

Polk County Public Schools

Kathleen Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Kathleen Middle School

3627 KATHLEEN PNES, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

Demographics

Principal: Sheila Gregory

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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: C (51%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (39%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Kathleen Middle School

3627 KATHLEEN PNES, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%
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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Kathleen Middle School, a community of diverse learners, is to ensure rigorous and relevant learning experiences that result in high achievement for our students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Kathleen Middle School, we strive to provide a secure learning environment for all students to prepare them for the competitive world in which we live. Each student will be empowered to lead and influence the ever-changing, diverse, global economy as a creative and critical thinker.

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
Gregory, Sheila	Principal	oversee the implementation of the School Improvement Plan and monitor effectiveness of goals and strategies
Day, Bucky	Assistant Principal	scheduling, grades, curriculum support
Lay, William	Dean	PBIS, CHAMPS, curriculum support, SEL
Scheloske, Amy	Assistant Principal	PBIS, curriculum support, discipline, facilities, SEL
Oliver, Joshua	School Counselor	scheduling, grades, SEL, crisis intervention, PBIS
Lipham, Christine	Instructional Coach	Literacy development within all content areas
Hill, William	Instructional Coach	Math support
Taylor, Kevin	Instructional Coach	Science
Smith, Monique	Instructional Coach	Math, Title One facilitator

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Sheila Gregory

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.*

2

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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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: C (51%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (39%)
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	282	226	244	0	0	0	0	752
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	45	72	0	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	66	84	0	0	0	0	228
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	44	61	0	0	0	0	180
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	44	61	0	0	0	0	145
December 2019 STAR ELA Level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	51	91	0	0	0	0	241
December 2019 STAR Math Level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	69	60	0	0	0	0	231

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	64	58	82	0	0	0	0	204

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	0	0	0	0	12

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/9/2020

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	309	234	239	0	0	0	0	782	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	51	59	0	0	0	0	179	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	100	71	0	0	0	0	262	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	7	0	0	0	0	17	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	119	71	0	0	0	0	288	

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	78	77	57	0	0	0	0	212	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	3	0	0	0	0	15	

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	281	222	244	0	0	0	0	747	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	51	59	0	0	0	0	179	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	100	71	0	0	0	0	262	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	30	7	0	0	0	0	54	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	87	122	0	0	0	0	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	78	77	57	0	0	0	0	212	

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	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	8	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	0	0	0	0	12	

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	39%	48%	54%	34%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	52%	54%	42%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	48%	47%	39%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	42%	50%	58%	27%	47%	56%
Math Learning Gains	53%	50%	57%	35%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	48%	51%	29%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	41%	44%	51%	33%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	72%	72%	62%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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
06	2019	37%	48%	-11%	54%	-17%
	2018	27%	41%	-14%	52%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	29%	42%	-13%	52%	-23%
	2018	36%	42%	-6%	51%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	45%	48%	-3%	56%	-11%
	2018	43%	49%	-6%	58%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	36%	47%	-11%	55%	-19%
	2018	29%	40%	-11%	52%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	38%	39%	-1%	54%	-16%
	2018	39%	40%	-1%	54%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	28%	35%	-7%	46%	-18%
	2018	13%	34%	-21%	45%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	40%	41%	-1%	48%	-8%
	2018	37%	42%	-5%	50%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	64%	70%	-6%	71%	-7%
2018	87%	84%	3%	71%	16%
Compare		-23%			
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	77%	50%	27%	61%	16%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	79%	60%	19%	62%	17%
Compare		-2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	53%	-53%	57%	-57%
2018	76%	41%	35%	56%	20%
Compare		-76%			

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	22	43	41	27	47	42	20	52			
ELL	13	43	44	24	58	65	10	44			
BLK	31	47	48	30	50	47	35	68	69		
HSP	38	50	44	40	54	60	34	58	59		
MUL				20							
WHT	45	53	51	51	55	51	53	71	69		
FRL	34	47	44	37	51	49	38	65	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	16	40	42	24	39	34	26	45			
ELL	15	39	42	25	56	48	24				
BLK	30	49	48	28	45	43	25	65			
HSP	29	46	39	29	49	51	33	100	53		
MUL	20	33		36	50						
WHT	44	58	63	39	56	56	44	92	72		
FRL	34	52	53	33	52	53	35	81	62		
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	5	24	26	3	26	24	5	37			
ELL	6	28	50	11	24	10		39			
BLK	23	42	53	16	28	27	7	58			
HSP	31	38	43	24	33	15	34	60	48		
MUL	18	50		24	50						
WHT	41	45	29	34	38	34	41	63	60		
FRL	27	40	40	23	33	29	28	56	48		

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	507
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	47
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	49
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	20
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	55
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	48
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.

Based on district progress monitoring, our 6th Grade Science did the lowest with 62% of the students scoring a Level 1. This is due to a substitute teacher being placed into this position with no science background and no teaching experience. Our students also had a gap due to days lost due to tornado.

Based on previous years FSA testing, our area of poorest performance is our 8th Grade Science, 42% proficiency rate, however, this rate has been steadily increasing over the last four years

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

Based on district progress monitoring, STAR, our ESE students showed a decline in Math proficiency with 52% of our ESE students scoring a Level 1 on the December STAR assessment. . Also, our 6th Grade Science did the lowest on our progress monitoring. This is due to a sub being placed into this position with no science background and no teaching experience along with lost instructional days due to tornado.

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.

Based on FSA 2019, our greatest gap was in 6th Grade Math proficiency. KMS rate was 36% proficiency compared to the state average of 55%, a -19% gap. These students were subjected to new teachers and substitutes.

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

The Math data, overall showed the most improvement in all areas. However, our Accelerated classes, Algebra and Geometry showed the most growth. We utilized the Imagine Math program in several different classes with the assistance of our Math Interventionist.

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

Student attendance
Low proficiency levels on FSA

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

1. Subgroup overall proficiency in CORE subjects (Science, ELA, Math, Civics)
2. suspension numbers
3. student attendance
4. maintaining level 3, 4, and 5 proficiency levels

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The purpose standards aligned curriculum and instruction is to provide a toolkit of strategies for students and teachers that will assist them in organizational methods of learning and instruction. It will guide students to comprehend materials and concepts and articulate ideas at increasingly complex levels within developmental general education and discipline based curricula. The addition of rigor serves as one of several tools used to raise the expectancy of highest student achievement among students and staff.

Measurable Outcome:

The goal is to move our overall proficiency to 42% in ELA; 44% in Math; 43% in Science and 69% in Civics. Our SWD will move to 41%, ELL will move to 41% and our multiracial will move to 25%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sheila Gregory (sheila.gregory@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Standards based planning and delivery with the LSI strategies of aligning Target/Task/Success Criteria. We will continue to focus on cognitive complexity and standards depth with student work aligned. Teaming will be focused on this year.

AVID and the use of the AVID WICOR strategies will be utilized school wide. Virtual Field trips to higher learning establishments are part of the curriculum.

Extended Learning will be in place quarterly to fill in gaps in instruction more closely and ongoing.

Accelerated Students will be afforded the opportunity to participate in extracurricular curriculum activities, virtually, to extend and refine skills.

LSI is a district wide initiative that has shown improvement of 20% if done with fidelity by clearly aligning the target, task and success criteria for lessons that are planned and delivered to our students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Rosetta Stone is a program to help with language acquisition with our ELL students. Due to the success of AVID elective and content AVID, teachers will continue to incorporate WICOR and Rigor strategies into their lesson planning on a daily basis. WICOR and rigor incorporated into teaching/learning methodologies and critical areas such as, writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization and reading to learn has shown to increase student learning gains. Rigor is simply the idea that if we expect students to perform at higher levels we must make it apart of the expectation and using the LSI framework is an additional resource we will use to meet this objective

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborative planning sessions weekly with coaches and administration to create lessons that are rigorous and to the cognitive complexity of the standard.

Person Responsible

Sheila Gregory (sheila.gregory@polk-fl.net)

Differentiated instruction

Support scheduling for SWD, ELL and multiracial students using Interventionists, Title One support para and ESE/ELL personnel.

Person Responsible

Bucky Day (bucky.day@polk-fl.net)

Aligning success criteria with the level of complexity for the standard using the knowledge gained from School wide AVID and its strategies will be included in all content areas. Virtual field trips will be part of the AVID experience.

Person Responsible Kevin Taylor (kevin.taylor@polk-fl.net)

Device check out to ELL students to work on Rosetta Stone at home along with enrichment opportunities for Level 3, 4, and 5 students.

Person Responsible Bucky Day (bucky.day@polk-fl.net)

Increased opportunities for students for extended learning sessions quarterly, both before and after school.

Person Responsible Christine Lipham (christine.lipham@polk-fl.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: With our student attendance rates below the district averages, with a large percentage showing less than 90% attendance rate, we feel that this is an area of concern. When students are not in class, they are missing valuable information.

Measurable Outcome: Our student rate of 24% compared to the district rate of 16% of students with attendance rates above 90% will see the gap narrow to less than 5% difference.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amy Scheloske (amy.scheloske@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS strategies will be adapted for attendance with rewards and positive reinforcements.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS has proven to decrease the amount of discipline in schools and should align to our attendance issues.

Action Steps to Implement

Attendance contracts for students that outline the procedures for high absentee rates. This includes systematic meetings with AP and could lead up to parent conferences with the district social worker and eventually a referral to YFA for truancy.

Person Responsible Amy Scheloske (amy.scheloske@polk-fl.net)

Monthly attendance rewards for students who miss less than 3 periods.

Person Responsible William Lay (william.lay@polk-fl.net)

Staff mentors to check in/out with to provide positive reinforcement for the students who miss over 10% of school days.

Person Responsible Joshua Oliver (joshua.oliver@polk-fl.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus	
Description and Rationale:	Based on our discipline data from 2019-20, August thru March, we had 1142 referrals, resulting in 307 students with a referral and of those, 228 students with one or more suspensions. These students missed a combined 825 days of instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	We plan to reduce the number of referrals and students, with suspensions, by 10% this school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	William Lay (william.lay@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We are continuing the implementation of CHAMPS and added PBIS schoolwide. These two initiatives will help ensure consistency with expectations, while promoting positive behaviors instead of focusing on the negative reinforcement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We are continuing the implementation of CHAMPS, schoolwide, to have a consistent framework for expectations in all classrooms and common areas. This will allow students to know routines and eliminate points of frustration, due to inconsistency. We also are continuing the implementation of PBIS to reward the positive behavior, through classroom rewards, referral challenges, and assessment incentives. Research show that children who receive positive reinforcement, are more likely to continue the desired behaviors.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide CHAMPS and PBIS training to newly hired personnel

Person Responsible William Lay (william.lay@polk-fl.net)

Collect data from the number of office calls for teacher managed behaviors and provide ongoing coaching and support to staff and gradually release as data shows decrease in the behaviors.

Person Responsible William Lay (william.lay@polk-fl.net)

Monthly schoolwide rewards for decreased discipline referrals for the grade level with highest percentage of decrease.

Person Responsible William Lay (william.lay@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The goal is to move our overall proficiency to 42% in ELA; 44% in Math; 43% in Science and 69% in Civics. Our SWD will move to 41%, ELL will move to 41% and our multiracial will move to 25%.

In order to do this, more targeted and ongoing interventions are needed with our low performing students as well as our "bubble" students who are hovering in the proficiency range.

Literature studies will be offered quarterly, via computer with certified teachers after school as an enrichment and acceleration strategy.

Forensics and Problem Solving clubs will also be offered, targeting 8th grade students, to increase science background skills.

Imagine Math will be offered to all math students to fill in gaps due to distance learning. This will be offered after school hours.

Extended learning opportunities will also be offered to students in Civics to focus on court cases and the judicial process.

Intensive Reading classes will be utilizing Science and Civics text as the basis for instruction.

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.

School SAC meets quarterly to discuss incentives related to student achievement goals.

Students identified as having social-emotional needs are given the opportunity to meet with the guidance counselor individually or in small groups or if applicable can be met through the classroom staff on a one-to-one basis. Severe cases may be handled with a contracted mental health counselor. The IEP also identifies and addresses social emotional goals for all of our students. Our school also utilizes resources:

CHAMPS - Students are made aware of the expectations in classrooms so that there is no mental stress on understanding the consequences of actions while in classrooms.

PBIS - Students are awarded based on making good choices.

Student Council members are enlisted to help create positive rewards for school wide celebrations.

Teacher Engagement Ambassador will be working with classroom teachers to create positive, supportive environments for all stakeholders.

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				\$397,996.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	100-Salaries	1191 - Kathleen Middle School	Title, I Part A	750.0	\$150,087.00
	6400	100-Salaries	1191 - Kathleen Middle School	Title, I Part A	750.0	\$198,265.00
	5100	510-Supplies	1191 - Kathleen Middle School	Title, I Part A	750.0	\$3,144.00
	5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	1191 - Kathleen Middle School	Title, I Part A	750.0	\$2,500.00
	5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	1191 - Kathleen Middle School	TSSSA	750.0	\$44,000.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7800	330-Travel	1191 - Kathleen Middle School	Title, I Part A	750.0	\$2,000.00
Total:						\$399,996.00