Daniel Jenkins Academy Of Technology Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Daniel Jenkins Academy Of Technology Middle School

701 LEDWITH AVE, Haines City, FL 33844

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

Demographics

Principal: Kathryn Blackburn   Start Date for this Principal: 6/8/2019

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: B (59%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (51%)
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

Daniel Jenkins Academy Of Technology Middle School

701 LEDWITH AVE, Haines City, FL 33844

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

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	94%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	87%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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 Daniel Jenkins Academy is to provide authentic, project-based learning opportunities that allow students to develop their interests and passions through personalized learning and STEM-based community partnerships.

Rigor - Precise and challenging curriculum with a special focus on math, science, engineering, and environmental science.
Reading/Literacy – Comprehend and derive meaning from text to stress verbal and written communication
Relevance – Real-life application by developing critical thinking, problem solving, and organizational skills
Results – Outcomes that drive the next step using innovative strategies, and traditional values to prepare students for future success.
Relationships – Interactions that promote a sense of belonging to all students to assist in their academics and develop their social and emotional potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Daniel Jenkins Academy is to provide students with high-quality, globally-focused educational opportunities to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to be college and career ready in the 21st Century.

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
Blackburn, Kathryn	Principal	The principal is the instructional leader of the school. It is Dr. Blackburn's responsibility to guide the school leadership team to support necessary changes that will increase student achievement and meet our goals.
Wilder, Alissiea	Assistant Principal	Ms. Wilder will take on the responsibility of monitoring data to support necessary adjustments in the plan for the success of each goal.
Walker, Patricia	Other	Ms. Walker will be instrumental in supporting the implementation of specific strategies we choose to support student success.
Boisselle, Deborah	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Boisselle will support monitoring of strategies implemented to improve our ESE student's data.
Spann, Lakiesha	Science Coach	Ms. Spann will monitor, train, and support our literacy team for improvement.
Sitek, Chris	Other	Mr. Sitek 's role will be to support the effective use of technology for the students and teachers.
Tucker, Melanie	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Ms. Tucker will be a resource to support monitoring data an progress monitoring during the implementation of the plan.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 6/8/2019, Kathryn Blackburn

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
30

Total number of students enrolled at the school
520

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
3

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	152	176	181	0	0	0	0	509
Attendance below 90 percent	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		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	63	27	0	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	28	63	0	0	0	0	119
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	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 6/23/2021

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	170	184	180	0	0	0	0	534
Attendance below 90 percent	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		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	28	63	27	0	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	28	63	0	0	0	0	119

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	12	8	11	0	0	0	0	31

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	

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	170	184	180	0	0	0	0	534
Attendance below 90 percent	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		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	28	63	27	0	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	28	63	0	0	0	0	119

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	12	8	11	0	0	0	0	31

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	

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				48%	48%	54%	42%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	52%	54%	39%	47%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	48%	47%	39%	42%	47%
Math Achievement				58%	50%	58%	46%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains				56%	50%	57%	46%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	48%	51%	47%	51%	51%
Science Achievement				37%	44%	51%	46%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				87%	72%	72%	98%	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	55%	48%	7%	54%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	38%	42%	-4%	52%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2021					
	2019	53%	48%	5%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	60%	47%	13%	55%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	34%	39%	-5%	54%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
08	2021					
	2019	61%	35%	26%	46%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	38%	41%	-3%	48%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	54%	-54%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	87%	70%	17%	71%	16%
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	88%	50%	38%	61%	27%
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 progress monitoring data.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	51	55	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	46	51
	Students With Disabilities	18	17	31
	English Language Learners	41	49	45
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	48	50	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	44	31
	Students With Disabilities	15	23	14
	English Language Learners	33	47	29

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40	44	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	40	40
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	8
	English Language Learners	20	21	26
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35	50	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	47	48
	Students With Disabilities	11	17	30
	English Language Learners	29	31	31
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	45	57	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	57	51
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	25
	English Language Learners	33	37	37
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30	63	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	64	58
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	25
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			50
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	10	21	24	13	36	47					
ELL	37	48	43	36	45	41	21	50	29		
BLK	40	43	35	31	33	38	33	72	32		
HSP	47	48	42	41	41	46	45	70	43		
MUL	33	27		50	55						
WHT	57	43	17	43	27		47	67	47		
FRL	42	45	37	34	35	42	38	74	38		
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	9	50	36	21	41	38					
ELL	18	45	53	43	52	46	19	73			
ASN	100	82		91	73						

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
BLK	47	51	43	51	56	67	32	81	74		
HSP	45	53	59	57	55	58	32	88	81		
MUL	67	50		75	75						
WHT	50	49	50	63	51	55	55	94	78		
FRL	44	51	52	55	53	57	35	85	75		
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	17	43	57	25	46	42					
ELL	23	38	43	28	37	29	40		64		
ASN	91			100							
BLK	34	28	26	38	44	49	38	100	75		
HSP	42	39	40	44	40	39	46	100	78		
WHT	47	49	59	53	56	75	46		59		
FRL	39	37	37	43	43	43	40	100	69		

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	32
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	432
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
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	38
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	40
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	46
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	41
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	44
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	42
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?

In reading, it appears that the Economically Disadvantage students were scoring from 3 to 8 percent below their peers. SWD scored significantly below their peer group with an average of 30% below. These data percent's were very similar in reading and n math for SWD students.

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

Students with disabilities have demonstrated the greatest need for improvement.. However, based on 2019, science is also a great concern. At 37% proficiency, this indicates that our scores were far below the state average and we fell 11% from the prior year.

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

Contributing factors could be : poor teaching, spotty attendance for students and teachers, computer mishaps, teacher frustration and poor motivation. To address these factors we will need to : create a tight monitoring plan to track student: attendance, grades, and motivation. In addition, assign a support team to ensure small group instruction is done.

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

In 2019, our greatest improvement was in math with out lowest 25%.

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

The teachers did a better job of motivating the students to do their best. They also did a better job of closely monitoring the student's progress and adjusting their teaching. Finally, they, the teachers, did a good job in repetition and remediation.

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

It will be important to consistently use small group instruction for those specific students who need that extra support. Using the strategies of repetition and remediation will be important to use consistently along with the proper assignment in the intensive course.

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.

Professional learning will be important, however, it will be very important to identify what kind of professional learning is needed for teachers and leaders. Professional learning without focus never get implemented.

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

Additional services will include : the PD department at the district, research studies found that used strategies, a chosen strategy will be implemented.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with disabilities scores performed significantly below their peers in reading and math. The data showed on an average SWD performed 30 percentage points below their peers. SWD percent proficiency showed only 31% of these students improved in 2020-2021. These students are also represented in the lowest 25% school data.
Measurable Outcome:	SWD will improve their academic scores by 10% in reading and in math. Progress monitoring data will show the improvement quarterly. The improvement will increase by 3 percent each quarter.
Monitoring:	The area will be monitored by creating a plan that will track each student's attendance, grades, progress monitoring and motivation. This will be monitored by a team composed of : ESE teacher, subject teacher, math coach , subject chair, assistant principal and principal. By-weekly meetings will be held to analyze student data, adjustments will be made by adding sessions with the math interventionist and intensive reading teacher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathryn Blackburn (kathryn.blackburn@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence- based strategies will include all low performing will be intentionally scheduled for sessions with the math interventionist and intensive reading teacher. The interventionist and reading teacher will use remediation and repetition supporting the areas of low mastery. In addition, small group will be used on a regular basis in the classroom and interventionist room.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using the strategies of remediation and repetition along with small group will improve the comprehension and low mastery of grade level standards. Data chats along with data analysis will also be used. STAR math STAR reading and the district quarterly assessments will be used to give data for the chats.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The LEA will review IEPs to determine if student performance and needs are aligned to accommodations.
2. Data analysis of the 2018-19 FSA Mathematics and Reading scores.
3. Data analysis of the 2020-2021 Star Math and Star reading progress monitoring data.
4. Strategic scheduling of students, specifically addressing the needs of the ESE students and lowest 25%.
5. Remediation, repetition, small group with math interventionist and intensive reading teacher.
6. Bi-weekly meetings with the team composed of: LEA,AP, and principal to analyze student progress and monitor parent communication of goals for each student.
7. Re-assess individual student academic success plan for non-preforming students.
8. Add additional support via tutoring after school with math and reading tutors.

Person Responsible	Alissiea Wilder (alissiea.wilder@polk-fl.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Eighth grade science is experiencing a continual decline in student proficiency, as evident by the 2018-19 NGSSS SSA (State Science Assessment). Specifically, student achievement dropped from 46% proficiency in 2017-18 to 38% in the 2018-19 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	8th grade science scores will increase from 38% to 50% proficiency on the NGSSS SSA .
Monitoring:	The Principal, Science Chair 8th grade science teachers will meet by-weekly and analyze data. During these meetings adjustments will be used to support learning gaps. Effective use of interactive notebooks along with hands -on activities used to learn essentials of the curriculum.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathryn Blackburn (kathryn.blackburn@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidenced based strategy that will be implemented will be hands-on activities along with an interactive notebook. The hands-on activities will increase student engagement. The use of the interactive notebook will support comprehension of the learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Hands-on learning will be an effective strategy, because it will engage all learning modalities. Level of evidence will be monitored through common benchmark assessments and district quarterly assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data analysis of the 2018-19 BGSSS SSA scores.
2. Data analysis of the 2020-2021 progress monitoring data
3. Professional development for all science teachers on effective hands- on activities.
4. Monitoring student progress via assessments created by the teachers and district qtrly assessments.
5. Sharing student work samples to in PLC's to determine is tasks are aligned to standards with appropriate cognitive level.
6. By-weekly data analysis of data collected with all science teachers and principal.
7. Implement a remediation plan covering the standards not mastered for students not meeting mastery. This will be teacher driven.
8. Science informational text will be used in all science classes to support science standards being taught during that 9-weeks. Literacy Coach will provide the passages and classes will use these passage bi-weekly.
9. Re-assessment of plan to insure student success.
10. Add science tutoring for those students no achieving mastery of taught standards.

Person Responsible Kathryn Blackburn (kathryn.blackburn@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data reveals that 2020 skills needed for success in college or career include : complex problem solving, critical thinking and creativity. Writing across the curriculum , when done with fidelity can support mastery of these skills. 2021 data shows in 6th,7th, and 8th grade language arts only approximately 50% of the students are reaching proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	All student will improve proficiency level in language arts by 5%.
Monitoring:	The monitoring of the area of focus will monitored for the desired outcome through data analysis from bi-weekly writing assignments. Students will use goal setting, peer review, rubrics and authentic, specific from the teacher to evaluate the success of students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathryn Blackburn (kathryn.blackburn@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Writing across the curriculum will be implemented schoolwide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this strategy is based on the over arching effects of using the strategy effectively. By using this strategy, writing across the curriculum the benefits will be seen in other curricular areas not only language arts.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Research several programs for writing across the curriculum.

2.Share plans and research with the Academic Leadership Team.

3. Elicit support from the district literacy team: professional development on selected process, consistent method for evaluating student work, and appropriate method for grading and feedback.

4.Leadership Team that consists of : subject chairs for all subjects, support staff, and administration will select a plan to use schoolwide.

5. Provide professional development for all staff members of the selected program and or plan. that will support: student work evaluation, effective feedback, and grading to encourage students in this practice.

6. Have teachers practice using selected program and or the writing process process to include effective feedback and grading during PLC's.

7. Support teachers with anchor charts, modeling and effective feedback from the Literacy coach before implementation of the plan.

8. Using the Academic Leadership team create an implementation plan for launching writing across the curriculum by discipline.

9. Develop the plan for implementation.

10. Execute the plan

11. Gather date from classrooms based on writing samples, class observations, and student feedback. ALT, along with the classroom teachers will the data analyze data.

12. Effective feedback and support by Literacy Coach and administration will be provided to teachers who may need support during the implementation period.

13. Evaluate implementation of the program and or plan.

14. Adjust for any issues found, looking at data, student samples, and classroom observations and reassess the need for additional PD.

Person Responsible   Kathryn Blackburn (kathryn.blackburn@polk-fl.net)

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.

Based on the Safe School report Daniel Jenkins Academy's show our discipline status is rated as moderate. Ranking 2.9 per 100 and ranked 242 of 553. The violent incidents were low ranked #37 of 553. Property incidents rated low #1 of 553. However, Drug/public order incidents was ranked high, rated 495 out of 553. This will be the area of focus for the 2021-20211 school year. The School Leadership Team will be the lens used to monitor behavior and discipline data. By-weekly meetings will be used with the discipline data added to the agenda.

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.

The school will address building a positive school culture and environment by creating an open honest environment. Communication is very important and administration will maintain an open door policy to increase communication and trust. As a school, we will revisit the core beliefs the school created and see if they need to be revised. It will be important to develop norms for behaviors and revisit these items periodically during the year.

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

The stakeholders will be as follows:
Principal and assistant principal- constantly commit to open communication with an open door policy with staff.
Subject Chairs on the Leadership Team- establish norms for behavior when at school
Other Leadership Team Members- actively involve in looking at the core values established at the school
SAC Members who will support decisions designed via the School Improvement Plan.

Business partners who will support our recognition program with staff members.
All members will continue with positive peer message sharing