Polk County Public Schools

George W. Jenkins Senior High

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

George W. Jenkins Senior High

6000 LAKELAND HIGHLANDS RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

Demographics

Principal: Tom Patton　　　　　　　　　　Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
2019-20 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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

George W. Jenkins Senior High

6000 LAKELAND HIGHLANDS RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	56%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	C

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.

Our mission is that each student is prompt, polite, and prepared.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is that each student will graduate with the skills necessary to be successful in college or in a career.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Patton, Tom	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school-based team implements sound instructional practices, conducts evaluations of school staff, ensures implementation/ documentation of a multitiered system of interventions and supports, ensures that adequate professional development opportunities exist and that these opportunities represent research-based, educational best practices that serve to enhance both the depth and breadth of the school's abilities both academic and beyond. The principal also ensure that appropriate and diverse methods of communication are in place to inform parents and other community stakeholders of school-based plans and activities.
Emmerling, Lacy	Assistant Principal	Assist and facilitate the common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing research-based, effective instructional strategies, conduct both informal and formal assessments of school staff, ensure implementation/documentation of a multi-tiered system of interventions and supports, ensure that adequate professional development opportunities exist and that these opportunities represent research-based, educational best practices that serve to enhance both the depth and breadth of the campus' instructional capacity, and communicate with parents regarding school-based plans and activities.
Hiers, William	Assistant Principal	Assist and facilitate the common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing research-based, effective instructional strategies, conduct both informal and formal assessments of school staff, ensure implementation/documentation of a multi-tiered system of interventions and supports, ensure that adequate professional development opportunities exist and that these opportunities represent research-based, educational best practices that serve to enhance both the depth and breadth of the campus' instructional capacity, and communicate with parents regarding school-based plans and activities.
Goodman, Robert	Instructional Technology	To ensure that the quality and quantity of technology is abundant and satisfactory across campus, and that teachers feel supported and ready for the classroom concerning their technology. In addition, Mr. Goodman diligently keeps track, updates, and monitors all technology across campus, and makes sure that each piece of technology is up to date and ready for usage and any time.
Crosby, Erin	Dean	This group provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, helps facilitate instructional and intervention supports, collaborates with staff to improve/implement intervention supports, and integrates materials/instructional techniques within the framework of the district curriculum maps.
Rawson, Daniel	Dean	This group provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, helps facilitate instructional and intervention

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		supports, collaborates with staff to improve/implement intervention supports, and integrates materials/instructional techniques within the framework of the district curriculum maps.
Walton, Jonathan	Dean	This group provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, helps facilitate instructional and intervention supports, collaborates with staff to improve/implement intervention supports, and integrates materials/instructional techniques within the framework of the district curriculum maps.
Provino, Lisa	Instructional Coach	The reading coach is instrumental in knowing the instructional practices and capacity of our teachers and providing input regarding professional development themes/design that would be beneficial for all staff. She will work with our deans to run an induction program for our new teachers and will ensure that they are monitored, encouraged, and provided with necessary support. She will work closely in designing cohesive lessons in our Reading and English departments in an effort to ensure seamless instruction and to maximize literacy-based efforts.
Akins, Ladreda	Assistant Principal	Assist and facilitate the common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing research-based, effective instructional strategies, conduct both informal and formal assessments of school staff, ensure implementation/documentation of a multi-tiered system of interventions and supports, ensure that adequate professional development opportunities exist and that these opportunities represent research-based, educational best practices that serve to enhance both the depth and breadth of the campus' instructional capacity, and communicate with parents regarding school-based plans and activities.
Vancamp, Jane	Other	Our school success coach works to identify students are behind in grade level when compared to their cohort, have a GPA below 2.0, or are otherwise deemed at-risk to not graduate with a diploma. Once identified, she works to build relationships with these students and their families, learn their goals and their strengths/weaknesses, and develop a plan to ensure that they successfully graduate with a diploma. Once a plan is created, she monitors students' progress towards achieving the goals within the plan, ensures that necessary supports are in place, and continually updates the plan of action, as needed. The role of the Success Coach is to ensure that every child, no matter the background or difficulties, has the support needed to graduate with a diploma and a plan for success in life after high school.
Corcelles, Taina	Teacher, K-12	The ELL instructor provides guidance for the ELL plan and participates in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of student data. She facilitates the development of intervention/support plans, provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation, and provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation. She also

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		facilitates data-based decision making activities that enhance the effectiveness of instruction delivered to our ELL students.
Hamid, Linda	Teacher, ESE	Serve as the facilitator and Lead Teacher for the ESE department and participate in student data collection, integrate core instructional activities/ materials into the instructional framework, and ensure that collaboration between ESE teachers and general education teachers are utilized consistently through activities such as consult, co-teaching, and support facilitation.
Odum, Denise	Teacher, ESE	Serve as the facilitator and Lead Teacher for the ESE department and participate in student data collection, integrate core instructional activities/ materials into the instructional framework, and ensure that collaboration between ESE teachers and general education teachers are utilized consistently through activities such as consult, co-teaching, and support facilitation.
Durham, Dan	Assistant Principal	Assist and facilitate the common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing research-based, effective instructional strategies, conduct both informal and formal assessments of school staff, ensure implementation/documentation of a multi-tiered system of interventions and supports, ensure that adequate professional development opportunities exist and that these opportunities represent research-based, educational best practices that serve to enhance both the depth and breadth of the campus' instructional capacity, and communicate with parents regarding school-based plans and activities.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Tom Patton

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
116

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
2019-20 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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.	

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	600	607	495	499	2201
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	55	48	43	208
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	106	86	72	377
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	71	78	55	280
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	84	106	79	330
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	129	85	50	383
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	26	139	47	324

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	30	32	30	49	141

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	66	71	49	52	238
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	13	10	44

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 5/21/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	631	583	524	460	2198
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	62	68	63	268
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	79	84	34	311
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	60	66	92	239
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142	99	70	8	319

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	95	50	129	43	317

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	95	81	82	49	307
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	17	14	6	50

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	631	583	524	460	2198
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	62	68	63	268
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	79	84	34	311
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	60	66	92	239
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142	99	70	8	319

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	95	50	129	43	317

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	95	81	82	49	307
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	17	14	6	50

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	55%	47%	56%	51%	44%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	46%	51%	45%	41%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	37%	42%	36%	33%	41%
Math Achievement	57%	43%	51%	40%	37%	49%
Math Learning Gains	45%	45%	48%	39%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	44%	45%	32%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	60%	58%	68%	62%	56%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	63%	61%	73%	72%	60%	70%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**				**Total**
	9	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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**
09	2019	53%	45%	8%	55%	-2%
	2018	57%	43%	14%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	56%	42%	14%	53%	3%
	2018	50%	42%	8%	53%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

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	60%	54%	6%	67%	-7%
2018	71%	59%	12%	65%	6%
Compare		-11%			
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	63%	57%	6%	70%	-7%
2018	70%	57%	13%	68%	2%
Compare		-7%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	50%	0%	61%	-11%
2018	63%	60%	3%	62%	1%
Compare		-13%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	53%	9%	57%	5%
2018	41%	41%	0%	56%	-15%
Compare		21%			

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	32	28	30	35	21	26	28		89	39
ELL	17	46	33	40	46		30			85	68
ASN	65	55		57	37		55	82		94	81
BLK	35	42	39	42	37	54	41	44		97	53
HSP	50	48	35	47	53	48	52	64		96	73
MUL	58	53		63	35		56	63		90	83
WHT	62	54	44	65	45	35	71	68		98	75
FRL	36	42	40	40	42	44	47	53		95	61
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	21	47	42	18	24	24	46	33		69	17
ELL	17	56	50	29	47			36		75	27
ASN	60	62		44	18		94	60			
BLK	35	45	44	28	34	33	68	49		82	36
HSP	48	56	54	41	45	55	71	67		87	60
MUL	51	60	45	44	29	33	75	76		85	71
WHT	63	56	48	59	41	48	72	78		90	57
FRL	43	52	50	36	37	39	66	59		81	43

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	9	29	30	16	38	31	16	43		66	22
ELL	16	23	27	21	35	31	31	47		63	8
ASN	60	50		54	47		88	82		90	53
BLK	31	40	28	29	36	30	40	53		76	31
HSP	45	36	33	30	30	29	61	67		86	51
MUL	42	44	30	40	50	29	52	78		100	57
WHT	59	50	45	47	42	35	67	78		91	58
FRL	38	39	31	30	32	29	49	61		78	39

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	59
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	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	650
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	66
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.**

These goals are based on the 2018-2019 school year data, so the data component that showed the
lowest performance was Algebra EOC with a 50%.
Students entered Algebra without sufficient computational ability. A contributing factor to
the decline in achievement was the increased amount of students who were enrolled in
Algebra IB; the students scheduled in Algebra IB have history of scoring an achievement
level of one or two on state assessments.
Another area that is noted is our school's ESSA data with Students with Disabilities. The
mandatory state average must be 41%, and the George Jenkins current average is 35%.
With this in mind, a focus will be placed on strategically hand-scheduling students into
supports in academic classes, additional trainings for both content teachers and ESE
teachers, increasing common planning for ESE teachers to identify and develop
interventions for students' struggling in multiple contents, and scheduling changes for
struggling students in academic courses mid-year.

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

These goals are based on the 2018-2019 school year data, so the data component that showed the
greatest decline was Algebra, with a -13% decline.
from 63% in 2018 to 50% in 2019. A contributing factor to the decline in achievement
was the increased amount of students who were enrolled in Algebra IB; the students
scheduled in Algebra IB have history of scoring an achievement level of one or two on
state assessments.

**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.**

These goals are based on the 2018-2019 school year data so with the current data available, the
component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was for 9th grade ELA,
with a -2%. The school's average was 53% and the state's average was 55%. Factors that
contributed to this gap and trends would be specific content related teacher absences. In addition,
data from our ESE student achievement continues to indicate that this subgroup needs additional
interventions and support.

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

These goals are based on the 2018-2019 school year data, so the data component that showed the
most improvement was a 21% gain in Geometry, from 41% to 62%. There was a unilateral focus on
common assessments during horizontal and vertical planning, there was extra tutoring after school,
and there were
item reflection with progress monitoring assessments.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

These goals are based on the 2018-2019 school year data, so two areas of concern would be course
failure in math (Geometry, Algebra I, and Math) and course failure in ELA for juniors. Both categories
are the highest for juniors, with 78 for ELA and 106 in Math. Another trend is the suspension rate and

attendance of freshman, which is the highest of all grades. The suspension rate is 113 and attendance below 90% is 62.

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

Based on the goals of the 2018-2019 school year data, the three priorities are as follows:

1. Student with disabilities.
2. Lowest 25% for Math gains.
3. Lowest 25% for ELA gains.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2018-2019 data indicated that students with disabilities were below the mandated percentage of 41% with the school's ESSA data.
Measurable Outcome:	2018-2019 data indicated that the measurable outcome that the school plans to achieve is to raise the total by 3%, from 34% to 37%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lacy Emmerling (lacy.emmerling@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	2018-2019 data indicated that there will be a thorough review of ESE students' classes and utilizing their Teachers of Record to make sure that each student will have the necessary support in the classroom needed. In addition, ESE students will be hand scheduled, based on their IEP's, and efforts will be made to match students with teachers who will best compliment their learning styles and personalities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We collaborated with the district-based ESE staff to determine the best placement for students based on their services and accommodations.

Action Steps to Implement

2018-2019 data indicated that the action steps for implementation are as follows:

1. Strategically hand-scheduled students into supports in academic classes.
2. Additional trainings for both content teachers and ESE teachers.
3. Increase in common planning for ESE teachers to identify and develop interventions for students' struggling in multiple contents.
4. Schedule changes for academic courses mid-year.

Person Responsible	Lacy Emmerling (lacy.emmerling@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2018-2019 data indicated that this group covers a wide range of subgroups. Focusing on the lowest 25% of math also covers multiple core math classes, such as ALG I, ALG IB, and Geometry. Sufficient growth in this component has not been evident throughout the past three years.
Measurable Outcome:	2018-2019 data indicated that the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is a 3% gain for the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	William Hiers (william.hiers@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	2018-2019 data indicated that teachers will identify and track the progress of their lowest 25% throughout the year. Common planning meetings will show an intentional focus on identifying common deficiencies within this subgroup and incorporating remedial teacher strategies/materials into instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	2018-2019 data indicated that embedding an ongoing plan for data analysis is a best practice that allows teachers to incorporate "live" data/assessment results into the lesson planning process. It allows for an ongoing analysis of specific standards that students have mastered, while also showing areas of needed growth. Common planning meetings among teachers have shown to produce tasks and assessments whose quality exceeds that of individual teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

2018-2019 data indicated that the action steps for implementation are as follows:

1. Teachers and administration will utilize data available in Unify to determine students' past performance in mathematics. Baseline pre-requisite skills tests will be incorporated within the first two weeks of school to provide additional, current information about students' abilities
2. Teachers and administration will determine which students comprise the lowest 25% component.
3. Common planning meetings will show a focus on tracking these students and showing growth throughout the school year.
4. Support from district math coaches will be utilized, as needed, to incorporate resources that will engage the lowest 25% of students.

Person Responsible	William Hiers (william.hiers@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2018-2019 data indicated this group covers a wide range of subgroups, such as ESE (34%), ELL (43%), and Black/African American Students (45%). Focusing on the lowest 25% of ELA allows a narrow focus on students who take ELA I and ELA II FSA exam; allowing administration to provide better support with either tutoring, additional reading classes, and/or progress monitoring with teachers.
Measurable Outcome:	2018-2019 data indicated the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is a 5% gain for the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	2018-2019 data indicated the strategy will be multi-tiered. Curriculum will be adjusted to fit the FSA testing schedule, so that teachers' content will match testing content. Also, to add focus on writing, teachers will be grade norming progress monitoring essays multiple times a year, and have students go through the writing process up to four separate times. In addition, teachers will have a week of reading prep before the FSA reading exam, and a week of writing prep for the FSA writing exam. Finally, each ninth and tenth grade teacher will have a personalized breakdown of the prior scores from the 2019-2020 school year and a breakdown for new students entering their class for the 2020-2021 school year; allowing them to narrow down the focus of their instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	2018-2019 data indicated the level of evidence will be a weekly meeting discussing best practices and well as grade norming for progress monitoring essays. In addition to grade norming, for each progress monitoring essay there will be a reflection process for each teacher, narrow down the scope of what writing strategies they should be working on. There will also be weekly walk-throughs by administration, and provided reading/writing prep for students prior to both the FSA reading and Writing exams. In addition, Ms. Provino (Reading coach) and Mr. Walton (Dean of students) will also be available for support and accountability, as well as meeting with Ms. Musselman (Department Head) and other English teachers on certain practices or ideas they wish to implement.
Action Steps to Implement	

2018-2019 data indicated that the action steps for implementation are as follows:

1. Each teacher receives a breakdown of prior scores from 2018-2019 school
year on FSA reading and Writing, as well as a breakdown on students
entering their classrooms for the 2020-2021 school year.
2. Adjusted curriculum for FSA testing.
3. Multiple thorough writing process for each student on progress monitoring
essays.
4. Reading and writing prep before FSA exams.
5. Narrowed scope for common planning with grade norming.

Person Responsible   Lisa Provino (lisa.provino@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

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

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

A positive school environment and culture is created through inclusivity via a multitude of student interest clubs, academic clubs, and athletics. Stakeholders are a key component in ensuring our groups are successful through various levels of support.

Each academy has various business owners and other pertinent positions that apply directly to each academy. For example, on the advisory board of the legal academy are judges and lawyers, and students will visit the Bartow courthouse to watch legal proceedings. Job shadowing and local community involvement is important for all seven academies.

Academics Booster Club and School Advisory Committee both have parents and community business leaders involved in decision making and processes through the school academics. Parents and stakeholder meet regularly around the school year to discuss student initiatives related to scheduling, testing, student award ceremonies and incentives. Both organizations also have a direct role in determining funding for resources and student activities.

George Jenkins High School also host multiple large events that invite various stakeholders, such as the initial school orientation and Eagle Fest. School Orientation is for 9th-12th student to visit, familiarize themselves to the school, get their course schedule, get their ID, sign up for local clubs, and/or discuss their courses with guidance counselors. Eagle Fest is a direct invitation to the local community to bring upcoming eighth graders and their parents, which creates a direct connection between the community and student/ family that is planning on attending George Jenkins High School. In addition, Eagle Fest is an event that presents academic clubs and athletics teams, as well as academies and Advanced Placement courses.

George Jenkins High School has various community business leaders who fund teacher events such as Teacher of the Year and School Related Employee of the Year awards. These same stakeholders support, organize, and fund student and staff activities and celebrations.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**