

Polk County Public Schools

Eagle Lake Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Eagle Lake Elementary School

400 CRYSTAL BEACH RD, Eagle Lake, FL 33839

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

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.

We, at Eagle Lake Elementary, supported by family and community, are committed to teaching a meaningful curriculum in a safe, positive learning environment, where students will be respectful, productive, and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Eagle Lake Elementary School is to become a healthy community of learners that develops high performing students with an emphasis on collaboration, involving families, staff members, and school community.

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
Hardesty, Bradley	Principal	Mr. Hardesty will analyze data, review, and revise the School Improvement Plan based on needs analysis. Mr. Hardesty will plan professional learning opportunities for staff that align and support out school improvement plan goals. An action plan will be established to support this process which includes monitoring and adjusting based on student data. Mr. Hardesty will collaborate with staff about data and instructional planning in the content area of ELA. In addition, as an instructional leader, Mr. Hardesty will collaborate and communicate with stakeholders to support student learning, community needs/concerns, and staff development.
Linn, Heather	Assistant Principal	Ms. Linn will lead and support the staff in promoting a safe, positive, and secure learning environment through the continuation of the PBIS/RtI behavior implementation plan. Ms. Linn will also collaborate with staff about data and instructional planning in the content areas of math and science. Ms. Linn will also oversee district progress monitoring and state assessment administration.
Jimenez, Maria	School Counselor	Our School Counselor will facilitate and support teacher implementation of behavioral and academic MTSS processes. Ms. Jimenez will counsel small group, and/or individual students regarding social emotional wellness and behavioral needs. She will also oversee the utilization and implementation of the Sanford Harmony (school-wide social emotional curriculum) at Eagle Lake Elementary.
Murphy, Amy	Reading Coach	Ms. Murphy will lead and support the implementation of literacy curriculum and corresponding data for kindergarten through fifth grade in conjunction with collaborative planning and professional learning communities (PLCs). She will also provide instructional supports to teachers through the utilization of the coaching cycle.
allen, neil	Math Coach	Mr. Allen will lead and support the implementation of mathematics curriculum and corresponding data for kindergarten through fifth grade in conjunction with collaborative planning and professional learning communities (PLCs). He will also provide instructional supports to teachers through the utilization of the coaching cycle.

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 school reviews our needs with our School Advisory Committee after each of the three progress monitoring windows close. We also continue to review and answer questions that may come up throughout the entire school year. The committee helps the school based leadership team brainstorm ways to modify our action plans to achieve the goals of the school.

In addition, the SIP plan is reviewed with the staff two times a year, at the beginning of each semester, to help focus the work of the school. The school staff is also encouraged to provide input on action steps.

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))

Eagle Lake Elementary's Leadership Team will review progress monitoring and summative assessment data at the conclusion of instructional units and progress monitoring windows. The leadership team will also review data from the standards walk through tool on a biweekly basis to determine short term action steps for classroom instruction. In addition, after the conclusion of progress monitoring windows, student assessment data will be utilized to adapt progress monitoring plans for tiered intervention. School science data will be monitored quarterly after the conclusion of the district science quarterly assessments. The school leadership team will work with the district instructional team to determine action steps and implementation.

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	63%
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)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: D 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
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	46	35	46	34	26	37	0	0	0	224
One or more suspensions	8	16	23	28	13	23	0	0	0	111
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	56	34	43	0	0	0	133
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	55	42	42	0	0	0	139
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	18	26	39	44	28	35	0	0	0	190

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	13	19	20	62	40	40	0	0	0	194

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	1	5	1	36	0	0	0	0	0	43
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	33	52	50	26	42	45	0	0	0	248
One or more suspensions	5	15	15	7	19	32	0	0	0	93
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	34	48	51	0	0	0	133
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	25	45	0	0	0	99
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	36	69	68	31	33	25	0	0	0	262

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	18	26	36	15	40	67	0	0	0	202

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	33	52	50	26	42	45	0	0	0	248
One or more suspensions	5	15	15	7	19	32	0	0	0	93
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	34	48	51	0	0	0	133
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	25	45	0	0	0	99
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	36	69	68	31	33	25	0	0	0	262

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	18	26	36	15	40	67	0	0	0	202

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	27
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*	34	45	53	36	47	56	41		
ELA Learning Gains				35			36		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				22			38		
Math Achievement*	37	49	59	45	42	50	48		
Math Learning Gains				52			34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			29		
Science Achievement*	41	41	54	31	49	59	32		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	40	54	59	51			45		

** 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	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	181
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	323
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	9	Yes	4	3
ELL	22	Yes	3	2
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	27	Yes	2	2
HSP	36	Yes	2	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	38	Yes	1	
FRL	32	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	27	Yes	3	2
ELL	27	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	36	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	37	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												
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	34			37			41					40
SWD	4			13			20				4	
ELL	18			23			18				5	40
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			30			33				4	
HSP	32			41			34				5	40
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	35			37			51				4	
FRL	30			34			34				5	40

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	36	35	22	45	52	51	31					51
SWD	14	26	22	22	44	38	12					36
ELL	10	21	11	27	35	58	6					51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	38		39	42		7					
HSP	29	24	8	44	51	56	28					49
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	47	43	43	50	57	53	44					
FRL	32	26	21	41	50	56	26					44

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	36	38	48	34	29	32					45
SWD	9	18	23	20	9	9	0					17
ELL	16	32	40	28	21		0					45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	49	53		38	27		23					
HSP	38	26	33	43	26		28					45
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	41	39		58	45		41					
FRL	39	35	14	43	28	17	25					41

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	40%	43%	-3%	54%	-14%
04	2023 - Spring	35%	53%	-18%	58%	-23%
03	2023 - Spring	28%	42%	-14%	50%	-22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	33%	51%	-18%	59%	-26%
04	2023 - Spring	34%	56%	-22%	61%	-27%
05	2023 - Spring	38%	44%	-6%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	35%	39%	-4%	51%	-16%

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 grade ELA was the lowest area of performance. One of the greatest contributing factors to the performance this year is the turnover of 3rd grade teachers. In addition, our reading coach was utilized to fulfill a classroom role, limiting the opportunity for academic coaching for the teachers that were consistently on staff.

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

4th grade math was the greatest decline from the prior year. Teacher absenteeism and student discipline were major contributing factors to this decline. These created instructional time that was not utilized to its fullest extent throughout the school year. In addition, Eagle Lake did not have a math coach. This limited the opportunity for academic coaching and action based on data for the classrooms.

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.

4th grade math was the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Teacher absenteeism and student discipline were major contributing factors to this decline. These created instructional time that

was not utilized to its fullest extent throughout the school year. In addition, Eagle Lake did not have a math coach. This limited the opportunity for academic coaching and action based on data for the classrooms.

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

5th grade math and science both showed improvements over the past assessment year. Both subject areas had experienced teachers who had previously delivered instruction on the grade level benchmarks. In addition, the fifth grade science teacher was also participating in district support programs in the area of science.

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

The area that causes the most concern is the number of suspensions. Several students spent more than one day at home and not receiving academic instruction due to their behavior at school.

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

1. Tier 1 instruction in Math
2. Tier 1 instruction in ELA
3. Student Behavior/Discipline
4. Tier 1 instruction in Science

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.

We will be focused on planning for and delivering core instruction that is aligned to the BEST standards. All students will receive grade level rigorous benchmark-aligned instruction to improve student achievement in core content areas which will decrease the gap in proficiency between Eagle Lake Elementary and the state.

Measurable Outcome:

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

State data will show an increase to 42% proficient in the areas of ELA and Mathematics for state tested grade levels.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring will be completed using the District Standard Walkthrough Tool on a weekly basis. This will ensure student mastery of benchmarks and alignment of tasks to the benchmarks in classroom instruction. Completed common assessments (formative and summative) and aligned-tasks will be analyzed reviewed, sorted, grouped, and used to determine student need toward mastery of grade-level benchmarks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@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. Utilization of Standards Walkthrough Tool for Monitoring
2. Engaging teachers in standards-based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework
- 3 -Data-driven decision-making through benchmark aligned, common assessments and tasks using student samples and performance data, including FAST progress monitoring given on student devices using headphones, as needed and provided by school.

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.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Strategy 1 - Utilization of Standards Walkthrough Tool for Monitoring

Action Step: Create a calendar for leadership team calibration and implementation.

Person Responsible: Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

By When: Calendar created by 8/11; ongoing

Strategy 1 - Utilization of Standards Walkthrough Tool for Monitoring

Action Step: Analyze data at leadership team meetings to create action steps to support an increase in student academic outcomes.

Person Responsible: Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

By When: ongoing at weekly leadership team meetings

Strategy 1 - Utilization of Standards Walkthrough Tool for Monitoring

Action Step: Monitor the impact between data review from SWT and planning per content area and grade level with the instructional coaches for mathematics and literacy.

Person Responsible: Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing at weekly collaborative planning sessions with instructional coaches - mathematics and literacy. Additional planning opportunities will be offered throughout the school year to support standards-aligned instruction and tasks.

Strategy 2 - Planning with the Learning Arc Framework

Action Step: Create a master schedule that allows for grade level collaborative planning time.

Person Responsible: Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

By When: 8/11

Strategy 2 - Planning with the Learning Arc Framework

Action Step: Conduct weekly collaborative planning utilizing the learning arc framework with facilitated support from instructional coaches for literacy and mathematics.

Person Responsible: Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

By When: ongoing at weekly collaborative planning sessions

Strategy 2 - Planning with the Learning Arc Framework

Action Step: Conduct correlation analysis between SWT observations and benchmarks planned using the Learning Arc Framework

Person Responsible: Bradley Hardesty (bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net)

By When: monthly at leadership team meetings

Strategy 3 -Data-driven decision-making through benchmark aligned, common assessments and tasks using student samples and performance data, including FAST progress monitoring given on student devices using headphones, as needed and provided by school.

Action Step: Conduct schedule times within collaborative planning to allow the reviewing of results of common assessments and tasks. Review and analyze progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible: Amy Murphy (amy.murphy@polk-fl.net)

By When: During weekly collaborative planning.

Strategy 3 - Reading and mathematics interventionist will assist with provision of interventions for students identified from common assessments and tasks tied to benchmarks.

Action Step; Identify additional students needing additional push-in support from interventionist.

Person Responsible: Amy Murphy (amy.murphy@polk-fl.net)

By When: Following SBLT and collaborative planning - ongoing (Revised and revisited frequently)

#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.

We will have a focus on reducing the number of student referrals and reducing the number of days in out of school suspension.

Measurable Outcome:

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

There will be a 50% reduction in office referrals this school year.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will meet monthly to discuss discipline data from FOCUS as well as classroom walk-through data found in Journey. The collected and monitored data includes, student office discipline referrals, out-of-school suspensions, in school suspensions, frequency data, and demographic data. This data will provide insight into areas of need and support related to student data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Linn (heather.linn1@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The Behavior Interventionist will allow for a more targeted approach for monitoring school-wide interventions and implementation of strategies to reach our most fragile learners as well as the opportunity to support staff with side-by-side coaching, feedback, use monitoring tools and weekly meetings with admin to discuss success, areas of concerns and next steps.

We will also implement CHAMPS and Sanford Harmony schoolwide. Student incentives will be utilized throughout the course of the school year to support PBIS implementation and reward positive student behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS assists in addressing behaviors that precede or lead to suspensions through establishing a positive social and academic culture. This structure provides a systematic approach that addresses student needs within tiered interventions.

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.

Update schoolwide PBIS plan

Person Responsible: Heather Linn (heather.linn1@polk-fl.net)

By When: Initial plan 8/11; ongoing updates monthly

Review discipline data

Person Responsible: Heather Linn (heather.linn1@polk-fl.net)

By When: monthly at leadership team meetings

Train teachers on implementation of CHAMPS; monitor weekly for implementation during classroom walkthroughs

Person Responsible: Heather Linn (heather.linn1@polk-fl.net)

By When: training by 8/11; monitoring ongoing through weekly walkthroughs

Implement Sanford Harmony Social Emotional Curriculum schoolwide

Person Responsible: Maria Jimenez (maria.jimenez@polk-fl.net)

By When: training by 8/11; monitoring ongoing through weekly walkthroughs

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).

Based on previous years' data it is evident that small group instruction in both ELA and Math are in need of support with materials, personnel, and planning. The addition of an ELA Interventionist and a Math Interventionist this year will afford us the opportunities to target specific subgroups for remediation, intervention, and acceleration. Additional paraprofessionals will also allow for small groups and targeted instruction using scripted lessons from the districts RTD lessons, lessons created by subject area district coordinators while also pushing in for Number Worlds and Corrective Reading.

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

The identification and implementation of appropriate and effective resources with fidelity has been an area of need for our teachers, specifically within the realm of literacy. Differentiation needs to occur within the classroom for intervention and acceleration of student learning. We will increase our K-5 reading proficiency through a focus on decoding, phonemic awareness, and phonics instruction in our primary grades (K-2). This will also be inclusive of aligned, benchmark-based instruction through the use of the Learning Arc Framework.

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

The identification and implementation of appropriate and effective resources with fidelity has been an area of need for our teachers, specifically within the realm of literacy. Differentiation needs to occur within the classroom for intervention and acceleration of student learning. We will increase our K-5 reading proficiency through an emphasis on comprehension and fluency in our intermediate grades (3-5). This will also be inclusive of aligned, benchmark-based instruction through the use of the Learning Arc Framework.

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

State PM data will show an increase to 42% proficient in the areas of ELA and Mathematics with progress monitoring.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

State data will show an increase to 42% proficient in the areas of ELA and Mathematics for state tested grade levels.

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 toward our goals will be monitored using the District Standardized Walkthrough Tool and will be reviewed to ensure student mastery of benchmarks taught within the classroom in alignment with common planning practices and results.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hardesty, Bradley, bradley.hardesty@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?

Monitor classroom instruction using the Standardized Classroom Walkthrough Tool. This tool will assist in identifying students’ access and engagement in equitable experiences based on the state benchmarks and standards.

Engage teachers in standards-based (benchmarks) planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The 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, assessments, and experiences.

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
<p>Strategy 1. Provide teachers with common planning for development of common tasks and assessments and data analysis. Action step: Establish planning protocols supporting standards (benchmark) based instruction and student data analysis.</p>	<p>Hardesty, Bradley, bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net</p>
<p>Strategy 1. Provide professional learning opportunities for the development of common tasks and assessments. Action step: Identify and design benchmark-based, common tasks and assessments to support student data analysis within literacy.</p>	<p>Murphy, Amy, amy.murphy@polk-fl.net</p>
<p>Strategy 1. Provide professional learning opportunities for the effective data analysis of student artifacts. Action step: Identify and design benchmark-based, common tasks and assessments to support student data analysis within literacy.</p>	<p>Hardesty, Bradley, bradley.hardesty@polk-fl.net</p>

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

Methods utilized for dissemination of the SIP, UniSIG budget, and SWP to stake holders will include, but are not limited school website usage, Facebook posts, School Advisory Council, family engagement nights, and school newsletters.

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))

Through the use of family engagement opportunities, school messenger chat, agendas, and written/ verbal communication will contribute to keeping parents/families informed of school activities and supports for students.

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))

- PBiS
- RTI
- MTSS
- Behavior Interventionist, Mathematics and Literacy Interventionist, Mental Health Counselors, and School Counselors

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))

Eagle Lake Elementary has an identified threat assessment team trained with CSTAG. Our school counselor, social worker, mental health facilitator, and school psychologist support our students in kindergarten and first using the second-step program. Our students receive tier one supports through the use of our core social-emotional curriculum (Sanford Harmony). Students in need of greater support have the opportunity to participate in peer groups and lessons built for their specific needs. If students and families are needing further assistance, our school connects them to outside resources (wraparound services).

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))

We encourage our staff and plan for technology infused lessons. Our students have the opportunity to participate in field trips to support postsecondary and workforce education. We have also engaged our community through business partners and approved volunteers to share their experiences with student led interviews. Each year our students are exposed to various workforce and postsecondary during the Great American Teach-In.

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).

The utilization of the MTSS framework is prevalent throughout everything thing we do within Eagle Lake.

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))

In an effort to better support our students within the learning environment and at school, our staff has been trained to use PBIS, verbal de-escalation, and various positive framed classroom management protocols. Our staff is also receiving additional training on benchmark-aligned tasks and the development of common assessments. Through the development of these tasks and assessments, our staff will engage in deepening their understanding of assessment and data literacy. This will lead to more structured, intentional instruction meeting students' needs.

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))

Eagle Lake Elementary provides opportunities for our Pre-K families to visit our kindergarten classrooms and receive additional information during Kindergarten Roundup. Throughout the school year all families are invited and encouraged to attend functions that engage families in gaining deeper and relevant insight into the K-5 academic realm.

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				\$307,858.49
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	130	1701 - Eagle Lake Elementary School	UniSIG	2.0	\$120,919.50
			<i>Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - School based/ Math and Reading Interventionist who work with small groups of students in need of remediation</i>			
	5100	210	1701 - Eagle Lake Elementary School	UniSIG	2.0	\$16,408.78
			<i>Notes: Retirement - 13.57% - Instructional Personnel -</i>			
	5100	220	1701 - Eagle Lake Elementary School	UniSIG	2.0	\$9,250.34
			<i>Notes: Social Security y -7.65% -Instructional personnel</i>			
	5100	231	1701 - Eagle Lake Elementary School	UniSIG	2.0	\$22,056.00
			<i>Notes: Health and Hospitalization - Instructional Personnel</i>			
	5100	232	1701 - Eagle Lake Elementary School	UniSIG	2.0	\$43.20
			<i>Notes: Life Insurance - Instructional personnel</i>			
	5100	240	1701 - Eagle Lake Elementary School	UniSIG	2.0	\$677.15
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation - .56% - Instructional Personnel</i>			

	6400	130	1701 - Eagle Lake Elementary School	UniSIG	2.0	\$73,150.60
			<i>Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - School based/ Coaches - 1 Literacy Coach, 1 Instructional Coach, who co-teach, coach, and assist with the instruction of students in classrooms</i>			
	6400	210	1701 - Eagle Lake Elementary School	UniSIG		\$18,644.42
			<i>Notes: Retirement - 13.57% -Coaches - School based /School paid</i>			
	6400	220	1701 - Eagle Lake Elementary School	UniSIG		\$7,368.32
			<i>Notes: Social Security - 7.65% staff development activities for instructional staff at the school</i>			
	6400	231	1701 - Eagle Lake Elementary School	UniSIG		\$14,667.24
			<i>Notes: Health and Hospitalization - School based Coaches</i>			
	6400	232	1701 - Eagle Lake Elementary School	UniSIG		\$28.73
			<i>Notes: Life Insurance - Coaches - School based /School paid</i>			
	6400	240	1701 - Eagle Lake Elementary School	UniSIG		\$539.38
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation .56% - School based Coaches</i>			
	5100	519	1701 - Eagle Lake Elementary School	UniSIG		\$893.67
			<i>Notes: Technology-Related Supplies - vendor (Smiley's), 89 headsets at \$9.95 each</i>			
	6400	160	1701 - Eagle Lake Elementary School	UniSIG	0.33	\$23,211.16
			<i>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.</i>			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				\$0.00
					Total:	\$307,858.49

Budget Approval

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

Yes