Polk County Public Schools

Union Academy

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Union Academy

1795 WABASH ST E, Bartow, FL 33830

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

Demographics

Principal: Stephen Scheloske

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (69%)
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.](http://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

Union Academy

1795 WABASH ST E, Bartow, FL 33830

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	54%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	46%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Union Academy Magnet School community of staff, parents, business partners, and civic partners work together to guide our students' education by:
Emphasizing academics with a special focus on the Middle Years Programme of IB. Developing life-long learners through a comprehensive curriculum, stressing verbal and written communication.
Using advanced technology, innovative strategies, and traditional values to prepare students for future success. Challenging students to do their best by nurturing their academic, aesthetic, physical, social, and emotional potential. Developing critical thinking and problem solving skills. Accepting and understanding cultural differences through cooperative learning and social skills development.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Scheloske, Stephen	Principal	I oversee and am responsible for all aspects of Union Academy. I am responsible for the education of our students, the development, support and guidance of our staff, the inclusion of our community and parents, our facilities, and all aspects of running a successful school. Some of those responsibilities include but are not limited to the oversight and operation of the following: • the daily operation of Union Academy • evaluation of staff • progress of all students • testing • federal, state and local mandates • monitoring and use of data to drive instruction and planning • professional development • finances • budge management • purchasing • payroll • facilities • awards and ceremonies • athletics • community relations • parent and advisory groups • school advisory council • implementation of the International Baccalaureate Middle Years Program
Simmons, Dana	Assistant Principal	Assist Principal in providing vision and leadership of school Oversee results on student learning goals and data analysis for instructional improvement Develop and implementation of quality standards-based curricula Work collaboratively to develop and implement an instructional framework aligning effective instructional practices, student learning needs and assessments recruiting, retaining and developing and effective and diverse faculty and staff facilitating effective professional development Providing structure and monitoring of the school learning environment to improve learning for all students Managing the process for making decisions and articulating who makes decisions Cultivating, developing and supporting other leaders within the school Managing the process for communication to staff and community by keeping all stakeholders engaged in the work of the school Maintaining high visibility at the school and in the community
Pemberton, Jodi	Reading Coach	Develop and instruct new teacher induction programs at the school level Support the learning environment for increased student success Planning and presenting school-wide professional development Assists in lesson plan development as needed works with struggling students to support their academic growth and success at

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		school supervises students who need support with PBIS
Trotter, Christy	Other	Preparing and organizing all standardized assessments for school Preparing and organizing all progress monitoring for staff and students at school Communicates requirements and testing timelines with all stakeholders of school Ensures the testing environment is secure and productive Ensures all testing procedures of the state, district and school are in place and followed at all times Supports the learning environment by assisting other school staff as needed

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Stephen Scheloske

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

Total number of students enrolled at the school

412

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

8

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

7

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	148	132	132	0	0	0	0	412
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	6	0	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	10

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/23/2021

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	153	139	131	0	0	0	0	423
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	7	4	0	0	0	0	27

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	153	139	131	0	0	0	0	423
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	7	4	0	0	0	0	27

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				80%	48%	54%	79%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				63%	52%	54%	59%	47%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	48%	47%	58%	42%	47%
Math Achievement				79%	50%	58%	80%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains				62%	50%	57%	60%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	48%	51%	57%	51%	51%
Science Achievement				64%	44%	51%	75%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				92%	72%	72%	93%	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	80%	48%	32%	54%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	81%	42%	39%	52%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
08	2021					
	2019	81%	48%	33%	56%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	79%	47%	32%	55%	24%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	70%	39%	31%	54%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
08	2021					
	2019	39%	35%	4%	46%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	64%	41%	23%	48%	16%
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	92%	70%	22%	71%	21%
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	94%	50%	44%	61%	33%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

STAR, Quarterlies

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	70	69	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	64	44
	Students With Disabilities	50	50	50
	English Language Learners	25	20	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	69	73	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	64	38
	Students With Disabilities	63	75	38
	English Language Learners	40	40	20

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71	70	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	64	68	56
	Students With Disabilities	25	50	25
	English Language Learners	100	100	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	52	77	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	56	69	54
	Students With Disabilities	50	50	25
	English Language Learners		100	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	82	56	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	79	45	74
	Students With Disabilities	33		50
	English Language Learners	81	54	72

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	73	76	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	61	67	80
	Students With Disabilities	100	83	83
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	58	75	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	63	56
	Students With Disabilities	33	50	33
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	80	62	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	68	48	42
	Students With Disabilities	63	63	25
	English Language Learners	83	65	58

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	44	59	55	39	41						
BLK	57	49	34	41	30	24	36	73	29		
HSP	66	59	52	58	35	28	73	83	74		
WHT	77	59	49	75	41	41	79	83	79		
FRL	60	52	44	53	34	26	57	74	54		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	73	64		100	82				100		
BLK	73	58	55	59	53	49	48	75	67		
HSP	85	66	64	76	58	53	52	100	63		
MUL	90	80		100	80						
WHT	81	63	59	85	65	64	71	94	74		

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
FRL	74	51	55	71	58	56	57	97	54		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
ASN	100	69		100	85				70		
BLK	68	54	44	62	51	30	70	83	45		
HSP	70	54	58	82	60	56	62	96	60		
MUL	80			70							
WHT	84	62	65	84	61	69	79	95	65		
FRL	75	56	56	77	61	52	70	91	56		

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	528
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	65
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	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

STAR Reading saw 6th and 7th grade on a similar path; being consistent in Fall and Winter before falling in Spring. STAR Reading for 8th grade showed consistent gains. STAR Math showed all three grade levels rise from Fall to Winter before falling back in the Spring. These trends were similar with our Economically Disadvantages student.

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

Due to the inconsistency of the progress monitoring scores our biggest need for improvement is based on our 2019 FSA Scores in ELA and Math Learning Gains for our Lowest 25%. Specifically the Learning Gains for our Lowest 25% in Math.

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

We have had staff changes in ELA and Math. We have also adjusted the teaching assignments for our math teachers. This year we are changing our PLC's from Grade Level PLC's to subject area PLC's. This will provide our teacher with the opportunity to benefit from each other.

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

Our greatest improvement was in Middle School Accreditation and ELA Learning Gains.

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

Middle School Accreditation was simple the policy changed from all students testing to testing students who completed the proper steps in order to qualify for testing. ELA saw improvement due to a shift in staff and instructional practices.

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

Proper scaffolding to meet student needs where they are currently. Our staff has done a much better job recently in addressing the needs of students. Proper PLC's to allow teachers to benefit from the other subject area experts in their field. Ongoing progress monitoring that is prioritized by students and staff.

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.

Proper PLC development and structured PLC meetings
Data deconstruction and structured planning to proper scaffolding in instruction
Anchor assemblies to evaluate instructional planning, progress monitoring as well as student progress

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

Specifically addressing the student who are in our bottom quarter to ensure their progress. Implementing aspects of Intensive Math into the math instruction. Specifically addressing student deficiencies in reading with Intensive Reading strategies.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improving our Lowest 25% Math Scores will drastically improve our overall math performance in addition to our overall school score. Most importantly it will improve individual student scores. This is our lowest scoring area.
Measurable Outcome:	We aim at raising our FSA Lowest 25% Math score by 5 points compared to the 2021 FSA Lowest 25% Math score.
Monitoring:	Department Specific PLC's, regular observations and classroom visits, data collections and progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephen Scheloske (stephen.scheloske@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Subject Area Specific PLC's, Appropriate Scaffolding, Introduction of Aspects of Intensive Math, Anchor Assemblies (Professional Development), Collaborative Learning Structures
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students have been evaluated and placed in the most appropriate math course based on their prior performance on the FSA or EOC exams. Teachers will provide lessons that include scaffolding for students on different levels in addition to specific aspects of Intensive Math. Subject area specific PLC's are in place.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The improvement of our Lowest 25% ELA Scores. This happens to be our second lowest scoring area and needs specific attention.
Measurable Outcome:	We plan to raise our Lowest 25% in ELA by 5 points in comparison to the 2021 ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	Regular classroom observations and visits, data collection, progress monitoring and PLC's
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative Learning, subject area specific PLC's, Anchor Assemblies (Professional Development), and a redirected focus on Intensive Reading with a new teacher.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our teachers have been working on collaborative learning strategies for the past couple years. Their development of those strategies has improved our classroom instruction. Teachers will provide lessons that are target-to-task aligned to better serve the needs of the students. They will be meeting together in subject area specific PLC's for the first time and we have added an experienced teacher.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Overall our school has a low incident rate per 100 students. For the 19/20 school year Union ranked 163 or 553 middle/junior schools statewide. There was one area which was "Very High" which was Property Incidents. During the 19/20 school year we had 2 total incidents that fell in this category. That put us at a rating of .5 per 100 students.
Overall, this show a very positive and safe environment at our school. Students a low chance of encountering Violent Incidents and Drug/Public Order Incidents. Although Property Incidents is rated very high we only had 2 total incidents for the 19/20 school year. Those were 2 thefts and they were recorded properly.
We will continue to operate under our current structure as our school data shows Union is very safe and positive.

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.

Parents and their students receive, review, sign and return a contract of the Union Academy expectations. The teachers receive professional development on expectations for their student behavior. They receive tools on positive student management and positive parent communication. The Union Academy Fall Open House hosts all students and their families in an attempt to display a positive and academically rigorous IB curriculum. Parents, teachers, administration and guidance participate in conferences as often as needed. Students are encouraged to attend and participate in all conferences. The Union Academy websites provide up-to-date information on all facets of the school. Union Academy hosts a Parent Night for upcoming 6th grade students during the first two weeks of school in order to orient parents and students to the Union Academy culture and expectations. A school wide Positivity and Empathy Campaign will be continued to increase staff and student empathy towards each other. This year in particular we will be focusing on a foundational approach with our staff and students. After the disruption of the last two school years we want to make sure all or our staff, students, parents, and community feel comfortable and remain focused on the structure and approaches we are taking to be successful this school year. Our students will all be back on campus in a more common setting under a more traditional structure.

Union Academy has partnered with Bartow Rotary to have an Interact Club on campus. The Principal is also a Rotary member who regularly attends Rotary meetings. We will return to hosting school dances, celebrations, ceremonies, and activities on campus. Our school has also reconnected with our history. The UA Alumni Association has been welcomed back to their school to help our current students connect with the rich history of our school. It is also important that those men and women are recognized for their accomplishment and dedication to Union.

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

Administration: Mr. Scheloske and Ms. Simmons are responsible for the planning, oversight, approval and operation of all programs, operations and events.
Leadership Team: Acting as a planning and oversight group, our leadership team assists in the planning, oversight and operation of the celebrations, ceremonies, activities and extra curriculars that happen on our campus.
Staff: We have an active staff that assists with various programs and activities beyond the everyday scope of teaching and learning. Our staff sponsor clubs and activities that allow our students to participate in extra curricular activities here at the school.
Parents: Our PTA has been very supportive in promoting positive events, ceremonies, and celebrations. They are also very active in assisting our school with providing materials that are wants in addition to

needs.

Community: Union has a proud tradition and many of our Alumni are actively engaged in the progress and recognition of our school. Some serve on our SAC committee and in other various ways at the school.

Part V: Budget

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

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