

Polk County Public Schools

George W. Jenkins Senior High



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 22 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 26 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 27 |

George W. Jenkins Senior High

6000 LAKELAND HIGHLANDS RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

Demographics

Principal: Tom Patton

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2021

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 9-12 |
| 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) | 69% |
| 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: B (58%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: C (52%) |
| 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 | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 22 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 27 |

George W. Jenkins Senior High

6000 LAKELAND HIGHLANDS RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>High School 9-12</p> | <p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>59%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>49%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
| Grade | | B | B | B |

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 that each student is prompt, polite, and prepared.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is that each student will graduate with the skills necessary to be successful in college or in a career.

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 |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--|
| Patton, Tom | Principal | <p>Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school-based team implements sound instructional practices, conducts evaluations of school staff, ensures implementation/documentation of a multitiered system of interventions and supports, ensures that adequate professional development opportunities exist and that these opportunities represent research-based, educational best practices that serve to enhance both the depth and breadth of the school's abilities both academic and beyond.</p> <p>The principal also ensure that appropriate and diverse methods of communication are in place to inform parents and other community stakeholders of school-based plans and activities.</p> |
| Emmerling, Lacy | Assistant Principal | <p>Assist and facilitate the common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing research-based, effective instructional strategies, conduct both informal and formal assessments of school staff, ensure implementation/documentation of a multi-tiered system of interventions and supports, ensure that adequate professional development opportunities exist and that these opportunities represent research-based, educational best practices that serve to enhance both the depth and breadth of the campus' instructional capacity, and communicate with parents regarding school-based plans and activities.</p> |
| Hiers, William | Assistant Principal | <p>Assist and facilitate the common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing research-based, effective instructional strategies, conduct both informal and formal assessments of school staff, ensure implementation/documentation of a multi-tiered system of interventions and supports, ensure that adequate professional development opportunities exist and that these opportunities represent research-based, educational best practices that serve to enhance both the depth and breadth of the campus' instructional capacity, and communicate with parents regarding school-based plans and activities.</p> |
| Goodman, Robert | Instructional Technology | <p>To ensure that the quality and quantity of technology is abundant and satisfactory across campus, and that teachers feel supported and ready for the classroom concerning their technology. In addition, Mr. Goodman diligently keeps track, updates, and monitors all technology across campus, and makes sure that each piece of technology is up to date and ready for usage and any time.</p> |
| Provino, Lisa | Instructional Coach | <p>This group provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, helps facilitate instructional and intervention supports, collaborates with staff to improve/implement intervention supports, and integrates materials/instructional techniques within the framework of the district curriculum maps.</p> |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Rawson, Daniel | Dean | This group provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, helps facilitate instructional and intervention supports, collaborates with staff to improve/implement intervention supports, and integrates materials/instructional techniques within the framework of the district curriculum maps. |
| Walton, John | Dean | This group provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, helps facilitate instructional and intervention supports, collaborates with staff to improve/implement intervention supports, and integrates materials/instructional techniques within the framework of the district curriculum maps. |
| Crosby, Erin | Dean | This group provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, helps facilitate instructional and intervention supports, collaborates with staff to improve/implement intervention supports, and integrates materials/instructional techniques within the framework of the district curriculum maps. |
| Durham, Dan | Assistant Principal | Assist and facilitate the common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school-based team is implementing research-based, effective instructional strategies, conduct both informal and formal assessments of school staff, ensure implementation/documentation of a multi-tiered system of interventions and supports, ensure that adequate professional development opportunities exist and that these opportunities represent research-based, educational best practices that serve to enhance both the depth and breadth of the campus' instructional capacity, and communicate with parents regarding school-based plans and activities. |
| Vancamp, Jane | Other | Our school success coach works to identify students are behind in grade level when compared to their cohort, have a GPA below 2.0, or are otherwise deemed at-risk to not graduate with a diploma. Once identified, she works to build relationships with these students and their families, learn their goals and their strengths/weaknesses, and develop a plan to ensure that they successfully graduate with a diploma. Once a plan is created, she monitors students' progress towards achieving the goals within the plan, ensures that necessary supports are in place, and continually updates the plan of action, as needed. The role of the Success Coach is to ensure that every child, no matter the background or difficulties, has the support needed to graduate with a diploma and a plan for success in life after high school. |
| Corcelles, Taina | Teacher, K-12 | The ELL instructor provides guidance for the ELL plan and participates in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of student data. She facilitates the development of intervention/support plans, provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation, and provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation. She also |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------|----------------|--|
| | | facilitates data-based decision making activities that enhance the effectiveness of instruction delivered to our ELL students. |
| Hamid, Linda | Teacher, ESE | Serve as the facilitator and Lead Teacher for the ESE department and participate in student data collection, integrate core instructional activities/ materials into the instructional framework, and ensure that collaboration between ESE teachers and general education teachers are utilized consistently through activities such as consult, co-teaching, and support facilitation. |
| Odum, Denise | Teacher, ESE | Serve as the facilitator and Lead Teacher for the ESE department and participate in student data collection, integrate core instructional activities/ materials into the instructional framework, and ensure that collaboration between ESE teachers and general education teachers are utilized consistently through activities such as consult, co-teaching, and support facilitation. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/24/2021, Tom Patton

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.*

3

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

115

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,155

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

9

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

5

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 615 | 585 | 503 | 452 | 2155 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 136 | 127 | 84 | 482 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 64 | 47 | 37 | 240 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 57 | 38 | 5 | 157 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 59 | 59 | 16 | 209 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 199 | 176 | 134 | 90 | 599 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 198 | 168 | 183 | 208 | 757 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 199 | 176 | 134 | 90 | 599 |

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 | 40 | 40 | 18 | 17 | 115 |

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 | 91 | 81 | 84 | 47 | 303 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 33 | 20 | 18 | 92 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/24/2021

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 607 | 495 | 499 | 2201 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 55 | 48 | 43 | 208 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 | 106 | 86 | 72 | 377 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 71 | 78 | 55 | 280 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 84 | 106 | 79 | 330 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 129 | 85 | 50 | 383 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 26 | 139 | 47 | 324 |

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 | 30 | 32 | 30 | 49 | 141 |

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 | 66 | 71 | 49 | 52 | 238 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 13 | 10 | 44 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 607 | 495 | 499 | 2201 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 55 | 48 | 43 | 208 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 | 106 | 86 | 72 | 377 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 71 | 78 | 55 | 280 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 84 | 106 | 79 | 330 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 129 | 85 | 50 | 383 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 26 | 139 | 47 | 324 |

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 | 30 | 32 | 30 | 49 | 141 |

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 | 66 | 71 | 49 | 52 | 238 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 13 | 10 | 44 |

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 | | | | 55% | 47% | 56% | 54% | 46% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 51% | 46% | 51% | 55% | 47% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 40% | 37% | 42% | 49% | 39% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 57% | 43% | 51% | 48% | 44% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 45% | 45% | 48% | 39% | 42% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 44% | 44% | 45% | 44% | 38% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 60% | 58% | 68% | 72% | 65% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 63% | 61% | 73% | 70% | 63% | 71% |

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 |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 45% | 8% | 55% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 56% | 42% | 14% | 53% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -53% | | | | |

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

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

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 60% | 54% | 6% | 67% | -7% |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 63% | 57% | 6% | 70% | -7% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 50% | 50% | 0% | 61% | -11% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 62% | 53% | 9% | 57% | 5% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool used for English Language arts was essay writing.

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 350/34% | 369/27% | 223/10% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 32/9% | 24/8% | 46/4% |
| | English Language Learners | 34/12% | 30/3% | 26/8% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 10/50% | 215/37% | 90/47% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 37/22% | 16/19% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 23/22% | 12/33% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 10 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 371/49% | 293/35% | 187/7% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 43/16% | 27/22% | 50/4% |
| | English Language Learners | 21/28% | 21/5% | 13/0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 22/59% | 385/28% | 159/42% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 76/13% | 38/11% |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 43/28% | 19/37% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 11 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|---------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 65/23% | 81/33% | 110/10% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1/0% | 9/11% | 6/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 2/50% | 2/0% | 5/0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 3/33% | 73/8% | 26/12% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1/0% | 28/0% | 6/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 2/50% | 7/29% | 5/0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 12 | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | 20/5% | 21/5% | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 0 | 6/41% | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | | 3/0% | 2/0% | 1/0% |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | 0/0% | 3/0% | 2/50% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 0 | 1/0% | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

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 | 14 | 35 | 34 | 11 | 39 | 41 | 26 | 31 | | 92 | 33 |
| ELL | 24 | 38 | 30 | 15 | 20 | 23 | 35 | 36 | | 92 | 57 |
| ASN | 68 | 64 | | 45 | | | 67 | 71 | | 100 | 92 |
| BLK | 32 | 43 | 40 | 13 | 16 | 25 | 33 | 47 | | 96 | 63 |
| HSP | 47 | 53 | 43 | 21 | 22 | 26 | 55 | 59 | | 95 | 62 |

| 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 |
| MUL | 43 | 44 | 36 | 12 | 7 | | 35 | 56 | | 100 | 81 |
| WHT | 57 | 53 | 43 | 32 | 27 | 34 | 66 | 69 | | 98 | 80 |
| FRL | 32 | 40 | 40 | 16 | 21 | 27 | 45 | 49 | | 95 | 61 |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 18 | 32 | 28 | 30 | 35 | 21 | 26 | 28 | | 89 | 39 |
| ELL | 17 | 46 | 33 | 40 | 46 | | 30 | | | 85 | 68 |
| ASN | 65 | 55 | | 57 | 37 | | 55 | 82 | | 94 | 81 |
| BLK | 35 | 42 | 39 | 42 | 37 | 54 | 41 | 44 | | 97 | 53 |
| HSP | 50 | 48 | 35 | 47 | 53 | 48 | 52 | 64 | | 96 | 73 |
| MUL | 58 | 53 | | 63 | 35 | | 56 | 63 | | 90 | 83 |
| WHT | 62 | 54 | 44 | 65 | 45 | 35 | 71 | 68 | | 98 | 75 |
| FRL | 36 | 42 | 40 | 40 | 42 | 44 | 47 | 53 | | 95 | 61 |
| 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 | 21 | 47 | 42 | 18 | 24 | 24 | 46 | 33 | | 69 | 17 |
| ELL | 17 | 56 | 50 | 29 | 47 | | | 36 | | 75 | 27 |
| ASN | 60 | 62 | | 44 | 18 | | 94 | 60 | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 45 | 44 | 28 | 34 | 33 | 68 | 49 | | 82 | 36 |
| HSP | 48 | 56 | 54 | 41 | 45 | 55 | 71 | 67 | | 87 | 60 |
| MUL | 51 | 60 | 45 | 44 | 29 | 33 | 75 | 76 | | 85 | 71 |
| WHT | 63 | 56 | 48 | 59 | 41 | 48 | 72 | 78 | | 90 | 57 |
| FRL | 43 | 52 | 50 | 36 | 37 | 39 | 66 | 59 | | 81 | 43 |

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 | 50 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 49 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 553 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 93% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 36 |
| 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 |
| 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 | 72 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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 | 46 |
| 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 | 56 |
| 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 | 43 |
| 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?

The trends that emerge across grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas show that there is a need for improvement for SWD students and ELA, Biology, history, and Algebra content areas when compared to the state average.

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

The data component, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessment, that requires the greatest need for improvement is the 2019 Algebra I data.

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

The contributing factors for this need for improvement is the 11% below the state average for Algebra I. A renewed focus on common planning and building common assessments, including a targeted reteaching of standards is needed.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement, based off the progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, is the Geometry EOC data, which was 5% above the state average.

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

The new actions that our school took to improve in this area was intentional common planning, common assessments, and integration of target district support in instructional areas of need.

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

The strategies that will be implemented in order to accelerate learning will be intentional common planning, common assessments, analyzing and reviewing progress monitoring and state exam data,

and district and school level coaching with an emphasis on standards instruction in the classroom. In addition, there are multiple tutoring sessions available for students throughout the week hosted by clubs and teachers, and there is personalized PSAT tutoring for gifted students, and cohort scheduling for higher achieving ninth and tenth graders.

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.

The professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders are consistent coaching from district and school level personnel. In addition, District provided off-campus trainings will be provided for various teachers and leaders to introduce the new state level standards.

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

The services that will ensure sustainability will be a continual review of student data to implement necessary instructional strategies. Continuing to build the instructional capacity and as well as our incoming new teachers, which will be completed through strategic peer observational opportunities, where teachers are given the time to observe a fellow teacher for instructional strengths and strategies to reciprocate in their own classroom.

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 were below the mandated percentage of 41% with the school's ESSA data.

Measurable Outcome: The measurable outcome that the school plans to achieve is to raise the total by 3 percentage points, from 35% to 38%.

Monitoring: The area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome through progress monitoring data, consistent and steady conversations with support teachers and ESE staff, and hand crafting ESE student schedules for individualized success.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lacy Emmerling (lacy.emmerling@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: There will be a thorough review of ESE students' classes and utilizing their Teachers of Record to make sure that each student will have the necessary support in the classroom needed. In addition, ESE students will be hand scheduled, based on their IEP's, and efforts will be made to match students with teachers who will best compliment their learning styles and personalities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research indicates that collaboration amongst teachers to examine students' achievement and progress increases students' learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Strategically hand-scheduled students into supports in academic classes.
2. Additional trainings for both content teachers and ESE teachers.
3. Increase in common planning for ESE teachers to identify and develop interventions for students' struggling in multiple contents.
4. Schedule changes for academic courses mid-year.

Person Responsible: Lacy Emmerling (lacy.emmerling@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This group covers a wide range of subgroups, such as ESE (35%), ELL (48%), and Black/African American Students (48%). Focusing on the lowest 25% of ELA allows a narrow focus on students who take ELA I and ELA II FSA exam; allowing administration to provide better support with either tutoring, additional reading classes, and/or progress monitoring with teachers. In addition, there will be a increase focus on English III and English IV average students, in order to provide instructional support so that students may pass the state mandated tests required for graduation.

Measurable Outcome: The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is a 5 percentage point gain for overall student achievement for the 2021-2022 school year. In addition, we wish to increase our learning gains by three percentage points.

Monitoring: How this area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome is through progress monitoring data. In addition, consistent, steady conversations and meetings with our reading coach, English teachers, and reading teachers to implement the curriculum and standards based education with our level I students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lacy Emmerling (lacy.emmerling@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The strategy will be multi-tiered. Curriculum will be adjusted to fit the FSA testing schedule, so that teachers' content will match testing content. Also, to add focus on writing, teachers will be grade norming progress monitoring essays multiple times a year, and have students go through the writing process up to four separate times. In addition, teachers will have a week of reading prep before the FSA reading exam, and a week of writing prep for the FSA writing exam. Finally, each ninth and tenth grade teacher will have a personalized breakdown of the prior scores from the 2020-2021 school year and a breakdown for new students entering their class for the 2021-2022 school year; allowing them to narrow down the focus of their instruction. In addition, we will provide reading teachers more support for their usage of Achieve 3000.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research indicates that adjusting instructions based on student data yields higher outcomes for student learning. In addition, collaboration amongst teachers to focus on instructional strategies and student supports is proven to increase achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Each teacher receives a breakdown of prior scores from 2020-2021 school year on FSA reading and Writing, as well as a breakdown on students entering their classrooms for the 2021-2022 school year.
2. Adjusted curriculum for FSA testing.
3. Multiple thorough writing process for each student on progress monitoring essays.
4. Reading and writing prep before FSA exams.
5. Narrowed scope for common planning with grade norming.

Person Responsible Lisa Provino (lisa.provino@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 2020-21 test scores (FSA Algebra 1 and Geometry EOC scores) show a crucial need in improving the proficiency/passing rate of all students. When compared to 2019 FSA Math EOC scores, our 2021 test data shows a 32% decrease in student achievement. Although a loss of mathematics instruction throughout the Covid shutdown contributed to this decline, it is evident that the instructional practice in our mathematics classrooms must be monitored and supported.

Measurable Outcome: The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is a 5 percentage point gain in 2021-22 mathematics achievement, when compared to 2020-21 data. In addition, we plan to increase our learning gains component by 3 percentage points.

Monitoring: Teachers will meet regularly in common planning meetings. These meetings will be focused on building common assessments and diagnosing student strengths and weaknesses demonstrated on these assessments. Administration will be present in these meetings to ensure discussion remains focused on data and student performance. After district quarterly progress monitoring assessments are given, teachers will examine this data together to diagnose needed adjustments/remediation in their instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: William Hiers (william.hiers@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will track students' mastery of standards through the proficiency demonstrated on both teacher assessments and district progress monitoring assessments. Discussion in common planning meetings will specifically be focused on what students know and are able to demonstrate, rather than what content teachers will teach next. Specific emphasis on informal, formative assessments will be crucial to teachers' understanding of what students do and do not know.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Tracking student progress is crucial to adjusting both the content being taught or retaught and the instructional techniques used to present that content. Informal, formative assessment of some sort on a daily basis must be an ongoing component of our classrooms as it is the most timely data that can guide teacher planning. Teacher summative assessments and district progress monitoring assessments will ultimately show student progress towards proficiency, but formative classroom assessments will be the data that steers teacher instruction from one day to the next.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers and administration will utilize data available in Unify to determine students' past performance in mathematics. Baseline pre-requisite skills tests will be incorporated within the first two weeks of school to provide additional, current information about students' abilities
2. Administration will meet with math teachers to discuss best practices in common planning groups and how data-based discussions will look.
3. Common planning meetings will show a focus on building common assessments and sharing student achievement on these assessments.
4. Support from district math coaches will be utilized, as needed, to incorporate resources that will further engage students in the content.

Person Responsible William Hiers (william.hiers@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.

George Jenkins HS has a reported 5.4 incidents per 100 students, and the state average is 3.3. When compared to all high schools statewide, it falls into the very high category.

When concerning violent incidents, George Jenkins HS ranks #328 out of 505 high schools. The county rank is #11 out of 18, and averages 1.27 out of every 100 students and is considered high. The categories, ranked highest to lowest, are fighting, threat/intimidation, battery, bullying, and sex offenses.

When concerning property incidents, George Jenkins HS ranks #1 out of 505 schools, and ranks #1 out of the county. It averages 0 out of every 100 students incidents and is considered very low.

When concerning drug/public order incidents, George Jenkins HS ranks #465 out of 505. The county rank #13 out of 18. It averages 4.17 per 100 students and is considered very high. The categories, ranked from highest to lowest, are Tobacco, Drug use/possession, disruption on campus, drug sale-excluding alcohol, and alcohol.

When concerning total reported suspensions, George Jenkins HS ranks #411 out of 505. The county rank is #9 out of 74. It averages 23 out of 100 students, and has a total of 525 reported suspensions. It is considered very high.

The goal or focus on our campus is to provide a safe and functional environment to succeed. For example, multiple administrators periodically walk the campus and check bathrooms for potential disciplinary incidents. We also have over 100 cameras that are continually upgraded, as well as additional cameras, which are an additional resource.

Each summer we review disciplinary data and trends from the prior school year in an effort to identify areas that require proactive measures, such as certain areas to monitor, strategies to lessen discipline in certain categories, and importance of creating a discipline plan that is utilized for the upcoming school year.

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.

Our incoming freshman class is targeted in January prior to their freshman year. We host a parent/student night that showcases our career academies, AP courses, clubs, and athletics for students to be involved in. Freshman Orientation is scheduled in the evening, separate from Upperclassmen Orientation, and provides an opportunity for incoming freshmen to familiarize themselves with our campus, club and sports opportunities, and school procedures. During the freshman year, our guidance staff meets with every freshman to discuss the next three years and post-secondary options. Each year after, the student meets the guidance staff to review the same information and help explore more options. During the junior year, a focus is placed on the post-secondary level with a college and career fair and meetings with guidance staff. This focus continues as the student prepares for the senior year where several dual enrollment and AP courses are offered. During the senior year, the guidance staff, along with the senior level teachers, assist student with the college application process, exploring scholarship opportunities, and complete a checklist for graduation requirements.

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

How we utilize stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school is by having various types of stakeholders on different boards, committees, and academies. From business executives to judges, we have a varied depth and expertise from multiple stakeholders in the community.

Our academic booster club members are vital for student and staff celebrations. The booster club consists of parents and community members who are regularly involved in supporting campus climate and culture.

In addition, one of our design academy teachers maintains and updates our school website and social media platforms in an effort to promote the positive endeavors and achievements of our students and staff.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |