

Polk County Public Schools

Union Academy



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	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Union Academy

1795 WABASH ST E, Bartow, FL 33830

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

Demographics

Principal: Stephen Scheloske

Start Date for this Principal: 6/8/2020

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
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 (70%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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

Union Academy

1795 WABASH ST E, Bartow, FL 33830

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

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	No	44%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

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.

Our mission is to fully develop the physical, social, emotional and intellectual potential, and to build the character of each individual in our culturally diverse community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

VISION DESCRIPTION:

The Union Academy Magnet School community of staff, parents, business partners, and civic partners work together to guide our students' education by:

Emphasizing academics with a special focus on the Middle Years Programme of IB. Developing life-long learners through a comprehensive curriculum, stressing verbal and written communication.

Using advanced technology, innovative strategies, and traditional values to prepare students for future success. Challenging students to do their best by nurturing their academic, aesthetic, physical, social, and emotional potential. Developing critical thinking and problem solving skills. Accepting and understanding cultural differences through cooperative learning and social skills development.

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
Scheloske, Stephen	Principal	Mr. Scheloske is the school Principal. His duties and responsibilities include, but are not limited to all day-to-day planning and operation of Union Academy. He oversees all aspects and functions of Union Academy which include instructional, curricular, personnel, student and community.
Simmons, Dana	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Simmons is the Assistant Principal. Her duties and responsibilities are to oversee the daily planning and operation of Union Academy.
Pemberton, Jodi	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Pemberton is the instructional coach. Her duties and responsibilities include planning and presenting professional development for the teachers. She works closely with all new teachers as the Campus Induction Coordinator. She models lessons for teachers and assists with lesson plans as needed, guiding teachers to become more successful.
Trotter, Christy	Other	Mrs. Trotter is the Testing Coordinator. her duties and responsibilities include preparing and organizing all standardized testing for Union Academy. She communicates with the district and staff at Union Academy to ensure testing procedures are followed properly.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/8/2020, Stephen Scheloske

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
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 (70%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	153	139	131	0	0	0	0	423	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	6	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	0	0	0	0	19	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	
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	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	14	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	7	4	0	0	0	0	27	

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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
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	142	132	126	0	0	0	0	400	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	10	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	7	7	0	0	0	0	27	

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	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	6	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	142	132	126	0	0	0	0	400	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	10	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	7	7	0	0	0	0	27	

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	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	6

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
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	80%	48%	54%	77%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	52%	54%	65%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	48%	47%	55%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	79%	50%	58%	78%	47%	56%
Math Learning Gains	62%	50%	57%	68%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	48%	51%	64%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	64%	44%	51%	65%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	92%	72%	72%	90%	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	80%	48%	32%	54%	26%
	2018	84%	41%	43%	52%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	81%	42%	39%	52%	29%
	2018	74%	42%	32%	51%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	81%	48%	33%	56%	25%
	2018	80%	49%	31%	58%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	79%	47%	32%	55%	24%
	2018	76%	40%	36%	52%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	70%	39%	31%	54%	16%
	2018	79%	40%	39%	54%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
08	2019	39%	35%	4%	46%	-7%
	2018	66%	34%	32%	45%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-27%				
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	64%	41%	23%	48%	16%
	2018	75%	42%	33%	50%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
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	92%	70%	22%	71%	21%
2018	93%	84%	9%	71%	22%
Compare		-1%			
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	94%	50%	44%	61%	33%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	96%	60%	36%	62%	34%
Compare		-2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%
2018	100%	41%	59%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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
ASN	73	64		100	82				100		
BLK	73	58	55	59	53	49	48	75	67		
HSP	85	66	64	76	58	53	52	100	63		
MUL	90	80		100	80						
WHT	81	63	59	85	65	64	71	94	74		
FRL	74	51	55	71	58	56	57	97	54		
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
ASN	100	69		100	85				70		
BLK	68	54	44	62	51	30	70	83	45		
HSP	70	54	58	82	60	56	62	96	60		
MUL	80			70							
WHT	84	62	65	84	61	69	79	95	65		
FRL	75	56	56	77	61	52	70	91	56		
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	58		33	42						
ASN	85	77		100	77						
BLK	69	56	50	67	72	71	45	92	47		
HSP	78	71	67	75	69	65	55	78	70		
MUL	85	85		75	50						
WHT	79	65	52	81	67	59	74	93	60		
FRL	71	63	49	71	65	65	56	86	63		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	630
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	84
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	60
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	69

Hispanic Students	
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	88
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	73
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	64
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.

Both ELA and Math Performance by the Lowest 25% were low, math was one percent lower. This data was from the 2019 FSA data. These are our lowest students, we needed to shift the concentration to allow for them to make the necessary gains. We made an adjustment to the teachers schedules to try maximize our Math department. We provided after school tutoring in the Fall and Spring. Teacher coaches were supporting the teachers in their classroom. Administration was visiting more frequently and providing more feedback.

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

Science

To be completely honest, we had a teacher who didn't want to be here anymore and it showed. That

teacher left us after the 2018-2019 school year. We have an excellent teacher in place and totally expect to see much higher scores.

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.

The greatest gap is our Social Studies score of 92 compared to the state average of 72. I believe this is due to our teacher being phenomenal. She has done everything we have asked as an administration to get the kids ready to be successful on the exam. She is an experienced teacher who is willing to try something new to better reach her students. She is excellent!

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

ELA Learning Gains went up 4 points. As a school we focused on reaching our students, slowing down to make sure they understand and releasing the class to them more than in the past. The ownership of the courses by the students has shown to be a positive for all stakeholders.

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

We do not have many students who are major concerns with the EWS data. This is both a positive and negative. It is negative because we have small numbers so those few can drastically change our overall numbers. It is a positive because we can provide specific attention to those students and work directly with them to improve.

Many of the students on our list have issues in both ELA and Math. Again, this is a small number in the overall but that means we can reach each one individually.

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

1. Improve Math Lowest 25%
2. Improve ELA Lowest 25%
3. Recover a positive Science score
4. Continue increasing student engagement
5. Continue the ongoing training and professional development for our staff

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The improvement of our Lowest 25% Math Scores will improve all of our math categories. This happens to be our lowest scoring area and needs specific attention.
Measurable Outcome:	We plan to raise our Lowest 25% in Math by 5 points in comparison to the 2019 Math FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephen Scheloske (stephen.scheloske@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative Learning with continued use of LSI best practices
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students have been evaluated and placed in the most appropriate math course based on their prior performance on the FSA or EOC exams. Teachers will provide lessons that are target-to-task aligned to better serve the needs of the students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will utilize STAR testing data and County Quarterly Exam data in addition to ongoing formative assessment to monitor the progress of the lower 25% are progressing with their math skills. When assessing takes place, instruction will be adjusted, as needed, to help students achieve greater levels of success in their needs as a result of the formative, STAR and Quarterly assessments.
2. Instruction on target-to-task alignment will be provided by all math teachers. Teachers will use results from STAR testing data and Quarterly exams to improve and alter their instruction.
3. Collaborative learning strategies will be provided in weekly PLC's. Follow-up will take place at future weekly PLC's, as well as monthly Anchor Assemblies, where teachers bring student samples for proof of using the collaborative learning strategies. Discussion will take place and teachers will analyze student samples to see what growth has taken place, or what needs to take place for growth to happen.
4. The Lower 25% will be offered access to an after school tutoring club twice a week, working on deficiencies using Imagine Math. This tutoring will begin as soon as possible but certainly when Title II funding becomes available.
5. Many of our lower performing students are students with disabilities. For the first time at Union Academy we have a full-time ESE teacher who will be pushing into Math and ELA classes to address the needs of our students. We are also looking at a specific class for our students with the greatest needs, taught by our ESE teacher. This is another place where students can get specific feedback to assist in their growth.
6. Additional support for our bottom 25% by assigning them a mentor within the school to regularly review their progress with them. They will be responsible for charting their assessments and assignments while reviewing their data and progress.
7. Our Tier 3 students are being specifically targeted to have Intensive Math and additional pull-out support by our support teachers. Based on previously mentioned testing results students will be pulled from elective courses to receive additional support in their needed area.

Person Responsible Stephen Scheloske (stephen.scheloske@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The improvement of our Lowest 25% ELA Scores will improve all of our math categories. This happens to be our lowest scoring area and needs specific attention.

Measurable Outcome:

We plan to raise our Lowest 25% in ELA by 5 points in comparison to the 2019 ELA FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dana Simmons (dana.simmons@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Collaborative Learning with continued use of LSI best practices

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Our teachers have been working on collaborative learning strategies for the past couple years. Their development of those strategies has improved our classroom instruction. Teachers will provide lessons that are target-to-task aligned to better serve the needs of the students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will utilize ongoing formative assessment, STAR testing data and County Quarterly Exam data to see how the lower 25% are progressing. When assessment takes place, instruction will be adjusted to meet the identified areas of deficiency. This will serve to help students achieve success in their struggling areas and reinforce the necessary foundation to build upon.
2. Teachers will use results from STAR testing and formative teacher assessments to complete data charts on students during our first staff development day in September. Teachers will collaborate in teams to identify their target students in the bottom 30 and 25%. UA Teachers will continue to use the data charts with updated assessment data throughout the year to hold monthly data chats improving not only student autonomy but streamlining instruction around the needs of students.
3. Collaborative learning strategies will be provided in our weekly PLC's. Follow-up will take place at future weekly PLC's, where teachers bring student samples for proof of use of the collaborative learning strategies. Discussion will take place and teachers will analyze student samples to see what growth has taken place, or what needs to take place for growth to happen. Additional support and assistance will be provided via our monthly Anchor Assemblies.
4. The Lower 25% will be offered access to an after school tutoring club that meets twice a week. Tutoring will start as soon as possible and certainly when Title II funds become available.
5. Many of our lower performing students are students with disabilities. For the first time at Union Academy we have a full-time ESE teacher who will be pushing into Math and ELA classes to address the needs of our students. We are also looking at a specific class for our students with the greatest needs, taught by our ESE teacher. This is another place where students can get specific feedback to assist in their growth.
6. Additional support for our bottom 25% by assigning them a mentor using our support staff and administration within the school to regularly review their progress with them. They will be responsible for charting their assessments and assignments while reviewing their data and progress. While creating measurable goals with students to achieve academic success.
7. Our Tier 3 students are being specifically targeted to have Intensive Reading and additional pull-out support by our support teachers. Based on previously mentioned testing results students will be pulled from elective courses to receive additional support in their needed area.

Person Responsible Dana Simmons (dana.simmons@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School leadership will be working directly with the teachers to support and assist them with lesson planning, delivery and evaluation. When needed we will assist in demonstrating the lesson to allow the teacher to see it from a different lens. Teachers will also get opportunities to observe other teachers and steal strategies from them. On-going classroom visits in addition to walk-thoughts, informal and formal observations will also provide constructive feedback for teachers to learn from.

The leadership team will be identifying students who are in the lowest 25% in math and ELA. We will be dividing up these students and having regular meeting with them to assist in their progress. Constant contact and feedback with their parent or guardian will be documented.

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.

Parents and their students receive, review, sign and return a contract of the Union Academy expectations. The teachers receive professional development on expectations for their student behavior. They receive tools on positive student management and positive parent communication. The Union Academy Fall Open House hosts all students and their families in an attempt to display a positive and academically rigorous IB curriculum. Union Academy hosts 3 parent nights per year. Each is targeted on providing parents with information and tools to enhance their student's learning. Parents, teachers, administration and guidance participate in conferences as often as needed. Students are encouraged to attend and participate in all conferences. The Union Academy websites provide up-to-date information on all facets of the school. Union Academy hosts a Parent Night for upcoming 6th grade students during the first two weeks of school in order to orient parents and students to the Union Academy culture and expectations. A school wide Positivity and Empathy Campaign will be continued to increase staff and student empathy towards each other. Union Academy has partnered with Bartow Rotary to have an Interact Club on campus. The Principal is also a Rotary member who regularly attends Rotary meetings. Our school has also reconnected with our history. The UA Alumni Association has been welcomed back to their school to help our current students connect with the rich history of our school. It is also important that those men and women are recognized for their accomplishment and dedication to Union.

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: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00