

Polk County Public Schools

Kathleen Senior High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Kathleen Senior High School

1100 RED DEVIL WAY, Lakeland, FL 33815

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

Demographics

Principal: Daraford Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 12/18/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Kathleen Senior High School

1100 RED DEVIL WAY, Lakeland, FL 33815

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

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)
High School PK, 9-12	Yes	93%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Kathleen Senior High School is to provide professional, respectful and great customer service to all students allowing them to graduate prepared for college, post-secondary and/or to be career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All Kathleen High School students will graduate with a personalized, collaborative, and diverse education. Through an engaged family of educators and community partners, students are empowered, confident, and purposeful. Instruction is authentic and student-centered, ensuring all graduates are prepared for college, career, and life.

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
Jones, Daraford	Principal	
Akins, Ladreda	Assistant Principal	
Fisher, Summer	Assistant Principal	
Lasseter, Matthew	Assistant Principal	
Reyes, Joaquin	Dean	
Redd, Jennifer	Parent Engagement Liaison	
Sasser, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Freeman, Angela	Other	
Haggins, Ledarius	Other	
Reeves, Marvin	Assistant Principal	
Davis, Melissa	Dean	
Gulley, Jon	Instructional Coach	
Cress, Aaron	Math Coach	
Jones, Alvin	Psychologist	
Williams, Jeffrey	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 12/18/2020, Daraford Jones

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

113

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,928

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

15

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

26

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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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

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	550	500	416	462	1928
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	96	84	154	436
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	82	51	58	298
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187	41	34	10	272
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	35	55	23	149
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163	179	180	159	681
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167	145	112	111	535

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	116	128	113	142	499

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	5	31	17	3	56
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	32	26	1	73

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	550	500	416	462	1928
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	96	84	154	436
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	82	51	58	298
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187	41	34	10	272
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	35	55	23	149
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163	179	180	159	681
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167	145	112	111	535

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	116	128	113	142	499

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	5	31	17	3	56
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	32	26	1	73

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				38%	47%	56%	37%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				39%	46%	51%	42%	47%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32%	37%	42%	33%	39%	44%
Math Achievement				26%	43%	51%	36%	44%	51%
Math Learning Gains				39%	45%	48%	38%	42%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	44%	45%	39%	38%	45%
Science Achievement				53%	58%	68%	60%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				50%	61%	73%	56%	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	39%	45%	-6%	55%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	33%	42%	-9%	53%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

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	51%	54%	-3%	67%	-16%
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	48%	57%	-9%	70%	-22%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	20%	50%	-30%	61%	-41%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	30%	53%	-23%	57%	-27%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA - STAR, US History - District Quarterly Assessment, Biology - District Quarterly Assessment, Mathematics - District Quarterly Assessment

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31	35	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	28	25
	Students With Disabilities	5	8	5
	English Language Learners	5	9	6
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	62	35	7
	Economically Disadvantaged	71	33	8
	Students With Disabilities	33	17	2
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50	41	23
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	35	22
	Students With Disabilities	28	18	12
	English Language Learners	54	45	20
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55	33	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	25	29
	Students With Disabilities	31	11	21
	English Language Learners	58	34	29

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	23	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	24	31
	Students With Disabilities	15	7	14
	English Language Learners	15	3	8
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28	18	100
	Economically Disadvantaged		5	
	Students With Disabilities	25	20	5
	English Language Learners	75	14	
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50	41	23
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	35	22
	Students With Disabilities	28	18	12
	English Language Learners	54	45	20
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55	33	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	25	29
	Students With Disabilities	31	11	21
	English Language Learners	58	34	29

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36	28	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	21	16
	Students With Disabilities	5	10	17
	English Language Learners	6		
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6	9	
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	5	
	Students With Disabilities	8	6	
	English Language Learners		3	
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17		
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	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	11	20	19	16	18	25	18	32		89	17
ELL	8	24	31	10	14	19	18	25		90	26
BLK	19	29	29	11	14	14	21	36		94	40
HSP	26	29	25	16	18	20	37	45		92	40
MUL	37	39		18	30					92	33

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
WHT	47	45	31	32	25	32	56	57		89	57
FRL	25	30	25	16	17	14	37	45		90	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	18	36	30	20	37		28	27		67	21
ELL	15	27	19	6	23	30	17	13		69	45
ASN	67	45									
BLK	22	34	33	15	38	46	35	31		85	32
HSP	36	33	22	19	31	33	41	50		80	46
MUL	38	50								82	
WHT	47	45	42	41	46	52	72	65		75	56
FRL	33	39	32	19	34	44	42	42		77	38
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	16	32	28	23	26	35	39	33		48	13
ELL	13	41	49	19	21	17	35	27		50	20
AMI	10										
ASN	60	70									
BLK	25	38	35	21	32	33	43	38		77	23
HSP	34	38	36	34	35	46	54	52		71	40
MUL	38	50		45			73	40		63	50
WHT	48	47	25	45	43	40	72	66		77	58
FRL	30	38	34	30	35	35	56	47		71	37

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	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	25
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	92%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	26
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	
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	31
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	34
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	42
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	47
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	33
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

Most of our progress monitoring scores decreased throughout the school year across all grade levels and core content areas, but specifically within our SWD, ELL, and Economically Disadvantaged students. In the state assessments, ELA learning gains in our ELL, Asian, Black, and Hispanic subgroups showed the most significant decreases.

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

The greatest needs for improvement are demonstrated in our math achievement (26%), ELA achievement (38%), and ELA lowest 25th percentile (32%) compared to the district and state averages.

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 were the high number of substitutes in our core classes and ESE support units, high number of teacher turnover, low teacher attendance, low student attendance both on campus and e-learning, lack of progress monitoring data analysis in all areas, and the decrease in effective collaborative planning and PLCs. Our new actions will include more strategic monitoring of teacher and student attendance, heavy focus on teacher retention and support through school-based new teacher program, structured schedule of collaborative planning and PLCs to be facilitated/monitored by administration and instructional coaches, implementation of vertical planning in ELA, increase of data chats/analysis among teachers, students, and administration about progress monitoring results, and MTSS.

Teacher Attendance - Mr. Jones (Monthly)

Collaborative Planning - Ms. Fisher (ELA/Reading), Ms. Akins (Math & CTE), Mr. Reeves (Science), Mr. Lasseter (SS), Mr. Jones (Electives) - (Weekly)

New Teacher Program - Mr. Reyes, Ms. Vick and Mr. Locke

Implementation of Vertical Planning ELA/Math - Mr. Gulley and Mr. Cress

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

The areas that showed the most improvement was our college and career and acceleration (13% to 21%) and our graduation rate (48% to 67%).

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

The contributing factors was the ELA Saturday Academy and after school tutoring for ACT test prep. We provided our students with additional support in a smaller group setting, placement of reading and math interventionists to work with the lowest 25th percentile.

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

To accelerate learning, we will need to better support our ELL, Black, and Hispanic students through small group instruction, more effective intervention practices within the core classes and MTSS implementation.

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.

Our opportunities will include professional development led by our ESOL resource teachers, instructional coaches, and district personnel, strategic class and teacher scheduling for all students, and school counselor professional development on appropriate scheduling for each student on campus.

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

Additionally, we will provide a book study using the book, *Culturize*, to promote relationship-building among students from different cultural backgrounds, staff, and administration, and create the opportunity for vertical and horizontal summer collaborative planning.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Kathleen High School is ranked very high on school safety dashboard. The areas of violent incidents and drug/public order incidents are the specific areas.
Measurable Outcome:	Reduce our incidents per 100 students to the state average of 3.3 Kathleen High School's average is 6.8 incidents per 100 students.
Monitoring:	Monthly Discipline reports School Psychologist -Conflict Strategies for students receiving violent referrals (As Needed) Behavioral Interventionist (Weekly Meeting)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matthew Lasseter (matthew.lasseter@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All students with incidents in the specific areas from 2020-2021 to start school year 2021-2022 will be placed in Tier 3. Tier 3 will consist of a Prevention Problem Solving Team made up of School Psychologist, Behavioral Interventionist, School Counselor and Mentor. These Tier 3 students will 1. Recommended for School Counseling first 2 weeks of school (School Psychologist) 2. Taught Social Skills (Behavioral Interventionist) 3. Have Biweekly Meeting reviewing academics , attendance and behavior (Behavioral Interventionist) 4. Check-in and Check-outs Tier 1 & 2 students will receive school-wide positive behavior interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To reduce the number of incidents through the allowable resources provided to the school (Prevention Problem Solving Team). The team will be a treatment team for the students' social-emotional needs and education needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Recommended for School Counseling first 2 weeks of school (School Psychologist)
2. Taught Social Skills (Behavioral Interventionist)
3. Have Biweekly Meeting reviewing academics , attendance and behavior (Behavioral Interventionist)
4. Check-in and Check-outs
5. Book Study - Culturize
6. Book - Growth Mindset

Person Responsible Matthew Lasseter (matthew.lasseter@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELL students are performing at 30% of Federal Index this is two consecutive years of performing below 32% and they are the largest demographics.

Measurable Outcome: The ELL students will achieve above 32% of Federal Index level.

Monitoring: Progress Monitoring- STAR
Monthly Meeting with ELL and ESE teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Summer Fisher (summer.fisher@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Progress Monitoring and Monitoring Attendance and Monitoring Discipline
ELL teachers pullout - Small Groups with Reading Interventionist
Common Assessments

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: ELL population will improve above 32% of index level.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review all ELL students with STAR scores for 2020-2021 school below proficiency.
2. Require ESOL teachers/paras to push into general ed classrooms.
3. ESOL teachers and Literacy Instructional coach will provide professional development to assist teachers with effective strategies for ELL students
4. ESOL teachers visit subject area collaborative planning to provide feedback to general ed. teachers and to become more knowledgeable of instructional focus in general ed classes.
5. Analyze STAR progress monitoring data frequently to determine needs

Person Responsible Summer Fisher (summer.fisher@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.

The primary and secondary areas of concern are fights and tobacco use.

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.

1. Grade level meetings were held to present school wide discipline policy, expectations and rules.
2. Students with GPA below 2.0 and/or with previous years discipline will have additional grade level meetings.
3. Groups were created for students with gpa below 2.0 and/or previous discipline. Each group has a team of administrators assigned to monitor those students at least biweekly in regards to attendance, discipline and academics.
4. At end of first nine weeks, any student not meeting all three elements a parent conference will be scheduled with the counselor, administrator, student and parent to determine students viability to continue at Kathleen High school or provide alternative educational opportunities.

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

Administration will provide support to all stakeholders to determine areas of need.

The school's psychologist is working with discipline team to address students receiving violent referrals.

DJJ is working in collaboration with Kathleen High School to treat the whole student with services to prevent the continuing of negative behaviors.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: School Safety				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1181 - Kathleen Senior High School	TSSSA		\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5200		1181 - Kathleen Senior High School	Title, I Part A		\$0.00
Total:						\$0.00