Kathleen Senior High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Kathleen Senior High School

1100 RED DEVIL WAY, Lakeland, FL 33815

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

Demographics

Principal: Daraford Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
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)	100%
2018-19 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (36%) 2015-16: D (40%) 2014-15: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Polk 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.

Table of Contents

Kathleen Senior High School

1100 RED DEVIL WAY, Lakeland, FL 33815

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	Yes	81%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	D	D

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 Kathleen Senior High School is to promote academic excellence by cultivating a legacy of lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kathleen High School is committed to cultivating a legacy of lifelong learners by providing the knowledge and skills needed to be successful, productive citizens. Our students, staff, parents, and community will work together as a family to instill a sense of P.R.I.D.E. in who we are, where we are, and what we are to become.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jackson, Johnnie	Principal	
Miller, Yvonne	Instructional Coach	
Robertson, Kevin	Assistant Principal	
Lasseter, Matthew	Assistant Principal	
Reyes, Joaquin	Dean	
Redd, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Epperson, Tammy	Assistant Principal	
David, Jaime	Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	591	527	449	442	2009
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	94	87	94	415
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	182	101	68	52	403
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	142	102	75	448
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	189	152	159	148	648

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	33	25	20	153

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	142	102	75	448

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
87

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 7/29/2019

Prior Year - 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	206	245	229	203	883
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	79	59	35	279
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	99	130	6	276
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210	254	204	105	773

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179	221	205	59	664

Prior Year - 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	206	245	229	203	883
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	79	59	35	279
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	99	130	6	276
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210	254	204	105	773

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179	221	205	59		664

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	38%	47%	56%	32%	44%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	39%	46%	51%	30%	41%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	37%	42%	20%	33%	41%
Math Achievement	26%	43%	51%	23%	37%	49%
Math Learning Gains	39%	45%	48%	26%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	44%	45%	30%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	53%	58%	68%	44%	56%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	50%	61%	73%	52%	60%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	591 (0)	527 (0)	449 (0)	442 (0)	2009 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	140 (206)	94 (245)	87 (229)	94 (203)	415 (883)
One or more suspensions	182 (106)	101 (79)	68 (59)	52 (35)	403 (279)
Course failure in ELA or Math	129 (41)	142 (99)	102 (130)	75 (6)	448 (276)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	189 (210)	152 (254)	159 (204)	148 (105)	648 (773)

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

NOTE: 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
09	2019	39%	45%	-6%	55%	-16%
	2018	35%	43%	-8%	53%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	33%	42%	-9%	53%	-20%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	35%	42%	-7%	53%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	51%	54%	-3%	67%	-16%
2018	57%	59%	-2%	65%	-8%
Compare		-6%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	57%	-9%	70%	-22%
2018	51%	57%	-6%	68%	-17%
Compare		-3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	20%	50%	-30%	61%	-41%
2018	33%	60%	-27%	62%	-29%
Compare		-13%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	30%	53%	-23%	57%	-27%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	29%	41%	-12%	56%	-27%
Compare		1%			

Subgroup Data

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	18	36	30	20	37		28	27		67	21
ELL	15	27	19	6	23	30	17	13		69	45
ASN	67	45									
BLK	22	34	33	15	38	46	35	31		85	32
HSP	36	33	22	19	31	33	41	50		80	46
MUL	38	50								82	
WHT	47	45	42	41	46	52	72	65		75	56
FRL	33	39	32	19	34	44	42	42		77	38
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	16	32	28	23	26	35	39	33		48	13
ELL	13	41	49	19	21	17	35	27		50	20
AMI	10										
ASN	60	70									
BLK	25	38	35	21	32	33	43	38		77	23
HSP	34	38	36	34	35	46	54	52		71	40
MUL	38	50		45			73	40		63	50
WHT	48	47	25	45	43	40	72	66		77	58
FRL	30	38	34	30	35	35	56	47		71	37
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	7	18	14	7	24	31	9	29		52	13
ELL	7	15	13	10	28	35	15	17		41	6
AMI	36	30									
BLK	19	25	25	10	21	30	27	30		80	21
HSP	31	27	19	22	27	31	39	44		66	28
MUL	28	30		17	25		42	69		75	25
WHT	41	35	17	31	28	27	57	73		70	47
FRL	23	24	22	17	26	31	36	46		68	23

ESSA Data

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	512
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	56
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Math showed the lowest performance for the 18-19 school year with 26% meeting a level 3 or higher. Teachers struggled with teaching the standard at the complexity of the assessments.

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

Math showed the lowest performance for the 18-19 school year with 26% meeting a level 3 or higher. Teachers struggled with teaching the standard at the complexity of the assessments. Substitutes were a factor as 6 sections of Alg 1B were without a teacher for the majority of the year.

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.

Geometry EOC had the greatest gap compared to the state average. Teachers struggled with teaching the standard at the complexity of the assessments.

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

Math learning gains for the lower 25% increased from 39 to 42. Focus on identifying students that needed remediation and tutoring.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The number of students that are a level 1 on a statewide assessment and the number of students with high absence rates.

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

1. Math Proficiency, closing the gap between the state average and school data in both Alg 1 and Geometry. (20)
2. ELA Proficiency, closing the gap between the state average and school data. (16)
3. US History Proficiency, closing the gap between the state average and school data. (19)
4. Science Proficiency, closing the gap between the state average and school data. (15)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Proficiency
Rationale	The gap between the school proficiency and the state average is 16 points. We must close the gap in ELA proficiency to be in line with the state average. Improved ELA proficiency will also increase the students performance in other tested areas.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The ELA proficiency will increase by 12 points to 50% overall.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jaime David (jaime.david@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction in ELA and Reading will help address deficiencies and areas for remediation. Common Assessments will help identify those groups of students who need support. Feedback through common planning will help teachers focus and collaborate on research-based strategies. Teachers examining student evidence will help increase standard complexity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction in ELA and Reading will help address deficiencies and areas for remediation. Common Assessments will help identify those groups of students who need support. Feedback through common planning will help teachers focus and collaborate on research-based strategies. Teachers examining student evidence will help increase standard complexity.

Action Step	
Description	1. SWD: Tier 3 small group instruction with support facilitation teachers in core content areas based on data and IEP needs. Review of accommodations in order to ensure the needs of the students are being met. Tier 2 interventions will be provided in the core content classrooms by classroom teacher in consultation with the IEP teacher of record. 2. ELL: Tier 3 support by strategic scheduling in sheltered classes by need of the student. Tier 2 support with new ESOL teacher will be provided in the core content areas as push-in support in the classroom. 3. African American Males: Tier 3 small group instruction with ELA interventionist based on data. Tier 2 support will be provided as push-in interventions with ELA interventionist and classroom teacher using data to identify African American Males in most critical need of support. 4. PD based on trends through the use of C4I Walks, target/task alignment, and student teaming. 5. Common assessments will help drive instruction and identify trends
Person Responsible	Jaime David (jaime.david@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Math Proficiency
Rationale	The gap between the school proficiency and the state average is 20 points. We must close the gap in Math proficiency to be in line with the state average. Improved Math proficiency will also increase the students performance in other tested areas.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The Math proficiency will increase by 15 points to 45% overall..
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Johnnie Jackson (johnnie.jackson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction in Math will help address deficiencies and areas for remediation. Common Assessments will help identify those groups of students who need support. Feedback through common planning will help teachers focus and collaborate on research-based strategies. Teachers examining student evidence will help increase standard complexity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction in Math will help address deficiencies and areas for remediation. Common Assessments will help identify those groups of students who need support. Feedback through common planning will help teachers focus and collaborate on research-based strategies. Teachers examining student evidence will help increase standard complexity.

Action Step	
Description	1. SWD: Tier 3 small group instruction with support facilitation teachers in core content areas based on data and IEP needs. Review of accommodations in order to ensure the needs of the students are being met. Tier 2 interventions will be provided in the core content classrooms by classroom teacher in consultation with the IEP teacher of record. 2. ELL: Tier 3 support by strategic scheduling in sheltered classes by need of the student. Tier 2 support with new ESOL teacher will be provided in the core content areas as push-in support in the classroom. 3. African American Males: Tier 3 small group instruction with Math interventionist based on data. Tier 2 support will be provided as push-in interventions with math interventionist and classroom teacher using data to identify African American Males in most critical need of support. 4. PD based on trends through the use of C4I Walks, target/task alignment, and student teaming. 5. Common assessments will help drive instruction and identify trends
Person Responsible	Joaquin Reyes (joaquin.reyes@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Through the remediation of ELA and Math, it is our goal to address the other deficiencies in science and history. By strategically planning professional development that focuses on target/task alignment and teaming, proficiency will increase.

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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.

Please see attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan for full details on how we plan to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Through the Parent/Family Engagement Events, the school's goal is to bridge the gap between the school and parent needs. The school is required to have one night in which we explain the Title I and data information. At this meeting, we explained the ESSA requirements and the instructional strategies in place in order to support the different sub-groups (SWD, ELL, and African-American Males).

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.

School leadership and guidance provide students with counseling, mentoring, and other opportunities to express themselves so that their social-emotional well being remains intact and healthy. The School Psychologist is present on campus each school day in order to provide social and emotional support for those students in need. The therapeutic sessions can either be individual or in a group setting. The Drumbeat Program has also been implemented as another form of appropriate expression. The Psychologist also is funded by Title I.

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

The school has a separate building dedicated to freshmen students to support them during their transition to high school. This building houses 25 classrooms, a science lab, a media center, a computer lab, and 4 administrative offices. Joaquin Reyes, Dean, is assigned to the Freshman Academy to provide them with specialized attention and support. All freshmen take their core academic classes in this building to transition them smoothly into high school which can be intimidating. Additionally, all freshmen are assigned to an adult advisers who provides them with additional guidance, support, and monitoring.

To assist seniors who are transitioning to post secondary life, the school has a Success Coach who provides information and guidance for this transition. All counselors (based on alphabet) also provide information and guidance for all seniors. Whether it is enrolling in a post secondary education, enlisting in the military, or seeking employment, these staff members have the knowledge, expertise, and resources to ensure the transition is smooth. Students meet with their counselors and Success Team

Coach, Jeffrey Williams, to apply for college admissions, scholarships, job opportunities, and/or to speak to military recruiters.

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.

The district forms instructional material adoption committees that meet several times to review and evaluate curriculum and resources from several different vendors. In terms of personnel and instruction, the school-based leadership meets every week, throughout the school year and summer months, to discuss observational data from classroom walkthroughs as well as the scheduling of students and specific teacher assignments. The team provides staff with ongoing feedback related to teaching, learning, and performance. Walkthroughs are performed daily to support teachers and other staff members.

Title I, Part A project funds school-wide services at our eligible and participating Title I schools. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions so that all students achieve academic success.
Title I, Part C project funds assist students that are prioritized by the MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status, as defined by federal and state regulations.
Title I, Part D project funds provide Transition Facilitators at select Neglected and Delinquent school sites to assist students who transition from Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facilities back into their zoned school.
Title II funds provide professional development resources to build the capacity of teachers by funding consultants, district professional development personnel, including district/regional coaches, and curriculum specialists.
Title III provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their teachers in Title I schools, professional learning opportunities for school staff, as well as parent family engagement opportunities.
Title IX – Homeless OR HEARTH Program funded through Title IX and Title I, provides support for students identified as being in a homeless situation. Schools of Hope project supports interventions at Kathleen High School that lead to student success by providing wrap-around services, building the capacity of instructional staff and leadership, improving school and community collaboration, and developing family and community partnerships.

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

KHS guidance counselors and school leaders meet with students and parents, individually and in groups, to discuss students' academic/graduation plans. During these conferences, course offerings are discussed based on student interest and ability level. Additionally, KHS hosts several academic nights on campus and in the community for parents and students to get information about the various course offerings, find out about all the happenings at KHS, apply for financial aid and scholarships for colleges, apply for colleges, complete FAFSA, etc.

College and Career awareness and readiness is supporting in the following ways:

• Through our Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs and our career academies, work-based learning opportunities are being implemented within the experiential learning domains and standards of practice. Partnerships continue being developed assuring those opportunities for students and the bridges to post-secondary educational institutions remain a priority. Articulation agreements are

continually being developed with technical colleges and state colleges in response to higher attainment levels of high school industry certifications. Dual enrollment courses within the CTE field are consistently evaluated and provided to students as often as possible.

• Accelerated programs, such as dual enrollment and Advanced Placement, in addition to high school courses being offered at middle schools, will be available to students to provide academic rigor and to earn college credit while in high school.

• Student Success Coaches will work with targeted students to ensure that high school graduation and post-secondary education is achieved in a timely manner.

• AVID will be implemented in sixteen secondary schools to support targeted students in participating in accelerated programs and enrolling in college.

• Students will create academic plans for high school and graduation, and will also track planning for post-secondary education and training. FloridaShines and Overgrad will be used to track this information.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Proficiency	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00