

Polk County Public Schools

Kathleen Middle School



2021-22 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Kathleen Middle School

3627 KATHLEEN PNES, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

Demographics

Principal: Sheila Gregory

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 (51%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: D (40%)
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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Kathleen Middle School

3627 KATHLEEN PNES, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Kathleen Middle School, a community of diverse learners, is to ensure rigorous and relevant learning experiences that result in high achievement for our students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Kathleen Middle School, we strive to provide a secure learning environment for all students to prepare them for the competitive world in which we live. Each student will be empowered to lead and influence the ever-changing, diverse, global economy as a creative and critical thinker.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gregory, Sheila	Principal	oversee the implementation of the School Improvement Plan and the effectiveness of the strategies and goals support all areas of curriculum
Day, Bucky	Assistant Principal	scheduling, grading, curriculum support
Scheloske, Amy	Assistant Principal	PBIS, curriculum support, discipline, facilities, SEL
Lay, William	Assistant Principal	PBIS, CHAMPS, curriculum support, SEL
Hill, William	Instructional Coach	math support
Lipham, Christine	Instructional Coach	Literacy development within all content areas
Taylor, Kevin	Instructional Coach	Science Support
Oliver, Joshua	School Counselor	SEL support and Guidance
Smith, Monique	Other	maintains Title One requirements and pushes into classrooms for math support

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Sheila Gregory

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.*

2

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

49

Total number of students enrolled at the school

801

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

14

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

16

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22**

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	277	281	235	0	0	0	0	793	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	98	73	0	0	0	0	250	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	96	73	0	0	0	0	258	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	30	6	0	0	0	0	61	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	39	3	0	0	0	0	56	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	76	87	0	0	0	0	211	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	82	79	0	0	0	0	217	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	146	153	141	0	0	0	0	440	

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	171	187	164	0	0	0	0	522	

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	7	0	3	0	0	0	0	10	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	9	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/12/2021

2020-21 - 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	282	226	244	0	0	0	0	752	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	45	72	0	0	0	0	165	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	66	84	0	0	0	0	228	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	9	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	44	61	0	0	0	0	180	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	44	61	0	0	0	0	145	
December 2019 STAR ELA Level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	51	91	0	0	0	0	241	
December 2019 STAR Math Level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	69	60	0	0	0	0	231	

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	64	58	82	0	0	0	0	204	

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	0	0	0	0	12	

2020-21 - 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	282	226	244	0	0	0	0	752
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	45	72	0	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	66	84	0	0	0	0	228
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	44	61	0	0	0	0	180
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	44	61	0	0	0	0	145
December 2019 STAR ELA Level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	51	91	0	0	0	0	241
December 2019 STAR Math Level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	69	60	0	0	0	0	231

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	64	58	82	0	0	0	0	204

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	0	0	0	0	12

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				39%	48%	54%	36%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	52%	54%	52%	47%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	48%	47%	51%	42%	47%
Math Achievement				42%	50%	58%	34%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains				53%	50%	57%	51%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	48%	51%	50%	51%	51%
Science Achievement				41%	44%	51%	39%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				67%	72%	72%	86%	86%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	37%	48%	-11%	54%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	29%	42%	-13%	52%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
08	2021					
	2019	45%	48%	-3%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	36%	47%	-11%	55%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	38%	39%	-1%	54%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
08	2021					
	2019	28%	35%	-7%	46%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	40%	41%	-1%	48%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	64%	70%	-6%	71%	-7%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	77%	50%	27%	61%	16%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	53%	-53%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

STAR Assessments were used in Math and Reading for all grades.
District Quarterly exams were used for Civics and Science.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35	34	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	32	25
	Students With Disabilities	9	10	5
	English Language Learners	23	31	28
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	36	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	33	24
	Students With Disabilities	13	15	5
	English Language Learners	33	26	23

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33	34	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	30	23
	Students With Disabilities	3	8	9
	English Language Learners	16	13	21
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29	39	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	37	27
	Students With Disabilities	5	5	3
	English Language Learners	26	28	17
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	57	30	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	21	37
	Students With Disabilities	45	18	23
	English Language Learners	62	34	45

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37	36	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	34	29
	Students With Disabilities	16	18	11
	English Language Learners	23	6	18
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27	54	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	51	38
	Students With Disabilities	13	35	29
	English Language Learners	12	40	32
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5358	31	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	25	36
	Students With Disabilities	24	11	18
	English Language Learners	60	31	46

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	13	33	34	18	24	21	21	34			
ELL	24	38	35	26	34	41	30	41	62		
BLK	16	26	26	13	22	25	15	37	21		
HSP	27	35	31	29	29	32	28	42	74		
MUL	33	36		36	50						
WHT	39	43	40	41	32	24	36	53	62		
FRL	25	34	30	24	27	28	20	39	43		
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	22	43	41	27	47	42	20	52			
ELL	13	43	44	24	58	65	10	44			
BLK	31	47	48	30	50	47	35	68	69		

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
HSP	38	50	44	40	54	60	34	58	59		
MUL				20							
WHT	45	53	51	51	55	51	53	71	69		
FRL	34	47	44	37	51	49	38	65	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	16	40	42	24	39	34	26	45			
ELL	15	39	42	25	56	48	24				
BLK	30	49	48	28	45	43	25	65			
HSP	29	46	39	29	49	51	33	100	53		
MUL	20	33		36	50						
WHT	44	58	63	39	56	56	44	92	72		
FRL	34	52	53	33	52	53	35	81	62		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	35
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	30
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	349
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	22
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	36
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	41
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	30
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

In all tested areas, based on the progress monitoring, most groups showed a decline from the first administration in the Fall to the Spring administration, except in certain Math areas. STAR Reading in our subgroup of Economically Disadvantaged showed a decline in all 3 grade levels, while our ELL population in 2/3 of the grade levels showed improvement. STAR Math in our 6th grade in all subgroups showed a decline from Fall to Spring.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our overall proficiency in ELA and Civics has steadily declined and is our greatest need based on our FSA data. Using our STAR data, Fall to Spring, we see the same trend. Our 6th grade group scored lower in all tested areas and subgroups. Reading went from 35% proficient to 30 % of all students and our Math went from 43% to 28%.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Staff turnover had a major impact on our 6th grade Math with one classroom having 4 teachers during the school year. Our ELA department had several new teachers with no teaching experience. Our students were very fluid in moving from E Learning to Face to Face throughout the year. This was disruptive to the teaching environment and caused many scheduling issues.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on all our collected data, our Algebra and Geometry are showing the most improvement. Although the students took the STAR Math as their progress monitoring, modular assessments compared year to year show improvement. Our ELL subgroup continues to show growth in ELA in 6th and 7th grades, going up 5% in both grade levels from Fall to Spring.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our ELL students have a separate Reading class with one of our ESOL teachers and are supported in the classroom with another ESOL teacher and para. Separate class support classes were also implemented for additional support in all content areas.

Our Math Interventionist pushed into the Accelerated Math classes more this year to provide more support. Our Math Coach also pushed in to the E-Learning Accelerated classes.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Imagine Math classes are being created for our Accelerated Math students to assist in acquisition of skills.

Classroom sections have been created to assist in remediation and acceleration of credits

ESOL tutoring will be multi-tiered to include previewing of text in tested curriculum areas.

Intensive Reading classes will utilize text that front loads content in Science and Social Studies.

AVID classes will work closely with the academic classes to also accelerate learning strategies.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Cross curriculum planning will be utilized throughout the year with quarterly planning sessions offered before and/or after school for more dialogue.

Instructional coaches will work with the departments to model how the cross curricular planning works.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We are going to push in to the Advanced and Accelerated Math classes on a more frequent schedule. After school tutoring will continue, quarterly, to continue the support at home and at school using Imagine Math.

ESOL tutoring will continue before and after school with drop in flexibility for our ELL students.

Learning Strategy open labs will be implemented this year to support and practice classroom instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With the advent of the BEST standards being introduced, it is more important now to keep our focus on the tested standards with the rollout of new standards. The purpose of a standards aligned curriculum and instruction is to provide a toolkit of strategies for students and teachers that will assist them in organizational methods of learning and instructions. It will guide students to comprehend materials and concepts and articulate ideas at varying levels of complexity within content areas. The addition of rigor serves as one of several tools used to raise the expectation of higher student achievement and teacher efficacy.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of rigorous standards based instruction, 38% of our students will achieve proficiency on the state reading assessment, 38% of our students will achieve proficiency on the state math assessment; 35% of our students will achieve proficiency in Science and our Civics scores will return to our 2018-19 proficiency rate of 64%.
Monitoring:	Math will continue to administer modular assessments while other content areas will administer formative assessments embedded within each standard/strand. Weekly data chats with instructional coaches will be conducted with administrator assigned to specific area. Administration will meet weekly to disaggregate the data and develop plans for immediate interventions, acceleration and support. Monthly PLC will focus on student work samples to calibrate accountability. Rigor walks will be conducted by Leadership Team, monthly with corrective feedback.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sheila Gregory (sheila.gregory@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards based bi-weekly planning will occur focusing on the LSI strategies of aligning the Target/Task/Success Criteria. We will continue our focus on cognitive complexity and the depth of standards with student work being aligned. AVID and AVID WICOR strategies will continue to be a focus in our instruction. Extended Learning and Acceleration will be offered all year, before and after school for all tested areas. Virtual opportunities will be offered to accelerate students. Book studies will be offered along with Science and Math extensions. LSI has been a districtwide initiative and has been shown to increase rigor and achievement in classrooms by up to 20% when done with fidelity and aligning the target/task/success criteria. Our ELL students will be given the opportunity for before/after school language immersion programs to increase language acquisition.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Rosetta Stone is a successful language acquisition program that will be utilized in the classroom along with before and after school opportunities for growth. Due to the success of the AVID and the elective class and content based AVID strategies, teachers will continue to incorporate the WICOR strategies in their classrooms. The LSI framework is an additional resource we will use to meet the expectations of students performing at higher levels.

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborative planning sessions with instructional coaches and interventionists to create lessons and accountability tasks that are rigorous and to the complexity of the standard.

Person Responsible Sheila Gregory (sheila.gregory@polk-fl.net)

Master Schedule will be created to support the varying levels of student achievement and allow for more access to advanced and high school level coursework.

Person Responsible Bucky Day (bucky.day@polk-fl.net)

Aligning success criteria and the level of complexity for the standard using knowledge gained from the AVID strategies in all content areas.

Person Responsible Kevin Taylor (kevin.taylor@polk-fl.net)

Device check out to ELL students to work on Rosetta Stone at home along with enrichment opportunities for our level 3, 4, and 5 students.

Person Responsible Amy Scheloske (amy.scheloske@polk-fl.net)

Weekly Administration meetings to discuss data and recommendations.
Bi-Weekly Leadership Team meetings to discuss trends and data.

Person Responsible Sheila Gregory (sheila.gregory@polk-fl.net)

Extended and Accelerated Learning, ongoing, before and after school.

Person Responsible Monique Smith (monique.smith@polk-fl.net)

The use of the Math and Reading Interventionists for targeted interventions for the three ESSA focus subgroups.

Person Responsible Bucky Day (bucky.day@polk-fl.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: During the 2020-21 school year, we had 1501 referrals. Looking at the last five years's data, this is a significant increase. Our highest areas of incidents are in the following areas: Disruptive Behavior - 674; ABU (abusive language and/or conduct toward others)- 130; Insubordination - 231; Tobacco- 46; and fighting - 69. With the fluidity of our student population, going to and from distance learning during the 20-21 school year, we feel that we need to put systems and structures in place to ensure a smoother transition to the new school year.

Measurable Outcome: In the 2021-22 school year, our goal is to decrease our referrals from 1501 to 1350. Our incident rates will also show a decrease with our Disruptive Behaviors decreasing from 674 to 606. Abusive Conduct toward others will also decrease from 130 to 117. Insubordination will decrease from 231 to 200. Tobacco usage and products will decrease from 46 to 35. Fighting referrals will decrease from 69 to 60.

Monitoring: Each week school's leadership team will meet to discuss various things going on with the school. The discipline team will bring current relevant data to come up with plans to solve what is currently going on. Discipline team will pull monthly discipline data in order to target specific times, actions and locations to lower the number of referrals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amy Scheloske (amy.scheloske@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: -Weekly, discipline data will be pulled for leadership meetings in order to target our focus for the upcoming week.
-Professional Development will be offered two times a month to teachers during planning. This PD will focus on classroom management strategies including specific teaching strategies to better incorporate LSI in classrooms to provide more rigorous instruction to decrease the disruptive behaviors.
-PBIS will be continued during the 2021-22 school year. When done with fidelity, the occurrence of positive behaviors increase which would subsequently decrease the negative behaviors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: With the high turnover, and new teachers, professional development will be essential to have our staff be as close to highly effective as possible. Along with the resources for PDs that we currently utilize, CHAMPS "A Proactive and Positive Approach to Classroom Management" and "Kagan Cooperative Learning",

Action Steps to Implement

-With the high turnover, and new teachers, professional development will be essential to have our staff be as close to highly effective as possible. Two resources for PDs that will be used is, CHAMPS "A Proactive and Positive Approach to Classroom Management" and "Kagan Cooperative Learning".

Person Responsible William Lay (william.lay@polk-fl.net)

PBIS will be incorporated school wide with positive reinforcing activities planned monthly.

Person Responsible William Lay (william.lay@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will be tiered according to monthly data and referral rates to provide coaching opportunities to increase positive interactions with students.

Person Responsible Amy Scheloske (amy.scheloske@polk-fl.net)

Tier 3 Behavior students will be assigned a mentor to work thru strategies in positive behaviors and reactions to be more proactive in relationships.

Person Responsible Amy Scheloske (amy.scheloske@polk-fl.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: SEL is helpful to both students and teachers, increasing self-awareness, academic achievement, and positive behaviors both in and out of the classroom. Students and teachers who are equipped to deal with problems that affect them on a personal level are then better able to navigate the pressures of everyday life.

Measurable Outcome: We want to see a 10% decrease in abusive language (130 incidents to < 117), insubordination (231 incidents to < 218), and fighting (69 incidents to < 62) incidents, based on referrals.

Monitoring: Weekly meetings will be held where discipline data will be disaggregated to monitor progress towards the goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joshua Oliver (joshua.oliver@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: AVID addresses each of the 5 core competence areas of SEL, which are self-awareness, self-management, decision-making, relationship skills, and social awareness.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We are an AVID certified school, which will allow us to implement strategies schoolwide to address social and emotional learning in all content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

AVID retraining will be delivered during pre-planning days to staff by our AVID site coordinator. Ongoing site visits and training will occur throughout the year.

Person Responsible Kevin Taylor (kevin.taylor@polk-fl.net)

Monthly schoolwide focus on SEL core areas will be initiated and delivered during morning announcements, news show and during assemblies.

Person Responsible William Lay (william.lay@polk-fl.net)

Students will share reflections of the monthly focus and will be shared with stakeholders with our social media accounts and website.

Person Responsible William Lay (william.lay@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

-Based on the safe school's for Alex website, our school is ranked 552 out of 553 for Drug/Public Order and ranked 396 out of 553 for Violent Incidents. . This data is from 2019-2020. Our school culture this year will be improved due to being able to have consistent face to face Professional Development, also by having student and teacher attendance improve with less quarantines. SEL will be our mode of improving our school culture and environment with a focus on positive interactions among all stakeholders.

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.

During the 2021-22 school year, a heavier emphasis is being placed on SEL Instruction. By doing this, we are looking at the students and staff for a more cohesive, supportive learning environment. SAC will be trained in SEL strategies to work with the community to build stronger ties to the school.

At Kathleen Middle, we are very transparent with our stakeholders. We use social media to promote events at the school and share accomplishments.

By using our student council, incentives are put in place to celebrate successes and increase positive interactions between stakeholders and improve culture and climate.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Utilizing our AVID classes, we have worked on creating a post-secondary goal for our students. College apparel and dialogue are focused on each month between students and teachers with our morning news show having a focus on possibilities.

Using social media sources, weekly blasts and pictures are shared of events around the school.

Local business partners sponsor academic contests in our classes which include breakfasts, lunches, shirts, gift bags.

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				\$402,564.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	100-Salaries	1191 - Kathleen Middle School	Title, I Part A	780.0	\$190,557.00
			Notes: In class support for literacy and math support along with ELL remediation			
	6400	100-Salaries	1191 - Kathleen Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$212,007.00
			Notes: Professional development for staff			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
Total:						\$402,564.00