Polk Avenue Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Polk Avenue Elementary School

110 POLK AVE E, Lake Wales, FL 33853

http://lwcharterschools.com/polkave

Demographics

Principal: Anna Barcenas

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2021

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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

N/A

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.

The mission of Polk Avenue Elementary is to educate and challenge students to discover the leader in themselves, empowering them to become responsible and contributing citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Polk Avenue Elementary is "Leadership Begins Here".

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Barcenas, Anna	Principal	Our leadership team is a critical part of shared decision making. Mrs. Barcenas and Mrs Hixenbaugh do make the final decision as the instructional leaders, but our resource teachers have a lot of input. Mrs. Bacenas and Mrs Hixenbaugh do instructional observations and provide feedback.
Hixenbaugh, Shay	Assistant Principal	Our leadership team is a critical part of shared decision making. Mrs. Barcenas and Mrs Hixenbaugh do make the final decision as the instructional leaders, but our resource teachers have a lot of input. Mrs. Barcenas and Mrs Hixenbaugh do instructional observations and provide feedback.
Saran, Ambica	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Saran is our Title I and Math Resource Teacher. She works on data for the team and presents in a format everyone can use. In addition she directly supervises math and holds monthly professional development as well as works with our math consultant.
Fletcher, Melanie	Other	Ms. Fletcher is the ESE Facilitator and she work with teachers on the MTSS process.
Sheppard, Tammy	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Sheppard is our Reading Resource Teacher and she tutors struggling students and supports reading teachers.
Kelly, Melissa	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Kelly provides science instruction to all of our students. She meets with 3-5th grade students weekly and K-2 monthly. She works with the teachers to ensure that science instruction is happening at a high level and provides professional development for the teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/1/2021, Anna Barcenas

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

560

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

5

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

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by 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	90	92	98	86	92	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	555
Attendance below 90 percent	59	22	20	15	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	37	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	42	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	5	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/13/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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	107	85	92	102	70	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	537
Attendance below 90 percent	22	10	12	7	25	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	5	1	3	8	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	2	5	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	15	0	1	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

2020-21 - Updated

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	107	85	92	102	70	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	537
Attendance below 90 percent	22	10	12	7	25	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	5	1	3	8	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	2	5	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	15	0	1	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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).

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
03	2021					
	2019	34%			58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%			58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2021					

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	46%			56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	44%			62%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%			64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%			60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	48%			53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

NWEA MAP growth assessment for Reading and Mathematics for grade K-5. NWEA MAP growth assessment for Science for grade 3-5.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50/95 (54%)	36/94 (38%)	39/94 (41%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	50/95 (54%)	36/94 (38%)	39/94 (41%)
	Students With Disabilities	1/2 (50%)	1/3 (33%)	2/4 (50%)
	English Language Learners	8/17 (47%)	3/19 (16%)	3/18 (17%)
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	57/95 (61%)	31/94 (33%)	39/94 (41%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	57/95 (61%)	31/94 (33%)	39/94 (41%)
	Students With Disabilities	1/5 (50%)	1/3 (33%)	1/4 (25%)
	English Language Learners	9/17 (53%)	2/19(11%)	3/18 (17%)

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27/84 (33%)	19/87 (23%)	19/83 (23%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	27/84 (33%)	19/87 (23%)	19/83 (23%)
	Students With Disabilities	1/5 (20%)	2/9 (22%)	2/10 (20%)
	English Language Learners	1/16 (17%)	1/17 (6%)	2/17 (12%)
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43/84 (51%)	37/87 (45%)	47/82 (57%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	43/84 (51%)	37/87 (45%)	47/82 (57%)
	Students With Disabilities	3/5 (60%)	4/9 (44%)	5/10 (50%)
	English Language Learners	6/16 (38%)	5/16 (31%)	6/17 (35%)

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37/92 (40%)	35/94 (38%)	29/95 (31%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	37/92 (40%)	35/94 (38%)	29/95 (31%)
	Students With Disabilities	2/11 (18%)	2/16 (13%)	1/22 (5%)
	English Language Learners	4/20 (20%)	4/21 (19%)	2/22 (9%)
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42/92 (46%)	28/94 (30%)	26/94 (28%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	42/92 (46%)	28/94 (30%)	26/94 (28%)
	Students With Disabilities	4/11 (36%)	2/16 (13%)	3/22 (14%)
	English Language Learners	7/20 (35%)	3/21 (14%)	4/22 (18%)

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51/109 (50%)	48/106 (46%)	39/103 (38%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	51/109 (50%)	48/106 (46%)	39/103 (38%)
	Students With Disabilities	10/30 (33%)	10/33 (30%)	6/29 (21%)
	English Language Learners	6/26 (23%)	8/26 (31%)	3/25 (12%)
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43/109 (41%)	30/106 (29%)	32/103 (31%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	43/109 (41%)	30/106 (29%)	32/103 (31%)
	Students With Disabilities	6/30 (20%)	5/33 (15%)	3/29 (10%)
	English Language Learners	8/26 (31%)	5/26 (19%)	5/24 (21%)

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24/69 (36%)	21/66 (33%)	17/64 (27%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	24/69 (36%)	21/66 (33%)	17/64 (27%)
	Students With Disabilities	8/22 (36%)	7/21 (33%)	2/18 (17%)
	English Language Learners	3/16 (33%)	2/16 (13%)	2/15 (13%)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25/69 (37%)	20/66 (31%)	30/65 (46%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/69 (37%)	20/66 (31%)	30/65 (46%)
	Students With Disabilities	8/22 (36%)	8/21 (38%)	4/18 (22%)
	English Language Learners	3/16 (19%)	9/16 (56%)	6/15 (40%)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	28/69 (42%)	22/66 (34%)	31/65 (34%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	28/69 (42%)	22/66 (34%)	31/65 (34%)
	Students With Disabilities	6/27 (35%)	7/17 (41%)	8/18 (44%)
	English Language Learners	3/15 (20%)	4/15 (27%)	4/15 (27%)

Subgroup Data Review

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
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	22	33	42	27	44	47					
ELL	31	56	44	51	68	50	45				
BLK	36	56		38	47	50	33				
HSP	37	58	50	51	68	57	58				
WHT	51	66		59	71		50				
FRL	40	58	57	48	65	58	47				

2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	9	57	60	19	36						
ELL	16	50	69	38	56	36	27				
BLK	30	50		43	63		40				
HSP	29	54	61	47	67	35	52				
WHT	45	40	27	65	73	55	62				
FRL	33	49	52	49	67	45	47				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	430
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	43
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	54
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	59
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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?

As per spring progress monitoring data, the following trends emerge across grade levels, sub groups and content areas:
1. ELA is an area with highest need for improvement in grades 2nd (23% level 3 & above), 3rd (31% level 3 & above), 4th (38% level 3 & above), & 5th (27% level 3 & above).
2. Math is an area with highest need for improvement in grades 3rd (28% level 3 & above), 4th (31% level 3 & above), & 5th (46% level 3 & above).
3. English Language Learner are a subgroup with high need for improvement in both ELA and Math.

As per FSA data, the following trends emerge across grade levels and content areas:
1. ELA is an area with highest need for improvement in grades 3rd (29% level 3 & above), 4th (42% level 3 & above), & 5th (39% level 3 & above).
2. Math is an area with highest need for improvement in grades 3rd (26% level 3 & above) & 4th (45% level 3 & above)

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA proficiency achievement component showed the 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?

Our students lack language experience and thus their vocabulary is low and is a contributing factor to lower test scores. We did have 2 new teachers in our third grade. Attendance is also a factor for our school.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA learning gains component showed the most improvement.

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

ELA learning gains showed the most improvement. We added a new phonetic program as well as a writing program with higher rigor. We believe that the writing scores helped our learning gains.

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

We will be implementing a new researched based reading program, "Wonders", and we will be providing the needed professional development for this program. We will provide intervention and tutoring to identified students. We have hired a Reading Coach, an additional ESE inclusion teacher, and two additional ESE paras who will all assist in providing additional targeted 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.

Teachers will be provided training in the New Best Standards and the new reading program

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

Intervention and tutoring will be two services provided that will be sustainable for more than one year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By analyzing state assessments and progress monitoring, we were able to identify ELA as an area of critical need.
Measureable Outcome:	Increase English Language Arts FSA achievement by 3% from 38% to 41%.
Monitoring:	We will use progress monitoring conducted 3 times a year to monitor progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ambica Saran (ambica.randev@lwcharterschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The programs that we will be using in the classroom have the following evidence-based strategies: 1. Summarization 2. Inferencing 3. Build schema
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We used the What Works Clearinghouse to ensure that we are using evidence based strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Plan, schedule, conduct, and participate in reading professional development including, but not limited to, " Standard based Language Arts lessons, Saxon Phonics, and Top Score writing.
2. Teachers will be trained on standards.
3. ELA family involvement night will be held to provide training and resources for parents to help their child at home.
4. Provide ELA tutoring for selected students.

Person Responsible   Tammy Sheppard (tammy.sheppard@lwcharterschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By analyzing state assessments and progress monitoring, we were able to identify Mathematics as an area of critical need.
Measureable Outcome:	Increase Mathematics FSA achievement by 3% from 41% to 44%.
Monitoring:	We will use progress monitoring which is conducted 3 times a year to monitor progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ambica Saran (ambica.randev@lwcharterschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Math Fact Fluency for a minimum of 60 minutes per week. 2. We provide explicit and implicit systematic instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We used the What Works Clearinghouse to ensure that we are using evidence based strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly 60 minutes practice of math facts using Rocket Math Online Game.
2. Building conceptual knowledge through Eureka Math for long term success.
3. We will use MAP Accelerator for grades 3-5 and Freckle Math for grades K-2 to fill in the instructional gaps identified through progress monitoring.
4. Math family involvement night will be held to provide training and resources to parents to help their child at home.
5. Math Tutoring or intervention will be provided to struggling students.

Person Responsible	Ambica Saran (ambica.randev@lwcharterschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By analyzing state assessments and progress monitoring, we were able to identify ELA as an area of critical need.
Measureable Outcome:	Increase Science FSA achievement by 3% from 55% to 58%.
Monitoring:	We will use progress monitoring conducted 3 times a year to monitor progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ambica Saran (ambica.randev@lwcharterschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Building background knowledge. 2. Provide hands on student centered experiences.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We used the What Works Clearinghouse to ensure that we are using evidence based strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. K-5 Teachers will use periodic non fiction materials, 3-5 Science Boot Camp nonfiction materials, and Ready Gen for the classrooms.
2. Science family involvement night will be held to provide training and resources for parents to help their child at home.
3. Each grade level will take one field trip annually to help build background.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

We will monitor the number of referral by grade level to identify area of improvement.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

Polk Avenue implements Leader in Me (LIM), PAX good behavior games, and Positive Behavior Support (PBS) strategies for building a positive school culture and environment at our school. Leader in Me is a whole-school transformation model and process that empowers students with the leadership and life skills they need to thrive in the 21st century. It is based on principles and practices of personal, interpersonal and organizational effectiveness, and upon the powerful premise that every child possesses unique strengths and has the ability to be a leader.The "Leader in Me" program is based on the "Seven Habits of Highly Effective People" by Steven Covey.
The PAX Good Behavior Game is a universal-level classroom-based behavior management strategy for elementary schools designed to prevent disruptive activity.
PBS provides a process to understand and resolve the problem behavior of individuals or children. It offers an approach to develop an understanding of why the child engages in problem behavior and strategies to prevent the occurrence of problem behavior while teaching the child new skills. Positive behavior support offers a holistic approach that considers all factors that have an impact on a child and the child's behavior.

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

Classroom teachers will implement eight days of 'Leader in Me' to set the culture and climate of the school. Our Leadership day invites parents and community member to visit our school for us to showcase 'Leader in Me' and our positive school environment. We collect feedback and share with our school advisory committee throughout the year.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$76,869.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6300	100-Salaries	1351 - Polk Avenue Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$76,869.00
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$73,689.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6300	100-Salaries	1351 - Polk Avenue Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$73,689.00
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**				**$152,317.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	100-Salaries	1351 - Polk Avenue Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$81,639.00
	6300	100-Salaries	1351 - Polk Avenue Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$70,678.00
					Total:	**$302,875.00**