Polk County Public Schools

Daniel Jenkins Academy Of Technology Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Daniel Jenkins Academy Of Technology Middle School

701 LEDWITH AVE, Haines City, FL 33844

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

Demographics

Principal: Kathryn Blackburn

Start Date for this Principal: 6/8/2019

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: B (59%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (51%) 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

Daniel Jenkins Academy Of Technology Middle School

701 LEDWITH AVE, Haines City, FL 33844

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	93%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	88%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	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 Daniel Jenkins Academy is to provide authentic, project-based learning opportunities that allow students to develop their interests and passions through personalized learning and STEM-based community partnerships.

Rigor - Precise and challenging curriculum with a special focus on math, science, engineering, and environmental science.
Reading/Literacy – Comprehend and derive meaning from text to stress verbal and written communication
Relevance – Real-life application by developing critical thinking, problem solving, and organizational skills
Results – Outcomes that drive the next step using innovative strategies, and traditional values to prepare students for future success.
Relationships – Interactions that promote a sense of belonging to all students to assist in their academics and develop their social and emotional potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Daniel Jenkins Academy is to provide students with high-quality, globally-focused educational opportunities to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to be college and career ready in the 21st Century.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Blackburn, Kathryn	Principal	The principal is the instructional leader of the school. It is Dr. Blackburn's responsibility to monitor the School Improvement Plan. It is her responsibility to lead the School Leadership Team to support changes necessary to accomplish our school's goals.
Flores, Mercedes	School Counselor	As the school counselor, Ms. Flores is instrumental in monitoring and making suggestions to keep student's success rate a prime objective.
Walker, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	Ms.Walker is a subject chair and can bring staff information to the team to monitor the success of implementation of any strategies we may employ.
Onorati, Sheri	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Onorati is responsible to data. She monitors progress monitoring and any other data we collect to decide on the course of action the school needs to take for the success of students.
Wilder, Alissiea	Assistant Principal	Administrative - curriculum, facilities, and discipline
Boisselle, Deborah	Teacher, ESE	Support ESE students and Academic Leadership Team
Bork, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	Subject Chair and ALT member
Fields, Jason	Dean	Student discipline
Gables, Melinda	Instructional Coach	Literacy and ALT
McCardle, Paula	Teacher, K-12	PE and ALT
Melendez, Gladys	Other	Teacher of the Gifted and ALT
Sitek, Chris	Other	Technology and ALT
Spann, Lakiesha	Teacher, K-12	Math Chair and ALT
Tucker, Melanie	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Elective Chair and ALT

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 6/8/2019, Kathryn Blackburn

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.*

0

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

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: B (59%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (51%) 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	170	184	180	0	0	0	0	534
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	63	27	0	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	28	63	0	0	0	0	119

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	8	11	0	0	0	0	31

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/8/2020

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	48%	48%	54%	52%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	52%	54%	54%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	48%	47%	46%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	58%	50%	58%	50%	47%	56%
Math Learning Gains	56%	50%	57%	51%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	48%	51%	55%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	37%	44%	51%	39%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	87%	72%	72%	68%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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	55%	48%	7%	54%	1%
	2018	34%	41%	-7%	52%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	38%	42%	-4%	52%	-14%
	2018	37%	42%	-5%	51%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	53%	48%	5%	56%	-3%
	2018	58%	49%	9%	58%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

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

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

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

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	87%	70%	17%	71%	16%
2018	98%	84%	14%	71%	27%
Compare		-11%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	88%	50%	38%	61%	27%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	85%	60%	25%	62%	23%
Compare		3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%
2018	95%	41%	54%	56%	39%
Compare		5%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	9	50	36	21	41	38					
ELL	18	45	53	43	52	46	19	73			
ASN	100	82		91	73						
BLK	47	51	43	51	56	67	32	81	74		
HSP	45	53	59	57	55	58	32	88	81		
MUL	67	50		75	75						
WHT	50	49	50	63	51	55	55	94	78		
FRL	44	51	52	55	53	57	35	85	75		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	17	43	57	25	46	42					
ELL	23	38	43	28	37	29	40		64		
ASN	91			100							
BLK	34	28	26	38	44	49	38	100	75		
HSP	42	39	40	44	40	39	46	100	78		
WHT	47	49	59	53	56	75	46		59		
FRL	39	37	37	43	43	43	40	100	69		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	33	23		67	71						
ELL	32	47	46	35	51	54	9	58	33		
ASN		80			80						
BLK	46	41	34	42	49	53	35	50	23		
HSP	52	56	44	49	50	55	39	69	47		
WHT	54	58	63	61	54	57	45	76	50		
FRL	47	52	50	45	49	52	37	65	40		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	571
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	87
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	56
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	67
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	61
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	56
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 lowest data component was in science. A contributing factor was several sections being assigned to a teacher who was teaching a full load in another discipline. In addition, strategies were not adjusted to support learning with the average students. The advanced students typically do well here in science. However, there is trend data that supports poor performance from the average students.

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

Science was the data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year. A contributing factor was the adjustments that were necessary for average students to understand and learn the curriculum. Lack of consistent teachers in this discipline also was a contributor.

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.

Science had the biggest gap when compared to the state average. The factors that contributed to the gap were: not making the appropriate adjustments for average students in the learning process and lack of consistency of a teacher in science.

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

The data component which showed the greatest improvement was in our math lowest 25% percentile students. The action we took was to closely monitor those students. The teachers aggressively used repetition and remediation to support growth of these students.

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

One potential area of concern for this group of students is the lack of specific Varying Exceptionality Teachers to support these students in the classroom.

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

1. Support specific learning strategies for average 8th grade students to improve science learning.
2. Monitoring reading and math to support effective learning.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on progress monitoring data as well as state assessment data, science achievement will be an area of focus. It was identified as a critical need based on the achievement data in 2019. In addition, it was documented that the mid-year progress monitoring data in 2019 indicated that the scores would be replicated if instructional practices were not adjusted. The data from 2019 was analyzed and it was revealed that the advanced students were performing as predicted. However, the average students were not having the same success. It was determined that poor instructional practices could be a factor.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on 2019 data of 37% proficiency on the state science assessment our goal is to increase proficiency to 50% proficiency as achieved on the state science assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathryn Blackburn (kathryn.blackburn@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy being implemented will be hands- on learning with accountability.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Hands- on learning with accountability was chosen because it makes the students more engaged in their own learning. This also makes the students more accountable for their own leaning. Science labs will be conducted with specific lab reports in a Science Learning Log to be used by the students to analyze data, predict outcomes, and summarize steps as well as final outcomes. The students will be responsible for sharing with their peers as well as defend their summary.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Department Chair with department will develop and or agree on a common lab documentation form in pre-planning. This will be part of the expected Science Learning log.
2. Bi-weekly ,labs specifically related to the assessed standards will be selected to use in the classrooms.
3. All department members will create a plan for conducting, monitoring, documenting, sharing with peers and assessing all labs conducted in class. The plan will consist of weekly sharing sessions during PLC period.
4. An error -analysis system will be taught to all students so that real learning will occur and this will be a form of remediation.
5. Data will be collected by teachers and analyzed to support further remediation of standards not learned.

Person Responsible	Kathryn Blackburn (kathryn.blackburn@polk-fl.net)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math will also be an area of focus at DJA. Although, the data showed overall an increase of 12% in proficiency , 10% in learning gains, and 15% in lowest 25%, we have had multiple instructional changes after the 2019 assessment. The 7th grade math data has been consistently low and these student will need additional support in 8th grade.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to maintain proficiency at 51% and to increase learning gains to 60% in all grade levels.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathryn Blackburn (kathryn.blackburn@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence-based strategies will include small group instruction, identifying and monitoring all students in the lowest 25%, implementing the use of computer based instruction that will target those students. Monitoring and analyzing bi-weekly data to use for appropriate decisions with additional remediation in standards not mastered.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction is a proved evidenced strategy. By identifying those students in the lowest 25% we can target them with small group as well as computer based instruction. A co-teaching model will be implemented so that small group will take place daily. In addition, a math interventionist will be responsible for the data collection and analyzation.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Intentional scheduling for the intensive course will be used to select students who have scored in the lowest 25% in math.
2. Teacher of record and Math Interventionist will co-teach a small group of students.
3. Students will use computer based (Imagine Math) instruction that will serve two purposes: one track will be for remediation and closing specific learning gaps and two, tracks will be created for students get additional practice with standards being taught in their regular math classes.
4. Daily small group instruction will occur in the intensive math classes that will give the support where the gaps occur with students.
5. Math Interventionist and Literacy Coach will analyze data to conduct data chats with students quarterly. Data will be used from Imagine Math and weekly formative assessments.This data will be used to support decisions made for each student.
6. Students will have the opportunity to " test out" of the class. All students in the lowest 25% will continue to be monitored.

Person Responsible	Kathryn Blackburn (kathryn.blackburn@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

It will be the School Leadership Team's responsibility to continue to monitor the progress of the language arts department. The monthly monitoring will help to keep all students on track for success and will give information to help make decisions if necessary to support student learning.

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.

To build a positive school culture that involves all stake holders the school has established the following systems: a parent/ staff organization that meet monthly and share ideas and information with the administration, National Junior Honor Society has a student board who meet with the administration to make suggestions and share ideas, School Leadership Team is representative of all groups and serves to brainstorm as well as develop solutions to problems that we have at the school and an active School Advisory Council that meets bi-monthly to look at various aspects of the school which supports guiding the school for a positive relationship with our community and parents. Use of the morning announcements to share kindness quotes with Students and staff.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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