order to close the achievement gap.

Person Responsible: Magen Hayes (magen.hayes@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Our coaches will work to train and support teachers, so that intervention instruction is given with efficacy and fidelity.

Person Responsible: Magen Hayes (magen.hayes@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

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).

Funding allocations will be reviewed to ensure that there is a direct correlation with the immediate needs of our school population.

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

Grades K-2 instructional practice specifically relating to ELA will focus on foundations and phonics as the building blocks of literacy in order to bridge the gap in Elbert's reading achievement from 42% to 52%.

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

Grades 3-5 instructional practice specifically relating to ELA will focus on developing a love for literacy in order to encourage independent reading, increase student reading time, and bridge the gap in Elbert's reading achievement from 42% to 52%.

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

Grades K-2 will use STAR Reading as its source for progress monitoring.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Grades 3-5 will use FAST progress monitoring assessments.

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.

Elbert's RAISE Area of Focus will be monitored through school-based walk-throughs and Accelerated Reader data

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hayes, Magen, magen.hayes@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?

U-Fly Phonics and Accelerated Reader programs both meet evidence based guidelines and aligns with the BEST ELA standards.

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?

U-Fly Phonics and Accelerated Reader both address the identified needs and are proven to be effective for our target population.

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Staff will be trained in program and observed throughout implementation by literacy coaches.	Hayes, Magen, magen.hayes@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.

https://elbert.polkschoolsfl.com/
Open House Parent Meeting September 2023
SAC/CAT Meetings

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 capacity events
Data chats/conferences
Various family nights

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))

Supplemental Staff
Supplemental Resources
Collaborative Planning

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))

Data Com
Regional Meetings
Leadership Academy
ESE/ELL Support

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))

Individual and Group Counseling
Drum Beats
Community Collaboaration

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))

Nurse Lessons
DARE Lessons

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).

PBS
RTI
MTSS

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))

Data Com
UNISIG
TSSA

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))

ESE PreK
Kindergarten RoundUp
Books Bridge
Reading PALS

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				$103,831.87
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6400	130	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$51,576.42
			Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - School based/ Coaches - Literacy Coach, who co-teach, coach, and assist with the instruction of students in classrooms			
	6400	210	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG		$9,952.20
			Notes: Retirement - 13.57% -Coaches - School based /School paid			
	6400	220	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG		$5,610.49
			Notes: Social Security - 7.65% staff development activities for instructional staff at the school			
	6400	231	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG		$14,446.68
			Notes: Health and Hospitalization - School based Coaches - Literacy			
	6400	232	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG		$28.30
			Notes: Life Insurance - Coaches - School based /School paid			
	6400	240	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG		$410.70

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			Notes: Workers Compensation .56% - School based Coaches - Literacy			
	6400	160	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG	0.31	$21,807.08
			Notes: Cost sharing- Senior Coordinator of Instruction - individual will support multiple schools focusing on student learning by providing support and assistance to teachers and school-based administration. Provides extensive support and coaching services related to content-area instruction.			
2	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System**				**$72,364.53**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	130	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$50,348.94
			Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - School based/ Behavior Interventionist			
	5100	210	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG		$6,832.35
			Notes: Retirement - 13.57% - Instructional Personnel -			
	5100	220	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG		$3,851.69
			Notes: Social Security y -7.65% -Instructional personnel			
	5100	231	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG		$11,028.00
			Notes: Health and Hospitalization - Instructional Personnel			
	5100	232	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG		$21.60
			Notes: Life Insurance - Instructional personnel			
	5100	240	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG		$281.95
			Notes: Workers Compensation - .56% - Instructional Personnel			
3	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation**				**$113,029.69**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	130	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$50,925.58
			Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - School based/Reading Interventionist who works with small groups of students in need of remediation			
	5100	150	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$23,240.50
			Notes: Aides Paraprofessionals - Salaries - Classroom Paraprofessionals - who work under the direct supervision of a teacher to work with small groups of students in need of remediation			
	5100	210	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG		$10,064.34
			Notes: Retirement - 13.57% - Instructional Personnel -			
	5100	220	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG		$5,673.71
			Notes: Social Security y -7.65% -Instructional personnel			

	5100	231	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG		$22,056.00
			Notes: Health and Hospitalization - Instructional Personnel			
	5100	232	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG		$43.20
			Notes: Life Insurance - Instructional personnel			
	5100	240	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG		$415.33
			Notes: Workers Compensation .56% - School based Coaches - Literacy			
	5100	510	0591 - Elbert Elementary School	UniSIG		$611.03
			Notes: Supplies - Instructional - copy paper, notebook paper, pencils, pens, folders, post-it notes, spiral notebooks, flip charts			
					Total:	**$289,226.09**

Budget Approval

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

No