

Polk County Public Schools

Don E Woods Opportunity Center



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Don E Woods Opportunity Center

213 LAKE AVE E, Dundee, FL 33838

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

Demographics

Principal: Rodney Bellamy

Start Date for this Principal: 6/28/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
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)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	16

Don E Woods Opportunity Center

213 LAKE AVE E, Dundee, FL 33838

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

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 6-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

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.

Students First!

To provide a high quality education for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student will transition back to their home school understanding the necessary social skills needed to achieve academically and be productive students.

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
Bellamy, Rodney	Principal	<p>Specific Responsibilities:</p> <p>Principal: Rodney Bellamy - A servant leader that provides a common vision for the use of databased decision –making, models the Problem Solving Process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure for implementation of PS/Rtl; ensures that the school-based team is implementing PS/Rtl; conducts assessment of PS/Rtl skills of school staff; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; ensures and participates in adequate professional learning to support PS/Rtl implementation; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff for the implementation of PS/Rtl school wide; ensures resources are assigned to those areas in most need; and communicates with parents regarding school-based PS/Rtl plans and activities.</p>
Overstreet, Jamie	Assistant Principal	<p>Assistant Principal: Ms. Jaime Overstreet - Assistant Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of PS/Rtl, further assists the principal in the assessment of PS/Rtl skills, implementation of intervention support and documentation, professional learning, and communication with parents concerning PS/Rtl plans and activities.</p>
Mitchell, Tyjuan	School Counselor	<p>Guidance Counselor Tyjuan Mitchell:</p> <p>Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/ behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at-risk,” assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kerawala, Zeeshan	Other	Mental Health Counselor: Zeeshan Kerawala- Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/ behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at-risk,” assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 6/28/2015, Rodney Bellamy

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

11

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No

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)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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	1	3	2	0	0	0	6
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	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	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/17/2020

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	2	3	6	5	7	1	2	26	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3	

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	1	1	1	0	0	3

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

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	5	7	1	2	26
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3

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	1	1	1	0	0	3

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	47%	56%	0%	44%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	46%	51%	0%	41%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	37%	42%	0%	33%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	43%	51%	0%	37%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	45%	48%	0%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	44%	45%	0%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	58%	68%	0%	56%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	61%	73%	0%	60%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(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
06	2019	0%	48%	-48%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	41%	-41%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	18%	42%	-24%	52%	-34%
	2018	9%	42%	-33%	51%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
08	2019	24%	48%	-24%	56%	-32%
	2018	13%	49%	-36%	58%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
09	2019	23%	45%	-22%	55%	-32%
	2018	0%	43%	-43%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
10	2019	0%	42%	-42%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	42%	-42%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	0%	47%	-47%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	40%	-40%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	11%	39%	-28%	54%	-43%
	2018	0%	40%	-40%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
08	2019	11%	35%	-24%	46%	-35%
	2018	11%	34%	-23%	45%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	27%	41%	-14%	48%	-21%
	2018	17%	42%	-25%	50%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	30%	54%	-24%	67%	-37%
2018	0%	59%	-59%	65%	-65%
Compare		30%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	25%	70%	-45%	71%	-46%
2018	0%	84%	-84%	71%	-71%
Compare		25%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	57%	-57%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	7%	50%	-43%	61%	-54%
2018	0%	60%	-60%	62%	-62%
Compare		7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	53%	-53%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	41%	-41%	56%	-56%
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
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
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

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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	N/A
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The lowest performance for the 2018-19 school year was 7th grade ELA (0%). The main factor contributing to the low performance are instructional time at DWOC and stakeholder's value of education.

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

The school showed positive growth in testing areas but still more achievement is needed to reach district and state minimals. Instructional time at DWOC and stakeholder's value of education are two of the biggest reasons for decline overall.

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.

Eighth grade ELA (-45%) has the greatest learning gap with the state achievement level. Many barriers exist creating this learning gap none more than student instructional time at DWOC and stakeholder's value of education.

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

Ninth Grade ELA (+23) had the largest increase but still much growth is needed to reach district (45%) and state (55%) achievement levels. Instructional feedback and instructional common planning are two strategies we use to increase student achievement.

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

1. ELA (7th Grade) and Math (Algebra EOC) - The number of students with this indicator increased and is below district and state achievement levels.
 2. Level 1 on statewide assessment or district assessments - The number of students with this indicator increased.
- Neither of these two indicators can be explained by increase in enrollment alone. As ELA (7th Grade) and Math (Algebra EOC) form the basis for all statewide assessments.

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

1. To increase student achievement in ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies and Writing (core academics).
2. To provide behavior resources for students, so they can be successful in the school environment and teach the importance of education.
3. To maintain a highly effective instructional and resource staff to educate DWOC students and stakeholders.
4. To provide stellar customer service for all school stakeholders.
5. To be a resource for our students and stakeholders with community resources (communityresources, nutritional resources and volunteer opportunities)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. Auxiliary resources to assist school stakeholders
2. Culturally embedded instructional strategies and resources to increase student achievement.
3. Relevant guest speakers

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.

Students First!

Courageous and honest conversations with all stakeholders.

Providing stellar customer service to all school stakeholders.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

Total:	\$0.00
--------	--------