Daniel Jenkins Academy Of Technology Middle School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Daniel Jenkins Academy Of Technology Middle School

701 LEDWITH AVE, Haines City, FL 33844

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	85%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	C	B	B*

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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 Daniel Jenkins Academy is to provide authentic, project-based learning opportunities that allow students to develop their interests and passions through personalized learning and STEM-based community partnerships.

Rigor - Precise and challenging curriculum with a special focus on math, science, engineering, and environmental science.
Reading/Literacy – Comprehend and derive meaning from text to stress verbal and written communication
Relevance – Real-life application by developing critical thinking, problem solving, and organizational skills
Results – Outcomes that drive the next step using innovative strategies, and traditional values to prepare students for future success.
Relationships – Interactions that promote a sense of belonging to all students to assist in their academics and develop their social and emotional potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Daniel Jenkins Academy is to provide student's high-quality, globally- focused educational opportunities to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to be college and career ready in the 21st Century.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Tarver, Brad	Principal
Rivera, Miguel	Assistant Principal
Flores, Mercedes	School Counselor
Walker, Patricia	Teacher, K-12
Gonzalez, Carlos	Teacher, K-12
Smith, Sarah	Teacher, K-12

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The purpose of the School Leadership Team at Daniel Jenkins Academy is to help guide school wide decisions with the goal of increasing overall student achievement and meeting the needs set forth by our adopted School Improvement Plan. The Leadership Team meets weekly to engage in the following activities: Review data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data. Based on this information, our team identifies students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. In addition, the team identifies professional

development needs and resources. Lastly, the Leadership Team collaborates regularly with department chairs to problem solve and share effective practices.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	41	51	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	24	26	0	0	0	0	77
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	74	56	0	0	0	0	228

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	8	11	0	0	0	0	31

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	16	18	0	0	0	0	52

Date this data was collected

Tuesday 7/31/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

8th Grade Math. 37% in 2017 and 19% in 2018. Yes, math has dropped over the last three years.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

7th Grade ELA and Math (Both 17% drop)

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

8th Grade Math with a 26% gap>DJA 19% State 45%

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Civics. Yes, Civics has improved three years in a row (52% in 2016, 54% in 2017, 98% in 2018)

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

New teacher, scheduling, boot camps, rigor, tutoring, collaborative planning

School Data

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	46%	53%	56%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	39%	47%	54%	57%	51%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	42%	47%	50%	46%	45%
Math Achievement	46%	49%	58%	53%	47%	55%
Math Learning Gains	46%	51%	57%	58%	49%	55%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	51%	51%	54%	45%	47%
Science Achievement	46%	47%	52%	50%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	98%	86%	72%	54%	61%	67%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
Attendance below 90 percent	44 (0)	41 (0)	51 (0)	136 (0)
One or more suspensions	27 (0)	24 (0)	26 (0)	77 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	98 (0)	74 (0)	56 (0)	228 (0)

Grade Level Data

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**
06	2018	34%	41%	-7%	52%	-18%
	2017	48%	45%	3%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	37%	42%	-5%	51%	-14%
	2017	54%	45%	9%	52%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
08	2018	58%	49%	9%	58%	0%
	2017	52%	46%	6%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2018	41%	40%	1%	52%	-11%
	2017	45%	39%	6%	51%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	37%	40%	-3%	54%	-17%
	2017	54%	40%	14%	53%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2018	19%	34%	-15%	45%	-26%
	2017	37%	36%	1%	46%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2018	46%	42%	4%	50%	-4%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	98%	84%	14%	71%	27%
2017	67%	62%	5%	69%	-2%
Compare		31%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	85%	60%	25%	62%	23%
2017	71%	43%	28%	60%	11%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		14%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	95%	41%	54%	56%	39%
2017	85%	34%	51%	53%	32%
Compare		10%			

Subgroup Data

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	17	43	57	25	46	42					
ELL	23	38	43	28	37	29	40		64		
ASN	91			100							
BLK	34	28	26	38	44	49	38	100	75		
HSP	42	39	40	44	40	39	46	100	78		
WHT	47	49	59	53	56	75	46		59		
FRL	39	37	37	43	43	43	40	100	69		

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	33	23		67	71						
ELL	32	47	46	35	51	54	9	58	33		
ASN		80			80						
BLK	46	41	34	42	49	53	35	50	23		
HSP	52	56	44	49	50	55	39	69	47		
WHT	54	58	63	61	54	57	45	76	50		
FRL	47	52	50	45	49	52	37	65	40		

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Math
Rationale	Data trends shows deficiency and declining scores in all grade levels.
Intended Outcome	Our goal is to increase math proficiency to 51% to be above district average.
Point Person	Brad Tarver (brad.tarver@polk-fl.net)
Action Step	
Description	Intentionally scheduling of students, tutoring program, boot camps, and implementation of Khan Academy throughout math department, district support.
Person Responsible	Miguel Rivera (miguel.rivera01@polk-fl.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Master Schedule, Quarterly Assessments, Classroom Observations with timely feedback.
Person Responsible	Miguel Rivera (miguel.rivera01@polk-fl.net)

Activity #2	
Title	ELA
Rationale	Data shows deficiency and declining scores from 2017-18 year.
Intended Outcome	Our goal is to increase ELA proficiency to 48% to be above district average.
Point Person	Brad Tarver (brad.tarver@polk-fl.net)
Action Step	
Description	Implementation of a reading plan throughout our school with incentives, intentionally scheduling of students, tutoring, boot camps, and support from both literacy coach and district support.
Person Responsible	Brad Tarver (brad.tarver@polk-fl.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Master Scheduling, quarterly assessments, classroom observations with timely feedback, student data chats.
Person Responsible	Brad Tarver (brad.tarver@polk-fl.net)

Activity #3	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	Our data shows 28% of our students (136 out of 491) were absent under 90% of the time.
Intended Outcome	Our goal is to decrease the percentage of students who were absent under 90% of the time in half. By doing this, our overall attendance of students will increase to 98%.
Point Person	Brad Tarver (brad.tarver@polk-fl.net)
Action Step	
Description	First and foremost, get students to want to attend our school. We will implement a system to check attendance quarterly through our attendance manager in order to monitor data closely and identify if the problem is a grade level issue, etc. In addition, we plan to provide incentives monthly for great attendance.
Person Responsible	Brad Tarver (brad.tarver@polk-fl.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Weekly attendance data review,
Person Responsible	Brad Tarver (brad.tarver@polk-fl.net)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

N/A

PFEP Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget	
Total:	$0.00