

Polk County Public Schools

# Lake Shipp Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>24</b>

## Lake Shipp Elementary School

250 CAMELLIA DR, Winter Haven, FL 33880

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

### 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.

At Lake Shipp Elementary, we will foster a learning environment that helps students understand the purpose of learning while actively engaged in student centered activities.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision:

At Lake Shipp Elementary students are educated through a collaborative team consisting of parents, school staff, peers, and the community to become lifelong learners. Children take risks and become productive and innovative without fear of failure; their gifts and talents are recognized and celebrated.

MOTTO:

Be Responsible  
Be Respectful  
Be Safe

### 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
Raub, Kathryn	Principal	
Wilson, Marte	Assistant Principal	
Spencer, Artesha	School Counselor	
Sierra, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	
Mason, Malissa	Teacher, K-12	
Dampier, Misty	Teacher, K-12	
Bradwell, Likisha	Teacher, K-12	

#### Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The school leadership team reflects on the schoolwide data to help create a focus for the upcoming year. When looking at our data this year, 40% ELA proficiency, 51% Math proficiency, and 41% Science proficiency, a plan was developed for the upcoming year to continue to focus on Instructional Practices specifically focusing on Standards Aligned Instruction. Action steps were also developed to address the needs of individual subgroups that scored below the 41%. Our SAC members (parents and community members) work together to review the schoolwide data and SIP goals. They provide feedback and

suggestions to support these goals that we use to help develop a plan to help improve student achievement.

### 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 administration will conduct monthly leadership team meetings to analyze school wide progress monitoring data, Qualtrics walkthrough tool data, and PLC communication data. Action plans will be set for individual teachers that need extra support and adjustments to walkthrough calendars will be made to monitor those teacher's progress. If additional support is needed for students and/or staff a plan will be made at that time.

During instructional planning, the leadership team will help ensure that the instructional tasks and assessments are aligned to the benchmarks. They support the teachers by providing strategies, modeling instruction and giving feedback. Our teachers/staff are on the frontlines of the impact and focus of our goals which are meeting the needs both academically and social emotional needs of students to achieve their goals.

### Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	74%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)*
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: D 2019-20: C 2018-19: C

	2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

### 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	42	37	37	47	25	29	0	0	0	217	
One or more suspensions	3	3	11	14	16	21	0	0	0	68	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	37	14	30	0	0	0	81	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	18	8	25	0	0	0	51	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	17	42	38	30	10	32	0	0	0	169	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	8	15	21	40	26	37	0	0	0	147

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	22	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

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



Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	47	44	44	41	37	32	0	0	0	245	
One or more suspensions	13	22	12	16	15	40	0	0	0	118	
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	40	37	35	0	0	0	112	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	40	24	53	0	0	0	117	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	50	39	65	42	19	18	0	0	0	233	

**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	19	25	24	22	35	55	0	0	0	180

**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	30	0	0	0	0	0	30
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	47	44	44	41	37	32	0	0	0	245	
One or more suspensions	13	22	12	16	15	40	0	0	0	118	
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	40	37	35	0	0	0	112	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	40	24	53	0	0	0	117	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	50	39	65	42	19	18	0	0	0	233	

**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	19	25	24	22	35	55	0	0	0	180

**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	30	0	0	0	0	0	30
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*	37	45	53	40	47	56	41		
ELA Learning Gains				50			27		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			20		
Math Achievement*	46	49	59	36	42	50	32		
Math Learning Gains				28			30		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				23			47		
Science Achievement*	45	41	54	17	49	59	29		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	54	54	59	51			66		

\* 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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	223
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	286
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	2	2
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	2	
HSP	46			
MUL	19	Yes	3	2
PAC				
WHT	48			

**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
FRL	44			

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	14	Yes	1	1
ELL	27	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	28	Yes	1	1
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL	20	Yes	2	1
PAC				
WHT	43			
FRL	35	Yes	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**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	37			46			45					54
SWD	10			22			10				4	
ELL	33			45			29				5	54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			40			50				4	
HSP	40			52			38				5	55
MUL	8			30							2	

## 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
PAC												
WHT	44			47			53				4	
FRL	36			46			41				5	54

## 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	40	50	41	36	28	23	17					51
SWD	13	21		21	10	8	8					
ELL	23	48		19	23		0					51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	53	29	28	22	21	11					
HSP	33	51	67	37	33	20	17					45
MUL	33			7								
PAC												
WHT	58	46		51	30		31					
FRL	38	50	41	30	26	25	18					54

## 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	41	27	20	32	30	47	29					66
SWD	0			4	40							
ELL	30	38		26	33		31					66
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	26		25	12		6					
HSP	25	28		26	41		32					70
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	57	29		50	29		50					
FRL	37	22	10	23	24	50	17					74

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	33%	43%	-10%	54%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	53%	-5%	58%	-10%
03	2023 - Spring	40%	42%	-2%	50%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	63%	51%	12%	59%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	56%	-12%	61%	-17%
05	2023 - Spring	35%	44%	-9%	55%	-20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	44%	39%	5%	51%	-7%

### 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.**

3rd and 5th grade language arts and 5th grade science proficiency. Lack of appropriate planning to address the standards and the task does not fully address the standards. ELA continues to be an area of focus with little growth in data towards proficiency.

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

We showed gains in proficiency in all data components. The least amount of growth was in our ELA proficiency. The lack of standards based instruction contributed to the lack of growth in ELA.

**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.**

Our 5th grade ELA had the greatest gap with the state average. Our proficiency is 33% and the State is at 54%. The lack of standards based and instruction and target/task alignment contributed to the gap. When reviewing the data it was also noted that the 2nd greatest gap was in 5th grade math with the school being at 35% proficiency and the state at 55%.

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

Math proficiency in all grade levels showed the most improvement. We planned according to the standards, the task assigned addressed the standard being taught, implemented small group instruction, monitored classroom instruction, and adjusted instruction based on data.

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

Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency  
Students absent 10% or more days

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

Standards aligned instruction

Target/Task Alignment

Insure that Inclusion Teachers and ELL paras are using research based strategies during push ins.

Additional small group instruction for students in the ESSA subgroups.

### **Area of Focus**

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

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Data from FAST shows that our proficiency level in ELA 40%, Science 41%, and Math is 51%. When incorporating standards' aligned instruction and target task alignment all students will receive grade appropriate assignments, strong instruction, and deep engagement every day. Implementing small group instruction and using research based strategies in these groups will target our ESSA subgroups.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

State data will show a minimum of 5% increase in proficiency for all grades and content areas as well as 10% of the students just below the proficiency level becoming proficient. When looking at teacher increase in academic performance we should see an increase to 75%-100% in all focus areas when using the Qualtrics Walkthrough Tool.

**Monitoring:**

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

Weekly walkthroughs using the Qualtrics Walkthrough Tool will be used to measure planning and teacher effectiveness to ensure students are mastering Benchmarks being taught after planning is properly implemented. The teacher effectiveness will be measured by the data analysis of the FAST and STAR Progress monitoring.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

1. Monitor classroom instruction using the Qualtrics Walkthrough Tool. This tool will help show whether or not students are engaged in equitable experiences based on the state standards.
2. Engage teachers in standards based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework.
3. Inclusion teachers and ELL paras are provided support with understanding the BEST standards and how to support their students. Additional professional support is available based on individual needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Opportunity Myth speaks to the relationship between academic success and ensuring that every student should have access to grade-appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and teachers with high expectations, every day, in every class—regardless of their race, ethnicity, or any other part of their identity. It is imperative that we monitor for alignment and plan for teacher's understanding of the Benchmarks and aligned tasks and 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. Qualtrics Walkthrough Monitoring Tool

Create calendar for leadership team calibration walks by 8/11/23.

**Person Responsible:** Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** A weekly walkthrough calendar will be created each week by the school principal, it will be shared with administration on the Friday before each week.

## 1. Qualtrics Walkthrough Monitoring Tool

Conduct calibration walks with leadership team monthly.

**Person Responsible:** Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** This will be complete when the team shows 90-100% calibrated consistency focusing on standards based instruction and targeted task alignment.

## 1. Qualtrics Walkthrough Monitoring Tool

Add walkthrough data review to every leadership team meeting agenda.

**Person Responsible:** Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** This will be on the monthly leadership team meeting for the entire year.

## 2. Planning with the Learning Arc Framework

Create master schedule that includes intentional collaborative planning.

Conduct planning protocol on a weekly basis.

Math & Science Interventionist assist with the Learning Arc Framework and lesson planning.

**Person Responsible:** Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** This will be common practice throughout the school year.

## 2. Planning with the Learning Arc Framework

Conduct correlation analysis between WT findings and Benchmarks planned for using the Learning Arc.

**Person Responsible:** Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** This will be common practice throughout the school year.

## 3. Small Group Instruction

Focus on individual student needs through small group and extended learning. Classroom paras will assist with small groups alongside the teacher.

**Person Responsible:** Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** This will be common practice throughout the school year.

4. After reviewing the walkthrough data with the leadership team we will use this information to direct support where needed. Leadership team members can serve as support for their grade levels and teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** This will be common practice throughout the school year.

5. After school tutoring will be provided by teachers and paras to support those students with additional needs throughout the year. This will be monitored with STAR/FAST data and Pre/Post test during tutoring.

**Person Responsible:** Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** This will be common practice throughout the year.

**#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.

Having a positive school environment continues to be an area to improve on. Discipline issues and absenteeism on the campus contributed to low student attendance and a decrease in student achievement. Time was taken from classroom instruction and redirected to classroom issues with students. The high number of days absent directly related to the time students received quality classroom instruction.

In 2022-2023 students missed a total of 9,981 days due to absences, 235 of those days are a result of suspensions resulting from discipline issues on campus.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

To increase the percentage of students in attendance 90% of the time from 89% to 93% and to decrease the discipline referrals by 20% (235-188). This will increase the time students receive standards based instruction in the classroom.

**Monitoring:**

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

Discipline/PBIS Team will meet monthly to monitor student discipline reports and to make adjustments to the school discipline plan and/or PBIS plan as needed.

Office staff will run monthly reports of absences and share with administration.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Marte Wilson (marte.wilson@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.)

Sanford Harmony Kits- social emotional learning program

PBIS - Monthly staff professional development (2x10, 3:1 ratio, etc.) to help build relationships between staff and students to help improve student attendance. When students have a positive culture/school experience they want to attend daily.

MTSS

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Sanford Harmony provides educators the tools to foster social connections among all students, and to support the social, emotional, and cognitive skills students need to successfully negotiate peer interactions, develop positive peer relationships, and thrive in school.

PBIS seeks to improve school climate, reduce discipline issues, and support academic achievement.

MTSS is a framework that we use to provide targeted support to struggling students, the goal is to intervene early so students can catch up with their peers.

**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. School Wide Discipline Plan

Train staff on the school wide discipline plan

**Person Responsible:** Marte Wilson (marte.wilson@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** First week of school, completed by 8/11/23

#### 1. School Wide Discipline Plan

Add discipline data review to every Discipline/PBIS monthly meeting. Make adjustments to the plan as needed.

**Person Responsible:** Marte Wilson (marte.wilson@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** This will be done monthly throughout the entire school year.

#### 1. School Wide Discipline Plan

Monitor impact between data review of discipline and interventions for students with discipline concerns.

**Person Responsible:** Marte Wilson (marte.wilson@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** 2. PBIS Framework This will be done monthly throughout the entire school year.

#### 2. PBIS Framework

Create master schedule of PBIS events.

**Person Responsible:** Marte Wilson (marte.wilson@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** 8/18/23

#### 2. PBIS Framework

Train staff on the PBIS framework.

**Person Responsible:** Marte Wilson (marte.wilson@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** First week of school, completed by 8/11/23

#### 2. PBIS Framework

Add PBIS data review to every Discipline/PBIS monthly meeting

**Person Responsible:** Marte Wilson (marte.wilson@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** This will be done monthly throughout the entire school year.

#### 2 PBIS Framework

Make adjustments to the PBIS framework as needed and plan interventions for those that it is not helping.

**Person Responsible:** Marte Wilson (marte.wilson@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** This will be done monthly throughout the entire school year.

### CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

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

Engage teachers in standards-based planning utilizing the Learning Arc Framework. Included in this process is knowing the benchmark and what should be taught as well as planning appropriate task for that benchmark. Based on the data collected from the end of the year screening 42% of the students in kindergarten, 23% of the students in 1st grade, and 23% of the students in 2nd grade are below proficiency.

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

Engage teachers in standards-based planning utilizing the Learning Arc Framework. Included in this process is knowing the benchmark and what should be taught as well as planning appropriate task for that benchmark. Solicit coaching advice from the District Literacy Coaches on other ways to increase proficiency in 3rd- 5th grade. Based on the data collected from the FAST test, 60% of the students in 3rd grade, 52% of the students in 4th grade, and 65% of the students in 5th grade are below proficiency.

### 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

We expect our kindergarten students to increase 8% in ELA (42%-50%), our 1st graders to increase 15% (23% to 38%), and our 2nd graders to increase 15% (23%-38%). This will be measured with the data from the STAR Assessment.

### **Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

We expect for our 3rd grade students to increase 10% in ELA (40%-50%), our 4th grade to increase 3% (48%-51%), and our 5th grade to increase 10% (35%-45%) This will be measured using the FAST Statewide Assessment data.

## **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.

Progress monitoring data will be collected using the Qualtrics Walkthrough tool and will be reviewed to ensure students are mastering benchmarks being taught after planning is properly implemented. We will also use the STAR and FAST assessment data to monitor student improvement. This data will be used to determine small group instruction and after school tutoring. Pre and Post testing will be used in tutoring and small group. This additional assistance will be provided by teachers and paras.

### **Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Raub, Kathryn, kathryn.raub@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 will use the McGraw Hill Reading Wonders program for whole group instruction, Corrective Reading and SRA Reading Mastery will be used in small group with those needing additional assistance. In the K-2 classrooms we will also use the Wiley Blevins program, Phonics to Reading.

All of these are evidence based programs and align to the BESYT ELA Standards. They are also aligned to the District's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan.

**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?

These programs were selected since they are evidence based and are provided by the District.

**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
Reading teachers will be trained on Corrective Reading and K-2 Reading Mastery.	Raub, Kathryn, kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net
All K-2 students will be screened for the SRA Reading Mastery Program and all new students to 3-5 will be screened for Corrective Reading. These results will be used to appropriately place the students in these programs.	Raub, Kathryn, kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net
All grade levels have a dedicated hour each day to work on reading intervention. Administration will monitor the implementation of these programs and provide feedback to teachers when needed.	Raub, Kathryn, kathryn.raub@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.



School/District Webpage  
PEN Notebook  
Parent/Family/Community Input Meetings  
Annual Meeting

**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  
Staff Capacity Building Professional Development  
Conferencing  
Family/School Relationship  
Family/Community Input  
Data Chats/Conferences  
Webpage  
Annual Meeting  
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)**

Supplemental Staff (academic coaches, interventionists, paraprofessionals)  
Supplemental Resources  
Extended Learning  
Professional Development  
Collaborative Planning  
RTD  
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))**

Data Com  
School Improvement Planning Trainings  
Regional (area) Meetings  
Summer Leadership Academy  
Title 1 Technical Assistance- Use of Funds, PFE Input, Back to School Meeting  
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Technical Assistance  
ESE, Migrant, Early Childhood

#### **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))**

<https://polkschoolsfl.com/mentalhealth/>

Individual Counseling

Group Counseling

Drumbeat Class

Collaboration with community providers- Peace River Center, Watson Clinic Behavioral Health, Sweet Center- Winter Haven Hospital

Support Groups

Grief Support

Children's Home Society

**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).**

PBIS

RTI

MTSS

Mental Health Counselors, School Counselors

**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))**

Professional Learning Communities to Improve Instruction and Data

Data Com

RTD

UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation

Collective Bargaining Stipends- Title 1, Critical Shortage Area, Highly Effective

Recruitment and Educator Quality Department- PCPS Culture Ambassador Program

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

Early Childhood- <https://polkschoolsfl.com/earlychildhood/>

VPK Title 1)

Kindergarten Round Up

Kindergarten Readiness Camps

Books Bridge Bus

migrant Early Childhood Services

## 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				\$267,362.25
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	510	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG		\$2,100.94
			<i>Notes: Supplies - Instructional - copy paper, ink, flip charts, notebook paper, pencils, folders, spiral notebooks, post-its</i>			
	5900	120	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG		\$25,200.00
			<i>Notes: Classroom Teachers - Provide stipends to Teachers to provide supplemental after school tutoring, 12 teachers, 3 hours per week for 20 weeks, \$35 per hour</i>			
	5900	130	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG		\$2,100.00
			<i>Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel- Stipends for interventionists to provide supplementary after school tutoring, 1 Interventionist, 3 hours per week for 20 weeks, \$35 per hour</i>			
	5900	210	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG		\$3,704.61
			<i>Notes: Retirement - 13.57% - Instructional personnel for extended learning</i>			
	5900	220	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG		\$2,088.45
			<i>Notes: Social Security - 7.65% - Instructional personnel for extended learning</i>			
	5900	240	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG		\$152.88
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation -.56% - Instructional personnel for extended learning</i>			
	5100	130	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$57,856.92
			<i>Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - School based/ Math Interventionist- who work with small groups of students in need of remediation</i>			
	5100	150	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG	3.0	\$73,618.06
			<i>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</i>			
	5100	210	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG		\$17,841.15
			<i>Notes: Retirement - 13.57% - Instructional Personnel -</i>			
	5100	220	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG		\$10,057.84
			<i>Notes: Social Security y -7.65% -Instructional personnel</i>			
	5100	231	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG		\$44,112.00
			<i>Notes: Health and Hospitalization - Instructional Personnel</i>			

	5100	232	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG		\$86.40
			Notes: Life Insurance - Instructional personnel			
	5100	240	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG		\$736.26
			Notes: Workers Compensation - .56% - Instructional Personnel			
	6400	160	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG	0.29	\$20,068.12
			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.			
	6400	210	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG		\$2,762.75
			Notes: Retirement - 13.57% -Coaches - School based /School paid			
	6400	220	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG		\$1,557.48
			Notes: Social Security - 7.65% staff development activities for instructional staff at the school			
	6400	231	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG		\$3,198.12
			Notes: Health and Hospitalization - School based Coaches - Math, Literacy, Science			
	6400	232	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG		\$6.26
			Notes: Life Insurance - Coaches - School based /School paid			
	6400	240	0621 - Lake Shipp Elementary School	UniSIG		\$114.01
			Notes: Workers Compensation .56% - School based Coaches - Math, Literacy, Science			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				\$0.00
Total:						\$267,362.25

### Budget Approval

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

No