

Polk County Public Schools

# Davenport School Of The Arts



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>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Davenport School Of The Arts

4751 COUNTY ROAD 547 N, Davenport, FL 33837

www.davenportschoolofthearts.com

## Demographics

Principal: Cindy Braaten

Start Date for this Principal: 7/18/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	77%
<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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (70%) 2014-15: A (69%)
<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 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](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>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

## Davenport School Of The Arts

4751 COUNTY ROAD 547 N, Davenport, FL 33837

[www.davenportschoolofthearts.com](http://www.davenportschoolofthearts.com)

### 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)
Combination School PK-8	No	59%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

### School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

### 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.

Through an innovative, arts-infused curriculum, Davenport School of the Arts enriches the growth of each child in a collaborative, nurturing environment.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Members of the Davenport School of the Arts community are committed to becoming self-directed, life-long learners in a nurturing and stimulating environment, which fosters high expectations and academic excellence.

### 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
Hughes, Alicia	Assistant Principal	
Cotton, Christy	Assistant Principal	
Schumacher, Debbie	Instructional Coach	
Brown, Leslie	School Counselor	
Brewer, Jane	School Counselor	
Shelton, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Braaten, Cindy	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	106	104	108	102	110	111	170	164	157	0	0	0	0	1132
Attendance below 90 percent	11	8	9	4	8	6	10	15	11	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	0	3	19	17	50	22	0	0	0	0	115
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	16	20	36	26	27	0	0	0	0	130

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	1	6	7	10	10	7	0	0	0	0	42	

**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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

67

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

Thursday 7/18/2019

**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	12	14	13	7	13	15	20	24	29	0	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	3	2	2	4	7	11	17	11	7	0	0	0	0	64
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	7	9	11	30	24	22	0	0	0	0	103

**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	1	2	0	5	6	4	9	6	6	0	0	0	0	39

**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	12	14	13	7	13	15	20	24	29	0	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	3	2	2	4	7	11	17	11	7	0	0	0	0	64
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	7	9	11	30	24	22	0	0	0	0	103

**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	1	2	0	5	6	4	9	6	6	0	0	0	0	39

## 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	78%	61%	61%	76%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	58%	59%	66%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	49%	54%	58%	44%	51%
Math Achievement	74%	61%	62%	72%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	59%	56%	59%	56%	50%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	52%	52%	53%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	69%	52%	56%	64%	49%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	95%	79%	78%	87%	68%	75%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	106 (0)	104 (0)	108 (0)	102 (0)	110 (0)	111 (0)	170 (0)	164 (0)	157 (0)	1132 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	11 (12)	8 (14)	9 (13)	4 (7)	8 (13)	6 (15)	10 (20)	15 (24)	11 (29)	82 (147)
One or more suspensions	0 (3)	1 (2)	3 (2)	0 (4)	3 (7)	19 (11)	17 (17)	50 (11)	22 (7)	115 (64)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 (0)	5 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (7)	16 (9)	20 (11)	36 (30)	26 (24)	27 (22)	130 (103)

### 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
03	2019	89%	52%	37%	58%	31%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	80%	51%	29%	57%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	48%	26%	58%	16%
	2018	78%	48%	30%	56%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	79%	47%	32%	56%	23%
	2018	64%	50%	14%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
06	2019	74%	48%	26%	54%	20%
	2018	69%	41%	28%	52%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
07	2019	77%	42%	35%	52%	25%
	2018	70%	42%	28%	51%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	79%	48%	31%	56%	23%
	2018	81%	49%	32%	58%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	89%	56%	33%	62%	27%
	2018	82%	56%	26%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	56%	26%	64%	18%
	2018	84%	57%	27%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	86%	51%	35%	60%	26%
	2018	86%	56%	30%	61%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019	60%	47%	13%	55%	5%
	2018	58%	40%	18%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
07	2019	72%	39%	33%	54%	18%
	2018	56%	40%	16%	54%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
08	2019	40%	35%	5%	46%	-6%
	2018	49%	34%	15%	45%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	67%	45%	22%	53%	14%
	2018	73%	51%	22%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	71%	41%	30%	48%	23%
	2018	61%	42%	19%	50%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	70%	26%	71%	25%
2018	100%	84%	16%	71%	29%
Compare		-4%			
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	87%	50%	37%	61%	26%
2018	95%	60%	35%	62%	33%
Compare		-8%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	53%	43%	57%	39%
2018	0%	41%	-41%	56%	-56%
Compare		96%			

### 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	36	44	35	40	51	43	27				
ELL	61	53	35	54	56	60	36				
ASN	93	75		86	58						
BLK	58	55	38	55	46	36	53	90	64		
HSP	78	67	51	68	57	52	69	93	67		
MUL	90	94		67	44						
WHT	83	67	47	88	67	69	74	98	84		
FRL	69	60	44	63	54	45	67	92	63		
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	31	39	50	29	39	33	36				
ELL	48	42	44	51	43	36	13				
ASN	77	73		62	64						
BLK	58	54	48	55	56	41	53		54		
HSP	70	60	54	68	55	47	61	83	67		
MUL	74	53		63	63						
WHT	81	64	65	81	63	54	77	100	81		
FRL	66	59	55	64	55	42	60	85	60		
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	32	53	42	32	41	40					
ELL	46	51	49	53	60	55	25	59			
ASN	100	75		80	75						
BLK	66	57	42	65	51	48	57	81	44		
HSP	72	64	58	67	58	54	61	85	71		
MUL	89	77		78	38						
WHT	81	72	64	78	56	54	68	92	74		
FRL	70	62	52	66	57	52	60	82	72		

### 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	69
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	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	686
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	53
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	78
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	55
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	67

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	74
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	75
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	63
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.**

5th to 6th grade cohort decreased 26% in math  
 7th to 8th grade cohort decreased 16% in math  
 Student with disabilities performing at 39% overall  
 Contributing factors:  
 Instructional strategies  
 Level of student engagement  
 Instructional support given by ESE personnel

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

5th to 6th grade math cohort

Factors:

Teacher instructional strategies and level of student engagement

Attention to prior knowledge gaps necessary for grade level standard understanding

Lack of formative assessment data usage to check for understanding and guide instruction

Lack of classroom and ESE teacher collaborative planning

**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.**

8th grade math is 6% lower than the state average

Factors:

Instructional strategies

Level of student engagement

Instructional support given by ESE personnel

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

7th grade math had the most improvement.

New Actions:

Standards based planning teacher

Teacher focused on the specific needs of students

Highly engaging teacher who focused on great relationships

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

The EWS data begins with our 4th grade students and increases each year through 8th grade.

Potential concerns:

The content gaps developed in primary grades and students passed on without proper remediation.

82 students missed 18 or more days

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

1. Increase the proficiency in 6th and 8th grade math
2. Increase the proficiency of students with disabilities
3. Decrease the number of days absent K-8

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

#1	
<b>Title</b>	Increase proficiency and learning gains in 6th and 8th grade Math
<b>Rationale</b>	The 5th to 6th grade math cohort dropped 26% and the 7th to 8th grade math cohort dropped 16%
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase proficiency in each grade level cohort by 3%
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Cindy Braaten (cindy.braaten@polk-fl.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	After adjusting instructional personnel and strategies, our 6th to 7th grade cohort increased proficiency by 14%.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	We plan to apply the same strategies to 6th and 8th grade math. Strategies include: target/task alignment student engagement and depth of knowledge checking for understanding within lessons and adjusting to the individual needs of the students
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	1. Increase frequency of classroom rigor walks with feedback and differentiate teacher support based on data collected from rigor walks. 2. Ensure students with disabilities are receiving instruction towards their IEP goals and provide additional supports based on their need. (additional time spent filling academic gaps). 3. Level 1 students placed in Intensive Math, utilize time weekly on major math concepts and Imagine Math.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Christy Cotton (christy.cotton@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).**

We will adjust the ESE teachers focus as they plan for support of the students with disabilities, which include tracking of accommodations used in the classroom and on assessments. Provide additional student supports based on their areas of need. (additional time spent filling academic gaps, tutoring). Utilize district supports to provide professional development to our staff to optimize the instructional resources and strategies used for our ESE students.

### Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase proficiency and learning gains in 6th and 8th grade Math	\$0.00
			<b>Total:</b> \$0.00