Poinciana Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Poinciana Elementary School

1407 KENNEDY DR, Key West, FL 33040

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Tara Whitehead L

Start Date for this Principal: 8/28/2022

2019-20 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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	58%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (53%) 2020-21: (49%) 2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Kati Pearson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Monroe County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

MISSION: Building Leaders - Every Day!

Provide the school's vision statement.

VISION: Building Leaders for Life!

School Leadership Team

Membership
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.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities	
Whitehead, Tara	Principal		Operations and Instructional Leader
Roberts, Heidi	Assistant Principal		Student Behavior, School Climate, School Assessment Coordinator and Truancy
Finigan, Lesley	Reading Coach		Literacy Coach and MTSS Coordinator
Galvan, Jean	Math Coach		Mathematics/Data Coach, Professional Development Contact, MTSS Coordinator
Maxwell, Annette	Guidance Counselor		Counseling Services, School Climate, PBIS Coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 8/28/2022, Tara Whitehead L

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

Total number of students enrolled at the school

495

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

13

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

12

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	86	74	88	86	78	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	495
Attendance below 90 percent	18	7	8	9	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	23	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	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 who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	3	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/11/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	75	87	82	83	88	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	492
Attendance below 90 percent	17	9	14	9	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	17	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	58	29	35	37	41	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	249

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	75	87	82	83	88	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	492
Attendance below 90 percent	17	9	14	9	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	17	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	58	29	35	37	41	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	249

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	50%	54%	56%	58%			63%	70%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	56%	61%	57%			63%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	46%	52%	24%			62%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	59%	57%	60%	62%			65%	71%	63%
Math Learning Gains	57%	61%	64%	49%			67%	64%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	51%	55%	35%			66%	56%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	48%	51%	56%			61%	66%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	64%	70%	-6%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	58%	2%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					
	2019	61%	62%	-1%	56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	63%	62%	1%	62%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	60%	3%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					
	2019	68%	66%	2%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	62%	65%	-3%	53%	9%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	24	37	33	35	49	39	33				
ELL	36	48	55	44	53	50	50				
BLK	28	42	47	40	35	36	45				
HSP	49	60	46	53	58	47	65				
WHT	64	57		74	69		71				
FRL	49	53	57	54	52	48	63				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	34	38		40	38		45				
ELL	43	50	18	55	50		39				
BLK	37	40		51	33		33				
HSP	53	53		57	50		59				
WHT	72	70		72	55		65				
FRL	48	42	9	53	36	38	37				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	41	48	50	44	65	52	25				
ELL	38	50	53	51	65	60	21				
BLK	47	54	50	43	56	53	29				
HSP	59	60	65	62	65	65	53				
WHT	77	73		81	73		82				
FRL	53	58	60	55	66	66	47				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	438
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

According to 2021-22 FLDOE School Grade Report of Students with Disabilities, SWD students have demonstrated a decrease in achievement by 10 percentage points on the ELA Assessment and 5 percentage points on the Math Assessment from 2020-2021 assessments. More concerning, SWD students demonstrated a decrease in achievement by 17 percentage points on the ELA Assessment and a decrease of 9 percentage points on the Math Assessment from 2019 to 2021, as measured by the statewide assessment.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based off progress monitoring data and 2022 state assessments, Poinciana Elementary' s SWD student population demonstrates the greatest need for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Factors that contribute to this need for improvement include staffing, lack of curriculum , data driven instruction, learning loss due to COVID-19.
To address the issues of staffing, our Administration took a proactive approach and began the process of recruiting highly qualified educators with experience and certification in their subject areas in March of 2022. The Interventionist have a focus on the SWD students providing more intensive support based on the needs of the students' Individualized Education Plans.
To address the issue of Curriculum, our District has adopted state approved ELA and Math Curriculum that is aligned with the B.E.S.T. Standards.
To address the issue of student/teacher accountability, our School plans to implement data chats and the researched based strategy of Student Self-Reported Grades and Goals to enhance quality of data driven instruction.
To address the issue of learning loss due to COVID-19, our District/School has prioritized attendance initiatives for the 2022-2023 school year and after school tutoring that is specific to our urgent intervention and intervention students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based off of Progress Monitoring and 2022 State Assessment data, Students in our ELA Lowest 25% increased from 24% in 2021 to 47% in 2022 for an increase of 23 percentage points. Student in our Math Lowest 25% increased from 35% in 2021 to 42% in 2022 for an increase of 7 percentage points.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The cohort of students in the ELA Lowest 25% was identified to carry a large population of English Language Learner students. POI strategically revamped staffing patterns and placed students from this cohort into Co-Taught classrooms to better support their success and achievement.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

The strategy that will be implemented for the 2022-2023 school year, to support the SWD students in grades 3-5, is John Hattie's researched based strategies of Student Self-Grading through our Grade Level Data Chats. Teacher led small group instruction, another Hattie research based strategy, will also be implemented in our classrooms during the ELA and Math instruction.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The professional learning opportunities that will be provided throughout the school year are support from the district level Curriculum Specialists, weekly grade level planning meetings to review data, school based data analysis professional learning, support of teacher led small group instruction through coaching, and teacher led small group instruction PL.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

In order to ensure sustainability of improvement for this year and beyond, we will continue to collaborate with parents through conferences, continue and expand data chats, prioritize staffing based on student needs, continue SWD professional learning for all teachers, and continue to promote the implementation of teacher led small group instruction.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	According to the provided FLDOE data, POI's subgroup with the largest achievement gap is our students with disabilities.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By providing ESE students with appropriate supports, ESE students will make learning gains and begin to close the achievement gap. Specifically for the 2022-2023 school year, our goal is to see the achievement gap narrowed by 10% percentage points.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will utilize State/District Progress Monitoring Data to monitor progress towards our goals for ELA and Math achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heidi Roberts (heidi.roberts@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	John Hattie's research demonstrates that Student Reported Grading has an effect size of 1.33. We will utilize this evidence based strategy to support our goals for ELA and Math achievement. Through school wide data-chats, students will reflect and/or make predictions about academic progress and develop ownership of their academic ability and growth.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	According John Hattie's research, children are the most accurate when predicting how they will perform. Self-reported grades is a practice by which students assess the quality of their own work or their level of mastery over a given objective. With an effect size of 1.33, it can provide up to three years of additional growth in learning for every year, which will support all 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students in academic growth and success, thus resulting in a rise in achievement scores on the statewide assessment.

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.

Identify current 4th and 5th grade SWD students performing below satisfactory on the 2021-22 Statewide FSA ELA and Math Assessments. Identify current 3rd grade SWD students who scored below grade level on the F.A.S.T PM1 Assessment.

Person Responsible	Jean Galvan (jean.galvan@keysschools.com)

Develop system for collecting data on Student Reported Grading for use in Data Chats.

Person Responsible	Heidi Roberts (heidi.roberts@keysschools.com)

Admin will meet with Grade 3-5 BLPT Reps to discuss implementation of Student Reported Grades and Goals Data Chats.

Person Responsible	Tara Whitehead (tara.whitehead@keysschools.com)

Ensure BLPT communicates plan for implementation and works with Poinciana Leadership Team (PLT) to schedule student/teacher data chats.

Person Responsible	Lesley Finigan (lesley.finigan@keysschools.com)

Coaches will support Classroom Teachers on implementation of Data Chats/Student Reported Grades and Goals.

Person Responsible	Jean Galvan (jean.galvan@keysschools.com)

Complete admin/teacher and student/teacher data chats after the PM1 and PM2 Assessments, making academic modifications as needed to increase achievement.

Person Responsible	Lesley Finigan (lesley.finigan@keysschools.com)

PLT will review Student Self Reporting Grades and Goals data.

Person Responsible	Tara Whitehead (tara.whitehead@keysschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	According to our 2021-22 FSA Data, POI's ELA Achievement data has demonstrated a decrease in ELA Achievement since COVID. In 2019, students performed at 63%, in 2021 students performed at 58%, and in 2022 students performed at 50% Satisfactory Achievement on the State Assessment. This data indicates a need for more explicit direct instruction in a differentiated Teacher Led small group setting.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Our 2022-23 goal for overall ELA Achievement in grades fourth and fifth is to increase from 43% (current fourth grade) and 40% (current fifth grade) to 55% of all fourth and fifth grade students achieving a level 3 or higher on the FAST assessment. By mid year, 49% of fourth and fifth grade students will achieve a level 3 or higher on the FAST PM2 ELA assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Teachers will incorporate Explicit Direct Small Group Instruction into their lessons weekly. 75% of weekly walkthrough data will demonstrate evidence of Small Group Teacher led Instruction in the ELA class.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tara Whitehead (tara.whitehead@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	According to John Hattie's research, Small Group learning yields a .47 effect size on Student Achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the	Hattie's Visible Learning states that Small Group Instruction has a significant impact on student achievement. Research shows that small group instruction provides targeted differentiation, creates less anxiety in students, and offers the opportunity to evaluate and assess more closely. The IEP Practice Guide titled, Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School, states that small

rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

group instruction will also support our large populations of subgroups by providing students with multiple occasions to practice language, and also will help the teacher ascertain that they are understanding and processing new content.

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

Our Instructional Coaches will provide professional development to support teacher learning on best practices for teacher led small group instruction.

Person Responsible Jean Galvan (jean.galvan@keysschools.com)

Instructional Coaches will schedule learning walks for teachers to observe model teachers showcasing Explicit Direct Small Group Instruction.

Person Responsible Lesley Finigan (lesley.finigan@keysschools.com)

The Literacy Leadership Team will conduct walkthroughs using the Observational Walkthrough Tool that has been provided by the district.

Person Responsible Heidi Roberts (heidi.roberts@keysschools.com)

Walkthrough Data and Assessment Data will be reviewed by the Literacy Leadership Team and feedback will be provided to the teachers to improve the frequency and effectiveness of teacher led small group instruction.

Person Responsible Tara Whitehead (tara.whitehead@keysschools.com)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

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

Based on our STAR Early Literacy/Reading Benchmark(District) data, 48% of our current first graders, 28% of our current second graders, and 39% of our current third graders performed below grade level.

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

Based on our 2021-22 FSA data, 57% of our current 4th graders performed below grade level and 60% of our current 5th graders performed below grade level.

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 new 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: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on our 2021-22 STAR Early Literacy/Reading Benchmark(District) data, greater than 50% of our students currently in grades 1-3 are on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our 2022-23 goal for overall ELA Achievement in grades fourth and fifth is to increase from 43% (current fourth grade) and 40% (current fifth grade) to 55% of all fourth and fifth grade students achieving a level 3 or higher on the FAST assessment. By mid year, 49% of fourth and fifth grade students will achieve a level 3 or higher.

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 take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

By November 1st, 100% of our FTE Rostered Students in Grades 3-5 will complete the first Self-Grading Data Discussion, one-on-one with their teacher, and data will be collected in a google form. This data will be reviewed in Data Chats by grade level teachers, administration and academic coaches during Grade Level meetings. The same process will occur following PM2 during the months of January and February.

We will also utilize State/District Progress Monitoring Data to monitor progress towards our goals for ELA Achievement following the Fall, Winter and Spring Assessment. At the conclusion of each progress monitoring assessment, instructional adjustments will be made based on student data review.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Whitehead, Tara, tara.whitehead@keysschools.com

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
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. Â§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?

John Hattie's research demonstrates Student Reported Grading has an effect size of 1.33. We will utilize this evidence based strategy to support goals for ELA proficiency. Through school wide data-chats, students will reflect and/or make predictions about academic progress and develop ownership of their academic ability/growth. According to the IES Practice Guide titled, Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making, data analysis process can motivate both elementary and secondary students by mapping out accomplishments that are attainable, revealing actual achievement gains and providing students with a sense of control over their own outcomes. Teachers can then use these goals to better understand factors that may motivate student performance and adjust their instructional practices accordingly. This research based strategy also aligns with MCSD's Comprehensive Reading Plan which states, 'At each school student data from state assessments, progress monitoring and screening assessments is dissected to look for reading deficiencies.'

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific 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 practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

According John Hattie's research, children are the most accurate when predicting how they will perform. Self-reported grades is a practice by which students assess the quality of their own work or their level of mastery over a given objective. With an effect size of 1.33, it can provide up to three years of additional growth in learning for every year, which will support all 4th and 5th grade students in academic growth and success, thus resulting in a rise in proficiency scores on the statewide assessment.

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
1. Our Literacy Leadership Team will meet to identify current 4th and 5th grade students performing below proficiency on the 2021-22 Statewide FSA Assessment. The LLT will also develop system for collecting data on Student Reported Grading for use in Data Chats. The LLT will provide Professional Development to support teacher's understanding of the impacts of Self-Reported Grading on Student Achievement as well as the team's plan for implementation. 2. Our Coaches will provide coverage for teachers while they meet individually with students to discuss data and complete Student -Self Grading Form. In addition, the Literacy Coach will work with teachers to provide resources that will support the differentiated needs of students. 3. The LLT will meet with the grade level to review the Self-Reported Grades and State/School based Assessment Data.	Galvan, Jean, jean.galvan@keysschools.com
Ensure BLPT communicates plan for implementation and works with PLT to schedule data chats.	Finigan, Lesley, lesley.finigan@keysschools.com
Coaches will support Classroom Teachers on implementation of Data Chats/ Student Reported Grades.	Galvan, Jean, jean.galvan@keysschools.com
Complete no less than 2 data chats during the year, making academic modifications as needed to increase proficiency and achievement.	Finigan, Lesley, lesley.finigan@keysschools.com

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Several key sources of data were utilized when planning for the 2021-2022 school year which include school-wide parent survey, faculty Panorama surveys and Panorama student wellness surveys. These data sets were invaluable when looking at the various areas of culture and promoting a positive environment.
• The parent survey results indicated a positive response in the following categories: Feeling welcome at school
(99% yes), encouraged to volunteer (71%, yes), and effectiveness of school's information being sent to parents (91%,yes). Areas of improvement included: providing the families with parent resources and a parent resource center (69%); school notifies me of SAC (School Advisory Council) and encourages me to attend (79%). Focus areas for improvement planning include working with the Title 1 Department to create a parent resource center in the main office and utilizing Title 1 funds to purchase resources for parents to take home and use with their children. Administration Team created flyers and distributed the flyers to each parent and family during Meet the Teacher, invited the SAC Board Members to Meet the Teacher Night and Open House to inform parents of the meeting days and times for the SAC meetings, and send out Blackboard text messages to parents with the time and an invitation link for the SAC meeting.
• Student data from our Panorama survey indicate that students decreased 7 percentage points, from 60% in the first screener to 53% in the second screener for the 2021-22 school year. The questions that showed the least percentage points were focused on students working toward a goal (Grit). This focus area will be addressed with the reinforcement of standards aligned instruction, developing positive relationships with students and raising
the level of rigor in daily instruction. Students will begin to have teacher/student data chats that will engage the student in Self Reporting Grades and Goals which will continue to promote student motivation to meet their goals. During the Pelican Huddles, Admin discusses goal setting and developing grit.
• Our faculty Panorama survey included areas of strength in the following categories, "Staff and Leadership Relationships" and "School Climate and Culture". Target area for improvement include "Support from colleagues when new initiatives are implemented to improve teaching". Using this trend data, administration will work with the coaches and District Curriculum Team to provide support to the teachers when implementing new curriculums, grade level meetings will focus on collaboration of best practices in teaching and learning, and walkthroughs will be conducted by the Poinciana Leadership Team.
Additionally, we will implement research based HLI curriculum to provide targeted instruction
to help ease the impact of COVID19's emotional hardships and the recent hurricane impact. . Examples include Studies Weekly Well-Being materials with content to be delivered by our teachers. POI earned Platinum status for the PBIS Model Schools for 2021-22 school year. POI continues to implement the a PBIS culture and iBElieve Behavioral Expectations throughout the school.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

At Poinciana Elementary School, we utilize several methods to engage all stakeholders in building a positive culture and environment at the school.
1. Administrators - Creating a school climate that is welcoming and supportive of all stakeholders.
2. Teachers - Supporting the school mission and vision throughout their instructional lessons and building a classroom climate that is inclusive to all students and accepting to different backgrounds and cultures.
3. Staff - Supporting the school's mission and vision. Working collectively with the teachers and parents to support the students academic achievement level.
4. Students - Being respectful, responsible and ready to learn.
5. Parents, families, community members and local civil service groups - promoting the importance of school, supportive of the mission and vision of the school, attending activities and after school community nights.

Theresa Axford
Superintendent
10/25/22

John Dick
Board Chair
10/25/22