Kathleen Senior High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Kathleen Senior High School

1100 RED DEVIL WAY, Lakeland, FL 33815

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

Demographics

Principal: Daraford Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 6/16/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (36%) 2015-16: D (40%)
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

Kathleen Senior High School

1100 RED DEVIL WAY, Lakeland, FL 33815

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

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)
High School PK, 9-12	Yes	87%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	67%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	D

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Kathleen Senior High School is to promote academic excellence by cultivating a legacy of lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kathleen High School is committed to cultivating a legacy of lifelong learners by providing the knowledge and skills needed to be successful, productive citizens. Our students, staff, parents, and community will work together as a family to instill a sense of P.R.I.D.E. in who we are, where we are, and what we are to become.

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
Jackson, Johnnie	Principal	
Miller, Yvonne	Instructional Coach	
Robertson, Kevin	Assistant Principal	
Lasseter, Matthew	Assistant Principal	
Reyes, Joaquin	Dean	
Redd, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Epperson, Tammy	Assistant Principal	
David, Jaime	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/16/2020, Daraford Jones

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
112

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (36%) 2015-16: D (40%)
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	0	0	0	550	500	416	462	1928
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	96	84	154	436
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	82	51	58	298
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187	41	34	10	272
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	35	55	23	149
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163	179	180	159	681
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167	145	112	111	535

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	128	113	142	499

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	5	31	17	3	56
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	32	26	1	73

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/16/2020

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	0	0	0	591	527	449	442	2009
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	94	87	94	415
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	182	101	68	52	403
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	142	102	75	448
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	189	152	159	148	648

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	33	25	20	153

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	129	142	102	75	448

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	0	0	0	591	527	449	442	2009
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	94	87	94	415
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	182	101	68	52	403
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	142	102	75	448
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	189	152	159	148	648

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	33	25	20	153

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	129	142	102	75	448

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	38%	47%	56%	32%	44%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	39%	46%	51%	30%	41%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	37%	42%	20%	33%	41%
Math Achievement	26%	43%	51%	23%	37%	49%
Math Learning Gains	39%	45%	48%	26%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	44%	45%	30%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	53%	58%	68%	44%	56%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	50%	61%	73%	52%	60%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**				**Total**
	9	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(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**
09	2019	39%	45%	-6%	55%	-16%
	2018	35%	43%	-8%	53%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	33%	42%	-9%	53%	-20%
	2018	35%	42%	-7%	53%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	51%	54%	-3%	67%	-16%
2018	57%	59%	-2%	65%	-8%
Compare		-6%			

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

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	57%	-9%	70%	-22%
2018	51%	57%	-6%	68%	-17%
Compare		-3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	20%	50%	-30%	61%	-41%
2018	33%	60%	-27%	62%	-29%
Compare		-13%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	30%	53%	-23%	57%	-27%
2018	29%	41%	-12%	56%	-27%
Compare		1%			

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	18	36	30	20	37		28	27		67	21
ELL	15	27	19	6	23	30	17	13		69	45
ASN	67	45									
BLK	22	34	33	15	38	46	35	31		85	32
HSP	36	33	22	19	31	33	41	50		80	46
MUL	38	50								82	
WHT	47	45	42	41	46	52	72	65		75	56
FRL	33	39	32	19	34	44	42	42		77	38
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	16	32	28	23	26	35	39	33		48	13
ELL	13	41	49	19	21	17	35	27		50	20
AMI	10										
ASN	60	70									
BLK	25	38	35	21	32	33	43	38		77	23
HSP	34	38	36	34	35	46	54	52		71	40
MUL	38	50		45			73	40		63	50
WHT	48	47	25	45	43	40	72	66		77	58
FRL	30	38	34	30	35	35	56	47		71	37

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	7	18	14	7	24	31	9	29		52	13
ELL	7	15	13	10	28	35	15	17		41	6
AMI	36	30									
BLK	19	25	25	10	21	30	27	30		80	21
HSP	31	27	19	22	27	31	39	44		66	28
MUL	28	30		17	25		42	69		75	25
WHT	41	35	17	31	28	27	57	73		70	47
FRL	23	24	22	17	26	31	36	46		68	23

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	512
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	56
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	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
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	57
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	54
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	43
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.

Math proficiency showed the lowest performance for the 18-19 school year. Based on the data, we recognized that effective remediation and teaming were two areas in which we need to improve. Contributing factors include low performance from prior school year(s), number of days teachers were out of the classroom due to professional development opportunities, and lack of teacher knowledge of their content areas.

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

Math showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Contributing factors include low performance from prior school year(s), number of days teachers were out of the classroom due to professional development opportunities, and lack of teacher knowledge of their content areas.

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

Math showed a 25 point gap between the 2018 and 2019 school years. Contributing factors include low performance from prior school year(s), number of days teachers were out of the classroom due to professional development opportunities, and lack of teacher knowledge of their content areas.

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

English Language Arts showed the most improvement between the 2018-2019 school years. In order to increase proficiency, we instituted a more structured collaborative planning. The teachers were asked to bring in work samples and identify target/ask alignment and areas of growth. The teachers were then given the opportunity to visit other classrooms and identify and discuss best practices that could be easily be embedded into their lessons. The teachers were then asked to reflect on their teaching practices. Common assessment and progress monitoring data were used to help drive instruction.

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

1. Higher number of students retained two or more times in ELA and Math.
2. The attendance data for 9th grade is disproportionate to other grade levels.

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

1. Math achievement proficiency
2. ELA achievement proficiency
3. SWD proficiency
4. ELL proficiency
5. African-American proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA is the core and drives instruction in other areas. If we improve the core, it is our intention to improve other areas on campus. For example, including and improving the reading and writing component may increase proficiency in areas such as science and social studies.
Measurable Outcome:	We would look at the growth from prior year FSA tests, STAR, and writing Progress Monitoring. Our goal is to increase from 38% proficiency to at least 43%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jaime David (jaime.david@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Appropriate teaming and target/task alignment have proven to be effective in making sure that the students are working to the depth of the standard and that the teachers are using data to drive instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	ELA is the core and drives instruction in other areas. Once this area improves, it is our belief that other areas will show growth as well. We will continue to rely on State test data, identified walk-through trends, common and formative assessment data in order to make informed decisions about instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Focus on reading and writing integration throughout the grade levels in ELA, Science, and Social Studies. Professional development through the use of Title 1 and TSSSA Funds will be utilized. The Literacy coach will provide continuous professional development in PLC meetings to teachers in reading, ELA, social studies and science courses.

Person Responsible   Jaime David (jaime.david@polk-fl.net)

Focus small group instruction as it applies to the ESSA identified sub-groups in conjunction with support from the LEA.

Person Responsible   Jaime David (jaime.david@polk-fl.net)

Our literacy coach will work with teachers during collaborative planning sessions during the year by utilizing substitutes paid from Title I to cover classes. This will allow teachers an entire school day to effectively plan lessons centered around reading and writing integration to improve student achievement.

Person Responsible   Jaime David (jaime.david@polk-fl.net)

Our Reading Interventionist will push into classes to provide targeted support for students based on needs identified from assessments, teacher feedback, and progress monitoring. Supports may include small group instruction, one-on-one intervention, and pull outs for specific support to increase student achievement in reading and writing.

Person Responsible   Jaime David (jaime.david@polk-fl.net)

We will provide extended learning to students through the use of Tutoring Solutions for after school tutoring. Tutoring sessions will be provided by an evidence-based company and will target specific needs and be centered around SAT/ACT prep.
Additional Extended Learning will be provided by KHS teachers for tutoring in ELA, science, and social

studies after school. Tutoring will be centered around reading based strategies to focus on content for each area.

Person Responsible   Jaime David (jaime.david@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math is a core subject and drives instruction in other areas. If we improve the core, it is our intention to improve other areas on campus. For example, using the progress monitoring provided by the District and school implemented common assessments will help to align instruction across the different areas of math. Therefore, ensuring that the students are adequately prepared for the next level of instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	We would look at the growth from prior year FSA tests and District provided Progress Monitoring. Our goal is to increase from 26% proficiency to at least 36%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Johnnie Jackson (johnnie.jackson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Appropriate teaming and target/task alignment have proven to be effective in making sure that the students are working to the depth of the standard and that the teachers are using data to drive instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Math is a core subject and drives instruction in other areas. Once this area improves, it is our belief that other areas will show growth as well. We will continue to rely on State test data, identified walk-through trends, common and formative assessment data in order to make informed decisions about instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Focus small group instruction/teaming through professional development as it applies to the ESSA identified sub-groups in conjunction with support from the LEA. The math coach will provide continuous professional development in PLCs throughout the year. In addition the coach will provide in class support to teachers by modeling evidence based strategies.

Person Responsible Johnnie Jackson (johnnie.jackson@polk-fl.net)

Focus on the ELL and African-American subgroups as they pertain to math proficiency. Support in instruction such as push-ins provided by the ESE, ELL, and Instructional Coach support staff. Professional Development will also be provided through the use of Title 1 and TSSSA funds.

Person Responsible Johnnie Jackson (johnnie.jackson@polk-fl.net)

Our Math Interventionist will push into classes to provide targeted support for students based on needs identified from assessments, teacher feedback, and progress monitoring. Supports may include small group instruction, one-on-one intervention, and pull outs for specific support to increase student achievement in Algebra and Geometry.

Person Responsible Johnnie Jackson (johnnie.jackson@polk-fl.net)

Extended Learning will be provided by KHS teachers for tutoring in Algebra and Geometry after school. Tutoring will be centered around research based strategies to focus on student achievement in these areas.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Provide supports for student subgroups to increase student achievement and close the gaps for the subgroups compared to other student group. Increase the graduation rate for students in the ELL, ESE, and African American Male subgroups.
Measurable Outcome:	Close the achievement gap for African American Males, ELL, and ESE students by 4 point.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Robertson (kevin.robertson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide intervention and supports to the identified subgroups to focus on reading and writing achievement and increase graduation rate through the use of tutoring, one-on-one mentoring, college visits and incentives. Our behavior interventionist will work with targeted students and ESSA subgroups to focus on behaviors associated with higher suspension rates.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our achievement gap in the subgroups of ELL, ESE, and African American Males needs improvement to bring these areas in-line with other student groups. This area of need was identified in our ESSA subgroup data and shows the need to close the achievement gap for these students and increase the graduation rate for the subgroups.

Action Steps to Implement

Behavior interventionist will focus on students in the lower performing subgroups and targeted students to provide supports and strategies with behaviors identified that lead to higher suspension rates. This will lead to improved attendance rates for students and decrease the number of referrals and discipline actions for students in the identified subgroups.

Person Responsible	Matthew Lasseter (matthew.lasseter@polk-fl.net)

Our student success coach will focus on increasing the graduation rate by tracking students attendance, withdrawals and enrollments, providing mentoring for students behind in credits with an increased focus for students in the identified sub groups. Students not attending will be contacted by phone, social media, home visits with social worker, and other forms of communication.

Person Responsible	Kevin Robertson (kevin.robertson@polk-fl.net)

We will provide opportunities for students to recover credits, take on-line classes, and participate in accelerated course work through the use of the computer lab para provided by Title I funds. Students in the ESSA subgroups of ELL, ESE, and African American Males will be targeted to participate recover classes providing opportunities to meet anticipated graduation and improve GPA. Further, students in these groups will be targeted to participate in advanced course work with Polk Virtual and Polk State College through the use of the technology and time in the lab.

Person Responsible	Kevin Robertson (kevin.robertson@polk-fl.net)

College Visits will be provided for juniors and seniors as a motivation to graduation and post secondary learning. The trips will focus on opportunities available, scholarships, application processes, and other information to encourage students to apply for post secondary opportunities. This will also serve to help

mentor students to complete required course work for post secondary opportunities. Transportation for the college visits will be provided by Title I funds.

Person Responsible   Joaquin Reyes (joaquin.reyes@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team will identify specific target teachers, coaches, and leaders to participate in additional professional development by attending the LSI Conference in 2021. This professional development opportunity will focus on researched based teaching strategies that improve student engagement. This will continue the consistency of professional development that has been provided for teachers and continue to increase the ability to focus on student engagement through student teaming. This professional development will be provided through the use of Title I funds and will be aligned with the identified areas of focus in the School Improvement Plan.

The leadership team will increase the technology available to both students and teachers. Additional laptop carts will be purchased to use by students in core content areas to support standards based programs that are proven to increase student achievement. The laptops will be used in the classroom setting as an addition to the instruction and a means for students to work in teams to as well as independently.
Additional Smartboards will be purchased for classrooms to increase student engagement and provide for interactive lessons with students. This will coincide with the professional development provided to teachers focused on student teaming and engagement. Funds for the laptops, carts, and Smartboards will be provided through Title I funds.

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.

Please see attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan for full details on how we plan to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students. Through the Parent/Family Engagement Events, the school's goal is to bridge the gap between the school and parent needs. The school is required to have one night in which we explain the Title I and data information. At this meeting, we explained the ESSA requirements and the instructional strategies in place in order to support the different subgroups (SWD, ELL, and African-

American Males.

School leadership and guidance provide students with counseling, mentoring, and other opportunities to express themselves so that their social-emotional well being remains intact and healthy. The School Psychologist is present on campus each school day in order to provide social and emotional support for those students in need. The therapeutic sessions can either be individual or in a group setting.

The behavior interventionist provided from Title I funds will focus on working with identified target students and students in the lower performing ESSA sub groups (ELL, ESE, and African American Males). This will include working on target behaviors and associated with higher discipline rates in the subgroups and targeted students.

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: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00