

Polk County Public Schools

# Daniel Jenkins Academy Of Technology Middle School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

# Daniel Jenkins Academy Of Technology Middle School

701 LEDWITH AVE, Haines City, FL 33844

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Kathryn Blackburn**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/9/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: B (54%) 2014-15: B (54%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Polk County School Board on 12/20/2019.

### 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

# 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)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	C	B

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Polk County School Board on 12/20/2019.

## 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 students with 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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Blackburn, Kathryn	Principal	
Rivera, Miguel	Assistant Principal	
Flores, Mercedes	School Counselor	
Walker, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	
Gonzalez, Carlos	Teacher, K-12	
Smith, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	
Onorati, Sheri	Teacher, K-12	

### 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	160	169	160	0	0	0	0	489	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	18	15	0	0	0	0	39	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	18	22	0	0	0	0	53	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	8	0	0	0	0	20	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	63	27	0	0	0	0	118	

**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	1	9	2	0	0	0	0	12

**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	2	0	0	0	2	

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

30

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 7/9/2019

**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	5	15	13	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	61	42	0	0	0	0	132
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	12	8	11	0	0	0	0	31

**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	5	15	13	0	0	0	0	33	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	61	42	0	0	0	0	132	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

**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	12	8	11	0	0	0	0	31	

## 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	48%	48%	54%	52%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	52%	54%	54%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	48%	47%	46%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	58%	50%	58%	50%	47%	56%
Math Learning Gains	56%	50%	57%	51%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	48%	51%	55%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	37%	44%	51%	39%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	87%	72%	72%	68%	64%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	160 (0)	169 (0)	160 (0)	489 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	6 (5)	18 (15)	15 (13)	39 (33)
One or more suspensions	13 (29)	18 (61)	22 (42)	53 (132)
Course failure in ELA or Math	5 (0)	7 (0)	8 (1)	20 (1)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	28 (0)	63 (0)	27 (0)	118 (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.

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
06	2019	55%	48%	7%	54%	1%
	2018	34%	41%	-7%	52%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	38%	42%	-4%	52%	-14%
	2018	37%	42%	-5%	51%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	53%	48%	5%	56%	-3%
	2018	58%	49%	9%	58%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	60%	47%	13%	55%	5%
	2018	41%	40%	1%	52%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	34%	39%	-5%	54%	-20%
	2018	37%	40%	-3%	54%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
08	2019	61%	35%	26%	46%	15%
	2018	19%	34%	-15%	45%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		42%				
Cohort Comparison		24%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	38%	41%	-3%	48%	-10%
	2018	46%	42%	4%	50%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	54%	-54%	67%	-67%
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	87%	70%	17%	71%	16%
2018	98%	84%	14%	71%	27%
Compare		-11%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	88%	50%	38%	61%	27%
2018	85%	60%	25%	62%	23%
Compare		3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%
2018	95%	41%	54%	56%	39%
Compare		5%			

## 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	9	50	36	21	41	38					
ELL	18	45	53	43	52	46	19	73			
ASN	100	82		91	73						
BLK	47	51	43	51	56	67	32	81	74		
HSP	45	53	59	57	55	58	32	88	81		
MUL	67	50		75	75						
WHT	50	49	50	63	51	55	55	94	78		
FRL	44	51	52	55	53	57	35	85	75		
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		

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
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		

### 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	57
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	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	571
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	87
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	56
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
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	67
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	61
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	56
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.**

Of the state assessment data components, the SSA (Science) showed the lowest performance, with the overall proficiency dropping from 46% during the 2017-18 school year to 35% during the 2018-19 school year.

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

Of the state assessment data components, the SSA (Science) showed the greatest decline, with the overall proficiency dropping from 46% during the 2017-18 school year to 35% during the 2018-19 school year. Teacher absenteeism was a significant contributing factor in the decline in student achievement, as well as inconsistency with curriculum pacing and remediation.

**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.**

The SSA (Science) had the greatest gap when compared to the state average, primarily due to teacher absenteeism, as well as inconsistency with curriculum pacing and remediation.

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

FSA Mathematics for eighth grade showed the most improvement, with 61% demonstrating proficiency in the 2018-19 school year, compared to only 19% proficiency during the 2017-18 school year.

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

Based on the EWS data, we have identified that, based on 2018-19 data, our current eighth grade population had the highest rates of absenteeism and discipline (specifically, suspensions) in the previous school year. Therefore, in this current school year, we will need to put strategies in place to reduce the absences and behavioral issues within this eighth grade population.

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

1. Math improvement of our lowest 25%
2. ELA improvement in proficiency to 50%
3. Science improvement in proficiency of 50%

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#1	
<b>Title</b>	Mathematics
<b>Rationale</b>	FSA Mathematics proficiency for seventh grade indicates challenges for the 2019-20 school year. Therefore, focusing on learning gains based on 2018-19 data of incoming eighth graders will support academic improvement. Additionally, continued support for sixth and eighth grades are necessary in order to maintain or improve proficiency, as well as increase learning gains.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Our goal is to maintain proficiency at 58% across all grade levels and increase learning gains to 60%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Kathryn Blackburn (kathryn.blackburn@polk-fl.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Evidence-based strategies will include two TTI-funded para educators who will exclusively work with the lowest 25% student as well as our ESE subgroup. This will take place as a push-in strategy in the student's scheduled classrooms first semester. Second semester, it will be a pull out with small group. Students are scheduled in Intensive math classes as well, to support remediation of standards not learned. Finally, students will be using Imagine math weekly , with a twice a week 45 minute sessions.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Students will be monitored with grade level formative and summative assessments. All students will participate in data chats with teachers and track their own progress. Progress monitoring will also include common standards based assessments, STAR Math and the district quarterly assessments. All the assessment will help the team to clearly diagnosis gaps and create remediation opportunities for these students.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Data analysis of the 2018-19 FSA Mathematics scores</li> <li>2. Strategic scheduling of students, specifically addressing the needs of ESE and lowest 25%.</li> <li>3. Monitoring student progress and success through the use of STAR Math, classroom assessments and district quarterly assessments.</li> <li>4. Remediation Plan with the TT 1 paras assigned to students needing additional support, push-in during thier class periods and pull out.</li> <li>5. Re-Assessment Plan for non-performing students</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Miguel Rivera (miguel.rivera01@polk-fl.net)

#2	
<b>Title</b>	English-Language Arts
<b>Rationale</b>	FSA English-Language Arts proficiency for seventh grade indicates challenges for the 2019-20 school year. Therefore, focusing on learning gains based on 2018-19 data of incoming eighth graders will support academic improvement. Additionally, continued support for sixth and eighth grades are necessary in order to improve proficiency, as well as increase learning gains.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Our goal is to increase proficiency to 52% across all grade levels and increase learning gains to 55%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Kathryn Blackburn (kathryn.blackburn@polk-fl.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Evidence-based strategies will include professional development with an emphasis on effective planning based on LSI tools. Reading and Language arts teachers will have specific coaches who will support effective planning to move lessons to appropriate cognitive complexity for optimum learning for students. Team leads will be identified as early adopters and be coached one-on-one. Lesson plans will be analyzed and moved to a higher level of rigor for the students with on-going success.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The support of professional development is a keystone strategy for teacher development. Research states that having an effective teacher is the most important factor in the success of students. Professional development, coaching, and effective PLC's will be used to support the success of students.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Data analysis of the 2018-19 FSA ELA scores</li> <li>2. Strategic scheduling of students, specifically addressing the needs of ESE, ELL, and lowest 25%.</li> <li>3. Monitoring student progress and success through the use of STAR Reading, Writing Progress Monitoring, and classroom assessments</li> <li>4. Remediation Plan in place to support non-performing students first semester push-in and second semester using pull out.</li> <li>5. Re-Assessment Plan for non-performing students</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Miguel Rivera (miguel.rivera01@polk-fl.net)



<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Science
<b>Rationale</b>	Eighth grade science is experiencing a continual decline in student proficiency, as evident by the 2018-19 NGSSS SSA (State Science Assessment). Specifically, student achievement dropped from 46% proficiency in 2017-18 to 38% proficiency this past year.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Our goal is to increase proficiency to 50% on the NGSSS SSA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Kathryn Blackburn (kathryn.blackburn@polk-fl.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Evidence-based strategies will be professional development, school site visits to collaborate with successful programs, additional hands-on experiences for students to encourage the deep learning for success on assessments.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Hands-on learning will be an effective evidence-based strategy, because it will engage all learning modalities. Level of evidence will be monitored through common benchmark assessments and district quarterly assessments.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Data analysis of the 2018-19 NGSSS SSA scores</li> <li>2. Monitoring student progress and success, focusing on ESE, ELL, and lowest 25%, through the use of district quarterlies, the GUT check, and classroom assessments</li> <li>3. Remediation Plan in place to support non-performing students</li> <li>4. Re-Assessment Plan for non-performing students</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Miguel Rivera (miguel.rivera01@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).**

## 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.

### **PFEF Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEF), 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.**

Students identified as having social-emotional needs are given the opportunity to meet with the guidance counselor individually or in small groups or if applicable can be met through the classroom staff on a one-to-one basis. Severe cases may be handled with a contracted mental health counselor. The IEP also identifies and addresses social emotional goals for all of our students. Our school also utilizes the following resources (not all will apply and please elaborate on applicable resources): PBIS, Mentoring Programs, and Action Based Learning.

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

5th graders visiting/touring middle schools, Middle school parent event for incoming 6th graders, 8th graders visiting/touring high schools, and WE3 Expo.

**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.**

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. The Title II project contributes to the recruitment/retention of teachers in the district by funding district recruitment personnel, recruitment initiatives both within and outside the school district. Also, may reimburse certification exam fees for teachers placed in an area in which they do not yet have certification in upon successful passing of exam.

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. Title I provides support for this program, through funding of HEARTH staff, professional development, and contracted extended learning services for students.

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

Accelerated programs and high school courses are offered and available to students, in an effort to provide academic rigor and allow students to earn high school credit while in middle school. The school has a designated College and Career contact, and career inventories are used at all grade levels to help students identify skills and interests for college and career planning.

## Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Mathematics	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: English-Language Arts	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00