

Polk County Public Schools

Davenport School Of The Arts



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Davenport School Of The Arts

4751 COUNTY ROAD 547 N, Davenport, FL 33837

www.davenportschoolofthearts.com

Demographics

Principal: Cindy Braaten

Start Date for this Principal: 6/18/2019

| | |
|--|--|
| 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) | 77% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (70%) |
| 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Davenport School Of The Arts

4751 COUNTY ROAD 547 N, Davenport, FL 33837

www.davenportschoolofthearts.com

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 | 61% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 65% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A | A | A | A |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Hughes, Alicia | Assistant Principal | |
| Cotton, Christy | Assistant Principal | |
| Schumacher, Debbie | Instructional Coach | |
| Brown, Leslie | School Counselor | |
| Brewer, Jane | School Counselor | |
| Braaten, Cindy | Principal | |
| Guira, Kyle | Dean | |
| Fenton, Pamela | Other | LEA |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/18/2019, Cindy Braaten

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.*

5

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

87

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) | 77% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (70%) |
| 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 | 102 | 112 | 101 | 106 | 108 | 108 | 179 | 172 | 166 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1154 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| One or more suspensions | 9 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 14 | 9 | 10 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 4 | 16 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 14 | 23 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |
| Dec 2019 STAR Reading level 1 | 3 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 10 | 13 | 20 | 20 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 |
| Dec 2019 STAR Math level 1 | 0 | 38 | 16 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 29 | 22 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 |

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 | 13 | 9 | 10 | 4 | 7 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/10/2020

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 | 106 | 104 | 108 | 102 | 110 | 111 | 170 | 164 | 157 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1132 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 8 | 9 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 17 | 50 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 3 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 20 | 36 | 26 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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 | 106 | 104 | 108 | 102 | 110 | 111 | 170 | 164 | 157 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1132 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 8 | 9 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 17 | 50 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 3 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 20 | 36 | 26 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

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

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 78% | 61% | 61% | 76% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 67% | 58% | 59% | 66% | 53% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 49% | 54% | 58% | 44% | 51% |

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Achievement | 74% | 61% | 62% | 72% | 52% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 59% | 56% | 59% | 56% | 50% | 56% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 53% | 52% | 52% | 53% | 44% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 69% | 52% | 56% | 64% | 49% | 53% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 95% | 79% | 78% | 87% | 68% | 75% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| | (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 | 89% | 52% | 37% | 58% | 31% |
| | 2018 | 80% | 51% | 29% | 57% | 23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 74% | 48% | 26% | 58% | 16% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 48% | 30% | 56% | 22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 79% | 47% | 32% | 56% | 23% |
| | 2018 | 64% | 50% | 14% | 55% | 9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 15% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 74% | 48% | 26% | 54% | 20% |
| | 2018 | 69% | 41% | 28% | 52% | 17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 77% | 42% | 35% | 52% | 25% |
| | 2018 | 70% | 42% | 28% | 51% | 19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 79% | 48% | 31% | 56% | 23% |
| | 2018 | 81% | 49% | 32% | 58% | 23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 89% | 56% | 33% | 62% | 27% |
| | 2018 | 82% | 56% | 26% | 62% | 20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 82% | 56% | 26% | 64% | 18% |
| | 2018 | 84% | 57% | 27% | 62% | 22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 86% | 51% | 35% | 60% | 26% |
| | 2018 | 86% | 56% | 30% | 61% | 25% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 60% | 47% | 13% | 55% | 5% |
| | 2018 | 58% | 40% | 18% | 52% | 6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -26% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 72% | 39% | 33% | 54% | 18% |
| | 2018 | 56% | 40% | 16% | 54% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 16% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 14% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 40% | 35% | 5% | 46% | -6% |
| | 2018 | 49% | 34% | 15% | 45% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -16% | | | | |

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

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 96% | 70% | 26% | 71% | 25% |
| 2018 | 100% | 84% | 16% | 71% | 29% |
| Compare | | -4% | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 87% | 50% | 37% | 61% | 26% |
| 2018 | 95% | 60% | 35% | 62% | 33% |
| Compare | | -8% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 96% | 53% | 43% | 57% | 39% |
| 2018 | 0% | 41% | -41% | 56% | -56% |
| Compare | | 96% | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 36 | 44 | 35 | 40 | 51 | 43 | 27 | | | | |
| ELL | 61 | 53 | 35 | 54 | 56 | 60 | 36 | | | | |
| ASN | 93 | 75 | | 86 | 58 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 58 | 55 | 38 | 55 | 46 | 36 | 53 | 90 | 64 | | |
| HSP | 78 | 67 | 51 | 68 | 57 | 52 | 69 | 93 | 67 | | |
| MUL | 90 | 94 | | 67 | 44 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 83 | 67 | 47 | 88 | 67 | 69 | 74 | 98 | 84 | | |
| FRL | 69 | 60 | 44 | 63 | 54 | 45 | 67 | 92 | 63 | | |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 31 | 39 | 50 | 29 | 39 | 33 | 36 | | | | |
| ELL | 48 | 42 | 44 | 51 | 43 | 36 | 13 | | | | |
| ASN | 77 | 73 | | 62 | 64 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 58 | 54 | 48 | 55 | 56 | 41 | 53 | | 54 | | |
| HSP | 70 | 60 | 54 | 68 | 55 | 47 | 61 | 83 | 67 | | |

| 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 |
| MUL | 74 | 53 | | 63 | 63 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 81 | 64 | 65 | 81 | 63 | 54 | 77 | 100 | 81 | | |
| FRL | 66 | 59 | 55 | 64 | 55 | 42 | 60 | 85 | 60 | | |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 32 | 53 | 42 | 32 | 41 | 40 | | | | | |
| ELL | 46 | 51 | 49 | 53 | 60 | 55 | 25 | 59 | | | |
| ASN | 100 | 75 | | 80 | 75 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 66 | 57 | 42 | 65 | 51 | 48 | 57 | 81 | 44 | | |
| HSP | 72 | 64 | 58 | 67 | 58 | 54 | 61 | 85 | 71 | | |
| MUL | 89 | 77 | | 78 | 38 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 81 | 72 | 64 | 78 | 56 | 54 | 68 | 92 | 74 | | |
| FRL | 70 | 62 | 52 | 66 | 57 | 52 | 60 | 82 | 72 | | |

ESSA Data

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

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 69 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 69 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 686 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 39 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 53 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 78 |
| 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 | 55 |
| 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 | 67 |
| 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 | 74 |
| 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 | 75 |
| 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 | 63 |
| 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.

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

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

5th to 6th grade math cohort
 Factors:
 Teacher instructional strategies and level of student engagement
 Attention to prior knowledge gaps necessary for grade level standard understanding
 Lack of formative assessment data usage to check for understanding and guide instruction
 Lack of classroom and ESE teacher collaborative planning

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

8th grade math is 6% lower than the state average
 Factors:
 Instructional strategies
 Level of student engagement
 Lack of engaging lesson delivery
 Instructional support given by ESE personnel

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

7th grade math had the most improvement.
 New Actions:
 Standards based planning teacher
 Teacher focused on the specific needs of students
 Highly engaging teacher who focused on great relationships

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

The EWS data shows higher numbers in 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 6th, and 7th grades.

Potential concerns:

The content gaps developed in primary grades and students passed on without proper remediation. 82 students missed 18 or more days in 2019 and as of March 13th, 2020, 47 students missed 18 or more days.

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

1. Increase proficiency in 6th and 8th grade math
2. Increase the proficiency of students with disabilities
- 3.. Increase the number of students making learning gains in each subject area
4. Decrease the number of days absent K-8

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 grade level standards to build on their current level of learning to increase proficiency. Based on classroom visits, students received instruction and were given tasks aligned to the intent and rigor of grade level standards about 50% of the time. In 2018-2019, 48% of the Lowest 25% made learning gains in ELA and 53% of the Lowest 25% made learning gains in Math. This is a 21% gap in Math and a 30% gap in ELA when compared to achievement. Students with Disabilities missed the Federal index target of 41%, performing at 39%. English Language Learners performed at 53% and Black/African Americans performed at 55%. Both are in danger of dropping below 41% target.

Measurable Outcome:

Standards based instruction and evidence of student learning will determine next steps such as reteaching and/or the need for specific small group instruction. 53% of the Lowest 25% will achieve learning gains in ELA and 58% of the Lowest 25% will achieve learning gains in Math. Student learning will be monitored by classroom task performance, formative assessments and district progress monitoring. Attendance, grades, progress monitoring, behavior, and emotional well-being will be monitored for students in the Lowest 25% for ELA and Math, Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Black/African American students scoring below proficiency to increase their Federal Index to 44% for SWD, 58% for ELL, and 60% for Black/African American students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christy Cotton (christy.cotton@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Strategies include:

- Target/task alignment
- Student engagement, motivation, and depth of knowledge
- Checking for understanding within lessons and adjusting instruction to meet the needs of all students
- Students in the Lowest 25% in ELA and Math, Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners and Black/African American students who score below proficient will be "adopted" by a member of the leadership team to monitor their attendance, grades, progress monitoring, behavior and emotional well-being
- Utilizing classroom task performance, formative assessments and progress monitoring data to plan next steps and identify specific small groups for instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Target/task alignment and planning for the intent and rigor of each standard sets the tone for every lesson. The level of student engagement and motivation paired with their interaction with and understanding of the content determines the level of success students will experience. Checking for understanding throughout instruction is essential to determine whether or not students are on track or need different, further, or specific support. Evidence of understanding must be available to ensure students have connected with the concept and reached understanding. Criteria used for selecting this strategy is data from historical school performance. 30% of our students are not proficient and gaps are present in every subgroup with regard to learning gains. We are teaching in mostly whole groups settings and not using evidence to determine student levels of understanding. The lack of evidence means support is not being developed or delivered to support students.

Action Steps to Implement

Target Task Alignment Professional Development follow up through PLCs.

Teachers will bring prepared lessons and tasks, steps to align targets with tasks will be reviewed and used to assess their initial plan. Teachers will leave with an appropriately aligned plan of instruction.

Professional development will begin the second week of school during grade level/content area planning periods. PLCs will take place weekly, moving to biweekly, partial team or individual meetings based on progress toward true alignment, results of student understanding, and adjustment made or not made based on results.

After the initial follow up on target/task alignment, teachers will be instructed to bring evidence of student performance to analyze responses to the tasks given to students and what steps were taken as a result. Teachers will also bring a new prepared lesson for alignment analysis.

Person Responsible Christy Cotton (christy.cotton@polk-fl.net)

Classroom observations will take place weekly based on teacher tiers: Tier 1 teachers needing minimal support (biweekly), Tier 2 teachers needed moderate support (weekly), and Tier 3 teachers needing significant support (two times a week minimum).

Observations will focus on target/task alignment, level(s) of student engagement during instruction and/or task work, and level(s) of student understanding of content. Feedback will be provided after each classroom observation based on the points of focus during the observation. Support for lesson planning, student engagement, result analysis, alternate lesson ideas, or next steps will be provided to teachers as needed. Supports will be set up through lesson planning sessions, modeling lessons, and sharing resources.

Classroom observation notes will be used to monitor the impact of support provided by tracking progress toward target/task alignment, student engagement, and student understanding of content.

Person Responsible Christy Cotton (christy.cotton@polk-fl.net)

Leadership Team members "adopting" students in the Lowest 25% in ELA and Math, Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Black/African American students scoring below proficient.

Members of our Leadership Team will be assigned students from areas listed above to monitor their attendance (weekly), grades (weekly), progress monitoring results (as soon as available), behavior (weekly), and emotional well being (weekly). Leadership Team members will informally check-in with their students each week at a time that works best and does not interfere with classes. The check-in will consist of going through their current data and comparing it to prior weeks, celebrating their accomplishments and offering guidance on how to improve areas the student would like to focus on improving. The goal is to provide someone to be there for students needing support, letting them know someone is focused on them and has an interest in them and their success.

Person Responsible Alicia Hughes (alicia.hughes@polk-fl.net)

Utilize STAR progress monitoring data to track student progress, make instructional decisions, and set up specific small group/individual support.

After the August/September STAR Assessment, teachers will utilize the goal setting feature in Renaissance to set goals for students based on a years worth of growth from their initial scale score. This will take place during a grade level/content area planning period the week following the close of the testing

window.

STAR assessments will be given monthly to track progress toward student goals. ESE and content area teachers along with the LEA will utilize STAR progress monitoring and classroom data during monthly MTSS meetings to have conversations around skills and deficits individuals and groups of students need to grow. Small groups and/or individual students will be receive support delivered by our paraprofessionals, ESE teachers and trained volunteers. These supports will be scheduled during the MTSS meetings.

Person Responsible Alicia Hughes (alicia.hughes@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

An additional school wide improvement priority will be decreasing the number of student absences. We will utilize the school's Raptor system to ensure the accuracy of check in times for late arrivals. Students in all grades will develop personal attendance goals and monitor their progress throughout the 20-21 school year. Grade levels will celebrate students for reaching their goal. Students will track their attendance in leadership notebooks and celebrate their accomplishments during student led conferences.

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.

DSA creates an environment where students feel safe and respected. Students feel respected because of leadership opportunities provided to them through our Leader in Me program and their core values (Everyone is a leader), which offers the students the experience of being leaders and positive role models within our school and community. Students feel respected because they have opportunities to join the various extracurricular offerings here at DSA.

DSA does a wonderful job establishing respect between our families, students, & staff. Establishing a nurturing atmosphere of respect is the first piece to learning about the diversity of our families, students and building relationships with them. Our "open door" atmosphere contributes to and encourages families to be active and present in our school. This helps build relationships between staff and families. We have an overwhelming amount of parental involvement. We hold many events that give parents opportunities to be involved in our school community through the arts and academics - Space Night, Garden Days, Art Fair, All-

County Dance Festival, Dance Concert and Student Choreography Showcase, Drama Fall Play and Spring Musical, Drama Student Showcase, DSA's NJHS Induction Ceremony, All County Festival, Elementary Music Showcase, Fall Book Fair with The Davenport Singers and Storytellers, Spring Book Fair with Primary Choir, Elementary Music Winter and Spring Concert, Middle School Winter and Spring Concert, Middle School Piano and Orchestra Concert, Middle School Band All-County, Middle School Piano All-County Concert, Fine Arts Festival, Elementary Visual Arts Showcase and DSA's School wide Visual Art Show.

We provide a supportive environment before and after school as well. Our school's after school program, ESTAR, which provides a snack and homework guidance for students, also keeps their doors locked until the closing of the program at 6:00 P.M. ESTAR also offers fun and educational clubs for the students to join. Many students enjoy being a member of the Recycling Club, where students go around our school and collect the recycling from all of our classrooms and learn about why recycling is so important to our community and our world. Another popular club is the Spanish Club, where students are engrossed in the Spanish language and culture.

DSA also identifies and reaches out to help families in need. Because of established relationships, many families know that they can ask for assistance to help with school uniforms, school supplies, and help with Christmas gifts and meals. We get to know each student and parent by getting to know each family through communication with the teachers, beginning of the year get to know you activities, orientation, open house, and beginning of the year conferences.

Our staff members build relationships with students through the use of open communication, listening to students, and effectively creating and organizing small group interactions, as well as a variety of social activities to include, but not be limited to social time, fun day, dances, etc. These events allow students to communicate peer-to-peer, as well as allow the adults an opportunity to listen and maintain professionalism.

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 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |