

Polk County Public Schools

Jewett School Of The Arts



2022-23 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 | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Jewett School Of The Arts

2250 8TH ST NE, Winter Haven, FL 33881

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

Demographics

Principal: Michael Sears

Start Date for this Principal: 6/21/2022

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School PK-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2021-22 Title I School | No |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 98% |
| 2021-22 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 | 2021-22: C (51%) 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (60%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | ATSI |
| * 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 | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Jewett School Of The Arts

2250 8TH ST NE, Winter Haven, FL 33881

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

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School PK-8 | No | 98% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 74% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C | | 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.

The mission of Jewett School of the Arts is to provide all participants in our learning community with the resources needed to become responsible, life-long learners committed to excellence in the academics and the arts.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision of Jewett School of the Arts is to provide the pathway for faculty, staff, parents and community to cultivate, through communication, a sense of ownership, spirit and pride in the school. Not only must students be prepared academically; they must be fostered with a sense of cultural awareness which includes an appreciation of the arts, acceptance of diversity and the community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Sears, Michael | Principal | Educational Leader |
| Dean, Samantha | Assistant Principal | |
| Johnson, Chandra | Assistant Principal | |
| Smith, Linda | Teacher, K-12 | Kg instructor |
| France, Jessica | Teacher, K-12 | 1st grade instructor |
| Henry, Bridgette | Teacher, K-12 | 2nd grade instructor |
| Overstreet, Teresa | Teacher, K-12 | 4th Grade Math/Science |
| Richard, Lisa | Teacher, K-12 | Reading instructor |
| Burke, Kristin | Teacher, K-12 | 8th grade Science Instructor |
| | | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/21/2022, Michael Sears

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

683

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

12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

12

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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 | 68 | 65 | 64 | 76 | 78 | 79 | 82 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 583 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 11 | 12 | 5 | 11 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 11 | 7 | 11 | 18 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 13 | 23 | 23 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 18 | 23 | 29 | 28 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 38 | 39 | 16 | 9 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 | |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | 5 | 12 | 6 | 21 | 23 | 39 | 33 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 164 | |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/21/2022

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 | 70 | 72 | 71 | 66 | 74 | 84 | 80 | 73 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 670 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 26 | 27 | 28 | 17 | 28 | 34 | 19 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 205 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 15 | 26 | 10 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 5 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 21 | 29 | 17 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |

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 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 12 | 6 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |

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 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 70 | 72 | 71 | 66 | 74 | 84 | 80 | 73 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 670 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 26 | 27 | 28 | 17 | 28 | 34 | 19 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 205 | |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 15 | 26 | 10 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 5 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 21 | 29 | 17 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 | |

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 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 12 | 6 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | |

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 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |

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 | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 51% | 51% | 55% | | | | 57% | 61% | 61% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 53% | | | | | | 52% | 58% | 59% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 43% | | | | | | 47% | 49% | 54% |
| Math Achievement | 46% | 37% | 42% | | | | 55% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 51% | | | | | | 52% | 56% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 47% | | | | | | 48% | 52% | 52% |
| Science Achievement | 41% | 48% | 54% | | | | 43% | 52% | 56% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 70% | 53% | 59% | | | | 80% | 79% | 78% |

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 |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 52% | 2% | 58% | -4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 61% | 48% | 13% | 58% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -54% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 47% | 5% | 56% | -4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -61% | | | | |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 48% | 16% | 54% | 10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -52% | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 42% | 9% | 52% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -64% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 48% | 14% | 56% | 6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -51% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 56% | -5% | 62% | -11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 66% | 56% | 10% | 64% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -51% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 40% | 51% | -11% | 60% | -20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -66% | | | | |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 67% | 47% | 20% | 55% | 12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -40% | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 39% | 39% | 0% | 54% | -15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -67% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 35% | 35% | 0% | 46% | -11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -39% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 38% | 45% | -7% | 53% | -15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -38% | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 41% | 6% | 48% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 80% | 70% | 10% | 71% | 9% |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 70% | 50% | 20% | 61% | 9% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 79% | 53% | 26% | 57% | 22% |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 24 | 55 | 50 | 27 | 49 | 56 | 12 | | | | |
| ELL | 29 | 50 | | 21 | 46 | 55 | | | | | |
| BLK | 41 | 47 | 36 | 31 | 49 | 46 | 31 | 58 | 54 | | |
| HSP | 51 | 60 | 56 | 42 | 46 | 48 | 32 | 74 | 55 | | |
| MUL | 65 | 67 | | 76 | 67 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 63 | 51 | 50 | 63 | 56 | | 57 | 83 | 72 | | |
| FRL | 38 | 51 | 47 | 33 | 43 | 40 | 34 | 58 | 58 | | |
| 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 | 24 | 24 | 15 | 18 | 24 | 24 | 10 | | | | |
| ELL | 33 | 35 | | 37 | 30 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 33 | 29 | 27 | 21 | 25 | 13 | 52 | 38 | | |
| HSP | 48 | 46 | 46 | 51 | 34 | 29 | 20 | 58 | 64 | | |
| MUL | 56 | | | 56 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | 49 | 17 | 57 | 30 | 35 | 47 | 62 | 59 | | |
| FRL | 37 | 33 | 28 | 33 | 21 | 25 | 17 | 65 | 48 | | |
| 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 | 25 | 36 | 29 | 17 | 36 | 29 | | | | | |
| ELL | 36 | 29 | | 45 | 39 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 49 | 53 | 46 | 49 | 50 | 21 | 68 | 78 | | |
| HSP | 62 | 45 | 38 | 56 | 46 | 41 | 48 | 85 | 80 | | |
| MUL | 85 | 67 | | 77 | 50 | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| WHT | 68 | 58 | 44 | 61 | 59 | 49 | 56 | 87 | 61 | | |
| FRL | 48 | 51 | 51 | 47 | 49 | 41 | 36 | 81 | 65 | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | ATSI |
| 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 | 35 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 497 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 39 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 39 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |

| Asian Students | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 44 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 50 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 69 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 62 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 45 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 is the need from improvement in the area of Math and ELA to increase students performing on grade level and above.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data components that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement is Science proficiency.

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 to the need for improvement are misaligned instruction in the classroom to the state standards. Proper planning utilizing the learning arc to better understand the depth and breadth of the standards for instruction. Utilizing tasks and techniques that meet the depth of the standards in daily instruction. The ability to provide students with assessments that truly gauge the learning directly aligned with the standards.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data component that showed the most improvement was Math learning gains for the lowest quartile at 19% increase from the previous year.

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

The ability to provide intervention, remediation and targeted instruction for all students returning to in person instruction. The MTSS process identifying the students with deficits and creating an opportunity to provide supports in the areas that were illuminated through student data collected from classroom instructors and progress monitoring.

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

School wide implementation of Learning Arc Composition with lesson planning.
Review of teacher task and assessments to ensure alignment for students.
Consistent PD with focus on B.E.S.T. Standards implementation school wide.

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.

Learning Arc Professional Development focus
Collaborative planning focused on standards, task, objectives, and assessments
District Professional Development session on Learning Arc framework exercises
District support from Senior Coordinators of Instruction in areas of Science, Math, and ELA.

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

Data chats: Administration with staff & Instructors and Students
Target goal forms with administration and students to address lowest quartile to progress monitor student growth throughout the academic year.
Learning Arc Professional Development focus
Collaborative planning focused on standards, task, objectives, and assessments
District Professional Development session on Learning Arc framework exercises
District support from Senior Coordinators of Instruction in areas of Science, Math, and ELA.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Student Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Disciplinary referrals are greatly disproportionate based upon race throughout K - 8. Students are missing a large amount of class time due to suspensions and other disciplinary consequences at a disproportionate rate. In reviewing disciplinary data, the large discrepancy is displayed with in school and out of school suspensions.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

JSOTA will to reduce the amount of discipline referrals and also reduce the number of out of school/in school suspensions for students of color.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Disciplinary data will be monitored weekly by administration utilizing FOCUS reports.
 Disciplinary data will be reviewed with administration and PBIS committee on a monthly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

charma tillinger (charma.tillinger@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS) training and structures to increase positive school culture and assist students in strategies used to resolve conflict.

Social Emotional Learning (SEL) training for students K - 8, Early Release day focus on SEL lessons for Middle School students and one day per week in elective classes working on interpersonal skills and conflict resolution skills.

CPI Verbal De-escalation strategies (scheduled using district resources).

C.H.A.M.P.S.

Drumbeat Program

Student Mentor Programs

PBIS - research based programs that emphasize acknowledging and celebrating positive choices and behaviors. District supported strategy and training for implementation with fidelity from instructional and support staff. SEL strategies are research based tools that provide students the opportunity to grow in multiple areas of interaction as well as become prepared to deal with conflicts that may arise throughout the school day. District initiative to build and maintain positive relationships between staff and students.

CPI - district supported strategy used to equip students with the resources to diffuse situations using verbal communication instead of physical altercations.

CHAMPS - research based strategy designed to improve communication of learning expectations.

Drumbeat - research based strategy used to teach students how to channel their aggression, make good choices, and have positive behavior outcomes.

Mentoring Programs - research based strategy provides students with the opportunity to receive guidance and support in a safe environment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Action Step 1- Assign members to the PBIS Committee

Person Responsible Samantha Dean (samantha.dean@polk-fl.net)

Action Step 2- Create calendar items for PBIS Committee meetings

Person Responsible Samantha Dean (samantha.dean@polk-fl.net)

Action Step 3- Ongoing PBIS trainings facilitated by district facilitator and administration

Person Responsible Samantha Dean (samantha.dean@polk-fl.net)

Action Step 4- Instructional staff training students in the area of PBIS/CHAMPS Expectations

Person Responsible Samantha Dean (samantha.dean@polk-fl.net)

Action Step 5- Train leadership team on PBIS walkthrough tool

Person Responsible Michael Sears (michael.sears@polk-fl.net)

Action Step 6- Conduct calibration walks until team shows at least 90% consistency.

Person Responsible Michael Sears (michael.sears@polk-fl.net)

Action Step 7- Establish protocol to review PBIS data including evidence in PBIS Walkthrough Tool (PWT)

Person Responsible Michael Sears (michael.sears@polk-fl.net)

Action Step 8- Add PWT data review and monitoring to every leadership team meeting agenda.

Person Responsible Michael Sears (michael.sears@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The three year trend data from FSA scores displays a pattern with student proficiency and lack of growth indicating that the majority of task are not aligned to the rigor of the standard.

Measurable Outcome:**State the specific measurable**

outcome the school plans to achieve.

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

State data will show a minimum of +1% proficiency increase for all grades/content as well as 7% of the students just below the proficiency line becoming proficient.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress monitoring data offered by district level assessment platforms will be used to ensure students are mastering benchmarks being taught after planning is properly implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Hippeli (danielle.hippeli@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

-Monitor students engaging in standards based activities aligned to state expectations using the Standards Walkthrough Tool.

- Engage teachers in monthly standards-based planning using the Learning Arc Framework.

- Review work samples monthly to ensure task and assessments are meeting the depth of the standards.

- TNTP.org- TNTP's - The Opportunity Myth speaks to the relationship between academic success and ensuring students are able to engage in grade level standards-based expectations.

- Statistically, students succeeded on 71% of their assignments and they met grade-level standards on 17% of those same assignments.

- Students spend most of their time in school without access to four key resources: Grade-Appropriate Assignments, Strong Instruction, Deep Engagement, and Teachers with High Expectations.

-It is imperative that we monitor for teacher understanding of the Benchmarks and that all assignments (tasks and assessments) are aligned to the Benchmarks.

Rationale for Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Strategy- Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 1- Create calendar item for calibration walks

Person Responsible

Michael Sears (michael.sears@polk-fl.net)

Strategy- Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 2- Train leadership team on walkthrough tool

Person Responsible

Michael Sears (michael.sears@polk-fl.net)

Strategy- Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 3- Conduct calibration walks until team shows at least 90% consistency.

Person Responsible Michael Sears (michael.sears@polk-fl.net)

Strategy- Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 4- Establish protocol to review data including evidence in SWT

Person Responsible Michael Sears (michael.sears@polk-fl.net)

Strategy- Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 5- Add SWT data review and monitoring to every leadership team meeting agenda.

Person Responsible Michael Sears (michael.sears@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2- Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 1- Create master schedule that includes collaborative planning by subject area for middle school and grade level for elementary.

Person Responsible Samantha Dean (samantha.dean@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2- Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 2- Train facilitators (assistant principals)

Person Responsible Michael Sears (michael.sears@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2- Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 3- Conduct planning on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible Michael Sears (michael.sears@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2- Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 4- Review planning findings during leadership team meetings on a weekly basis

Person Responsible Michael Sears (michael.sears@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2- Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 5- Compare findings between SWT and Benchmarks

Person Responsible Michael Sears (michael.sears@polk-fl.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

We believe that everyday is a Great Day at JSA!

To establish a positive culture JSA supports the teacher by:

Peer selected Staff of the Week (SOW)

Administrator selected Teacher of the Month

Random dress down days (Jeans & Polo)
Back to School Family Picnics
Administration prepares breakfast and lunch throughout the year
Staff luncheons (pot luck)
Daily motivational emails
Walk Through Shout outs via email/announcements
VIP parking spots for staff members as a reward

To establish a positive culture JSA supports the students by:
Jaguar bucks are provided to students for positive acts while on campus
Non Uniform Today (N.U.T.) passes are provided to students for dress down days
Spirit Shirt Fridays
Accelerated Reader/Imagine Math/Achieve 3000 are provided incentives when their goals has been met
Student of the Week awards
Student of the Month recognition with T shirt and picture posted on bulletin board
Fine Arts Festival
Pep Rallies
PTA Assemblies (Honor Roll and Positive Behavior)
Jeans day rewards
Electronic Reward time during lunch periods (Middle School)
8th grade outside lunch & electronics access
Eat with a friend (elementary)

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

Staff and students are responsible for upholding the promotion of a positive culture with their thoughts, words, and actions. Staff and students actions and conversations shape the perception of the school culture and environment. Our staff promote a positive culture by coming prepared to embrace, encourage, and develop our students into positive contributors to our community. Students promote positive culture on our campus when they come prepared to learn, participate, and engage in a positive environment. Parents are essential to JSA! Parents have a major contribution to the culture of our campus through their ability to donate their time and/or services via volunteering, ensuring their students come prepared, and by supporting our community. The community supports a positive culture and environment by their partnership with our staff and school, donating their time, goods, finances, and services to the needs of our school, as well as providing mentoring to our students.