Jewett School Of The Arts

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Jewett School Of The Arts

2250 8TH ST NE, Winter Haven, FL 33881

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

Demographics

Principal: Michael Sears

Start Date for this Principal: 5/26/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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)	98%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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

Jewett School Of The Arts

2250 8TH ST NE, Winter Haven, FL 33881

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

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)
Combination School PK-8	No	69%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

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.

The mission of Jewett School of the Arts is to provide all participants in our learning community with the resources needed to become responsible, life-long learners committed to excellence in the academics and the arts.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision of Jewett School of the Arts is to provide the pathway for faculty, staff, parents and community to cultivate, through communication, a sense of ownership, spirit and pride in the school. Not only must students be prepared academically; they must be fostered with a sense of cultural awareness which includes an appreciation of the arts, acceptance of diversity, and the community.

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
Sears, Michael	Principal	
Dean, Samantha	Assistant Principal	
Dill, Dennis	Teacher, K-12	
Huyhn, Rhoda	School Counselor	
Reddick, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	
Sweet, Lacey	Assistant Principal	
Richard, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Mills, Meredith	Teacher, K-12	
Smith, Robert	Teacher, K-12	
Henry, Bridgette		
Ehrlich, Crystal	Teacher, K-12	KG
Hippeli, Danielle	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 5/26/2012, Michael Sears

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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)	98%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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	68	69	68	70	92	89	74	87	100	0	0	0	0	717
Attendance below 90 percent	5	3	2	1	12	2	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	3	7	2	3	3	10	2	12	11	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	0	1	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	0	1	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	8	14	14	13	16	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	20	15	26	10	14	0	0	0	0	89

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	1	0	1	6	8	3	3	7	0	0	0	0	30

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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 5/27/2020

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	72	72	72	75	88	88	90	114	88	0	0	0	0	759
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students 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	0	0	0	0	

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	3	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	72	72	72	75	88	88	90	114	88	0	0	0	0	759
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students 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	0	0	0	0	

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	3	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	57%	61%	61%	56%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	58%	59%	54%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	49%	54%	43%	44%	51%
Math Achievement	55%	61%	62%	50%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	52%	56%	59%	53%	50%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	52%	52%	50%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	43%	52%	56%	43%	49%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	79%	78%	51%	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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019	54%	52%	2%	58%	-4%
	2018	64%	51%	13%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	48%	13%	58%	3%
	2018	67%	48%	19%	56%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	52%	47%	5%	56%	-4%
	2018	58%	50%	8%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
06	2019	64%	48%	16%	54%	10%
	2018	50%	41%	9%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
07	2019	51%	42%	9%	52%	-1%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	62%	42%	20%	51%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	62%	48%	14%	56%	6%
	2018	65%	49%	16%	58%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	56%	-5%	62%	-11%
	2018	45%	56%	-11%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	56%	10%	64%	2%
	2018	56%	57%	-1%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				
05	2019	40%	51%	-11%	60%	-20%
	2018	52%	56%	-4%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
06	2019	67%	47%	20%	55%	12%
	2018	62%	40%	22%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
07	2019	39%	39%	0%	54%	-15%
	2018	38%	40%	-2%	54%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
08	2019	35%	35%	0%	46%	-11%
	2018	21%	34%	-13%	45%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	38%	45%	-7%	53%	-15%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	47%	41%	6%	48%	-1%
	2018	41%	42%	-1%	50%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

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	80%	70%	10%	71%	9%
2018	94%	84%	10%	71%	23%
Compare		-14%			
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	70%	50%	20%	61%	9%
2018	75%	60%	15%	62%	13%
Compare		-5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	53%	26%	57%	22%
2018	93%	41%	52%	56%	37%
Compare		-14%			

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	25	36	29	17	36	29					
ELL	36	29		45	39						
BLK	43	49	53	46	49	50	21	68	78		

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
HSP	62	45	38	56	46	41	48	85	80		
MUL	85	67		77	50						
WHT	68	58	44	61	59	49	56	87	61		
FRL	48	51	51	47	49	41	36	81	65		

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	15	20		15	33	40					
ELL	58	50		58	44						
BLK	44	48	45	38	49	52	34		62		
HSP	74	65	65	58	53	75	42		83		
MUL	64	38		57	77						
WHT	69	57	50	62	57	48	61	95	76		
FRL	55	52	51	47	50	55	40	94	78		

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	29	23		31	62						
ELL	56	45		56	64						
BLK	40	49	47	36	46	47	28	44			
HSP	64	53	31	56	50	60	54	56			
MUL	75	64		50	50						
WHT	64	56	41	59	58	50	53	55	78		
FRL	49	50	41	43	45	47	40	45	75		

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	87
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	591
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
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	58
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	70
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	60
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.

The students with disabilities exhibited the lowest performance on data. The quality and consistency of the effectiveness of the interventions. The trend with the students displays that they are increasing achievement. The current level of achievement is low compared to their peers. We will provide the students that are performing below the 41% threshold by providing support within the classroom with the classroom instructor and the ESE teacher. Collaborative planning will occur with our students to strengthen the instructional practices within the classroom. We will provide extended learning opportunities at the school site in the am prior to school starting and after school to provide support for our students in this category. We will also have ESE instructors group our students to provide support within the classroom.The ESE instructors will provide detailed weekly reports on students progress and the strategies that are being successful and unsuccessful to ensure we are providing the proper supports for all students.

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

English Language Arts showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Instructional delivery did not meet the rigor of the standard. Lack of implementation of curriculum properly. Inexperienced instructors and inconsistent instruction in multiple classes.

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.

Math data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average by having a total of 57% lower than the state averages when adding up the gap. Instructional delivery. Instruction coming directly from the text and lack of utilization of manipulative. The upper grades lack of interventions implemented in the classroom and a failure to shift instruction based on student needs.

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

Math data showed the greatest level of improvement with a total of 24% increase over the entire grades tested. Focus on math instruction setting up specific Math PLC, additional support with a school based and district based math coach, and school focus with walk throughs, coaching forms, and monitoring math instruction purposefully. Utilizing SMAD practice with incentives.

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

Students with one or more suspensions
Level 1 achievement on FSA Math

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

1. Increase Students With Disabilities proficiency levels.
2. Decrease school suspensions.
3. Improve instructional delivery throughout the campus.
4. Increase positive relationships between staff and students.
5. Improve teacher attendance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	All students will receive grade level standards-based instruction to improve student achievement in core content areas. Students will be exposed to the intent and rigor of the grade level standard, which will build on their current level of learning closing the gap in proficiency. Previously, students received instruction that was misaligned to the intent and rigor of the grade level standard; in addition, tasks were below the grade level expectation. In 2018-19 more than 50% of the lowest quartile in grades 3 - 8 did not make learning gains on the state Reading or Math Assessment. In 2018-19 75% of the students with disabilities subgroup failed to meet the ESSA goal of 41%.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of standards based instruction taught in core content areas, 52% of the Lowest Quartile will exhibit learning gains on the state reading assessment; 53% of Lowest Quartile will exhibit learning gains on state math assessment. All ESSA subgroups will perform at a minimum of 41% overall. Student learning will be monitored though grade level formative assessments and district progress monitoring tools.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lacey Sweet (lacey.sweet@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Target task alignment exercises, PLC on utilizing proper formative assessments, coaching cycle, OLA standards based assessments, collaborative planning, and vertical planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	District and school based initiative that provides research based strategies that yield improvements. The implementation is supported by the district.

Action Steps to Implement	

Provide Professional Development on effective Target Task Alignment implementation. Administration will monitor the implementation level through coaching cycles and monitoring of teacher lesson plans. Target Task alignment initial professional development will occur on the pre-planning week by Administration (Sears, Sweet, and Dean). Training will occur monthly in PLC conducted by administrators on a rotating basis. All of the instructional staff will participate in the training occurring in the PLC. Administrators will provide PD for Middle School, Elementary Grades, and Fine Arts instructors.

Person Responsible	Michael Sears (michael.sears@polk-fl.net)

Provide professional learning on effectiveness of formative assessments and how to properly implement the items within a lesson. Instructors will have access to researched based formative assessment stems. Instructors will provide work samples, ongoing formative and summative data to support the implementation of target task alignment. Formative assessment initial professional development will occur on the pre-planning week by Administration (Sears, Sweet, and Dean). Administrative team will also be provided training by Ashley Purcell on using District OLA tool. We will also have her come into the school site and conduct a training in September on the District OLA tool. Training will occur bi weekly in PLC conducted by testing coordinator/administrators on a rotating basis to assess the formative, . All of the instructional staff will participate in the training occurring in the PLC. Testing Coordinator and Administration will provide PD for Middle School, Elementary Grades, and Fine Arts instructors.

Person Responsible	Lacey Sweet (lacey.sweet@polk-fl.net)

School based instructional leaders will participate in a book study using Student Centered Coaching: A Guide for K - 8 Coaches and Principles by Diane Sweeney. Implement Coaching strategies and monitor effectiveness with forms from index and classroom walk throughs.

Person Responsible   Michael Sears (michael.sears@polk-fl.net)

Professional development for Online Learning Assessments (Performance Matters) how to create an effective online assessment and use data to direct instruction moving forward. Professional learning will be led by District personnel and testing coordinator. Training will be conducted by FOCUS staff member from the district office. Data will be reviewed bi-weekly. Testing Coordinator and Gifted Instructors with reports being provided to Administration. Data will drive instruction and reteaching or revising of instruction will be reflected in lessons and intervention instructional time for the instructors. Lesson plans and implementation will be monitored by Sears/Dean/Sweet.

Person Responsible   Kimberly Reddick (kimberly.reddick@polk-fl.net)

Teacher led collaborative planning will occur weekly: discussing topics with standards based instruction, target task alignment, work samples, formative and summative assessment data.

Person Responsible   Danielle Hippeli (danielle.hippeli@polk-fl.net)

Provide professional development on effective vertical planning practices. Administration will provide instructors with initial focus area to explore during vertical planning. Grade levels will compare terminology and identify the unpacking of the standard. Creating tasks collaboratively to meet the level of the standard. Aligning content area terminology and best practices. Staff members will conduct vertical planning on early release days.

Person Responsible   Lacey Sweet (lacey.sweet@polk-fl.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Disciplinary referrals are greatly disproportionate based upon race throughout K - 8. Students are missing a large amount of class time due to suspensions and other disciplinary consequences at a disproportionate rate. Reviewing disciplinary data the large discrepancy is displayed with in school and out of school suspensions.
Measurable Outcome:	We are seeking to have the referral breakdown reflect the student body make up percentages: 41% African Americans 32% White 23% Hispanic
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Samantha Dean (samantha.dean@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Positive Behavior Intervention Supports training and structures to increase positive school culture and assist students in strategies used to resolve conflict. Social Emotional Learning Training for students K - 5, Early Release day focus on SEL lessons for Middle School students. One day per week in elective classes working on interpersonal skills and conflict resolution skills. CPI Verbal Deescalation strategies
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The SEL program is a research based educational tool that will provide students the opportunity to grow in multiple areas of interaction as well as become better prepared to deal with conflicts that may arise throughout the school day experience. District initiative to build and maintain positive relationships between staff and students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use of JAC Behavior Card (5-8) and JAG Bucks. Incentives for positive choices (JAG Buck School Store & PBIS Celebrations)
2. Use CHAMPs to deliver school-wide expectations.
3. Middle school small group instruction (specific students). Data used to establish supports for small group will be disciplinary referral data, attendance data, and retention information.
- Behavior Contract, Caution/Red Card JAC will participate in Check in/Check out.
- Students in the category will participate in small group activities on choices and proper responses.
- We will meet once a week with small groups.
- Participate in mock role play and team building strategies.
4. Sanford Harmony SEL Lesson integration.
- Classes will participate in morning meetings daily in all of the K - 5 classrooms.
- 2x's per month SEL lessons will be taught to the students in all grade levels (K - 5) by Homeroom teacher during PE block.

Person Responsible	Samantha Dean (samantha.dean@polk-fl.net)

Provide professional learning through District Support Staff - (entire staff training) Deborah Badertscher and Lori Allen are providing the district training during pre planning initial training. We will have bullying training occur for our staff by Denise Sepulveda for our staff in September. She will provide support as needed for any students that have bullying claims substantiated in school. Staff will be provided PBIS training by AP Samantha Dean during PLC monthly and data will be discussed bi-weekly about

C.H.A.M.P.S.
Model proper strategies with the staff members.
Review implementation of strategies with classroom observations, disciplinary data, and positive to negative interaction with students in the classroom (CHAMPS Form) - bi weekly. (As needed based upon the data resulting in an increased observation.

Person Responsible Samantha Dean (samantha.dean@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Students with one or more suspensions: we will review disciplinary data during leadership team meetings, discuss implementation of C.H.A.M.P.S and PBIS data. provide the staff with techniques and track the usage of the items. Mentoring session data (meetings, topics discussed, follow up on behavior) for students that had disciplinary issues from the previous year. Small group meetings with counselor and Administrator to equip students with strategies on de-escalation and mentoring. Meet with Assistant Principal weekly to discuss any concerns or issues.

Level 1 achievement on FSA Math: Review Freckle reports/on demand assignments, SMAD data monitored, focus on Math instruction during block with focused walk throughs and discuss data collected.

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.

The school provides correspondence to parents by allowing access to student grades 24 hours a day electronically through the FOCUS system. We provide a monthly newsletter to parents highlighting events that are going on at the school site. We provide weekly correspondence via e-mail through our list serve that provides information through e-mail and Connect Ed messages that provide prerecorded messages to parents and stakeholders about important information. The school also schedules parent information nights (PIN) throughout the year on academic, behavioral, and STEAM themed information. The school has orientation nights for students. The school also will have portfolio meetings that allow parents to come in and listen to their students describe their program's progress with their schoolwork and what they are learning during the school year. The school provides opportunities to interact with stakeholders at events

such as "Donuts with Dad" and "Muffins with Mom." We participate in local community activities such as holiday parades, festivals, and celebrations. PTA organization provides school information updates on social website to keep community members abreast of school activities. Principal utilizes social media Twitter, Facebook, and REMIND APP to communicate information to stakeholders. We also will have parental events to promote parental involvement and assist parents in enhancing their student's education providing reading, mathematical, and science support strategies. The school utilizes Parent and Family Engagement Nights five times a year (virtually and/or on-campus) to provide parents with resources to enhance their students' education including two portfolio nights (1 fall, 1 spring), a Testing Night, an ELA/Math Night, and a STEAM Night. The school also provides workshops during the day to assist parents in communication with instructors and discussing student progress. Additionally, the school will implement monthly surveys to stakeholders to analyze the school's "customer service." These surveys will include stakeholders' opinions on, but not limited to, communication, problem solving, level of satisfaction, academics, behavior, and appearance as it relates to the school.

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: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00