**Polk County Public Schools** 

# Daniel Jenkins Academy Of Technology Middle School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# **Table of Contents**

| School Demographics            | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
|                                |    |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
|                                |    |
| School Information             | 7  |
|                                |    |
| Needs Assessment               | 11 |
|                                |    |
| Planning for Improvement       | 15 |
|                                |    |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0  |
|                                |    |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

# **Daniel Jenkins Academy Of Technology Middle School**

701 LEDWITH AVE, Haines City, FL 33844

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

## **Demographics**

Principal: Kathryn Blackburn

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| 2021-22 Title I School  | Yes  |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)   | 100%   |
| 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%)<br>2018-19: B (59%)<br>2017-18: C (53%)   |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | ormation*  |
| 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   | or 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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

#### **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               | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 15 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

# **Daniel Jenkins Academy Of Technology Middle School**

701 LEDWITH AVE, Haines City, FL 33844

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

#### **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gi<br>(per MSID |          | 2021-22 Title I Schoo | l Disadvan | Reconomically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|------------|---|
| Middle Sch<br>6-8               | nool     | Yes                   |            | 100%  |
| Primary Servio<br>(per MSID I   |          | Charter School        | (Reporte   | Minority Rate<br>ed as Non-white<br>Survey 2)   |
| K-12 General E                  | ducation | No                    |            | 90%   |
| School Grades Histo             | ory      |                       |            |   |
| Year                            | 2021-22  | 2020-21               | 2019-20    | 2018-19   |
| Grade                           | С        |                       | В          | В   |

#### **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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

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

#### **Part I: School Information**

#### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Daniel Jenkins Academy is to provide authentic, project-based learning opportunities that allow students to develop their interests and passions through personalized learning and STEM-based community partnerships.

Rigor - Precise and challenging curriculum with a special focus on math, science, engineering, and environmental science.

Reading/Literacy – Comprehend and derive meaning from text to stress verbal and written communication

Relevance – Real-life application by developing critical thinking, problem solving, and organizational skills

Results – Outcomes that drive the next step using innovative strategies, and traditional values to prepare students for future success.

Relationships – Interactions that promote a sense of belonging to all students to assist in their academics and develop their social and emotional potential.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

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

#### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|-----------------------|------------------------|---|
| Blackburn,<br>Kathryn | Principal              | Instructional leader, as well as plan, manage, monitor, and supervise all aspects of the school's culture, learning environment, and school community. Safe and orderly environment are also supervised, monitored and maintained by the principal. |
| Wilder,<br>Alissiea   | Assistant<br>Principal | She is to support the established goals, as well as monitor and maintain all aspects of curriculum, instruction and student safety.   |
| Boisselle,<br>Deborah | Teacher,<br>ESE        | Her job is to monitor and maintain the student with disabilities population. Serve on the MTSS team and support students, teachers and families who have students that need extra support.  |
| Spann,<br>Lakiesha    | Reading<br>Coach       | She will support teachers with planning, data, and professional development that is necessary for teacher success in the classroom.   |
| Walker,<br>Patricia   | Teacher,<br>K-12       | She will support students as well as teachers to meet literacy goals.   |
| Sitek,<br>Chris       | Other                  | He is to maintain all computers, software, and technology used by students and staff.   |

#### **Demographic Information**

#### Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Kathryn Blackburn

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.

Ĺ

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

Total number of students enrolled at the school

517

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

6

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

**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 |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 | 153 | 171 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 490   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24  | 26  | 32  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 82    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48  | 35  | 36  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 119   |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5   | 1   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21  | 14  | 23  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 58    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29  | 22  | 26  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 77    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14  | 5   | 5   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 24    |

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                            |   |   |   |   |   | ( | Grad | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6    | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73   | 57   | 65  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 195   |

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

| Indicator                           |   |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|--|
| indicator                           | K | 1 | 2           | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |  |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |  |  |  |
| 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 6/30/2022

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 | 176 | 181 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 509   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 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 | 9   | 10  | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11  | 7   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28  | 63  | 27  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 118   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28  | 28  | 63  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 119   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| 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 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|
| indicator                           | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |  |
| 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  |       |  |  |

## The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 | 176 | 181 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 509   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24  | 26  | 32  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 82    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48  | 35  | 36  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 119   |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9   | 10  | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11  | 7   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28  | 63  | 27  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 118   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28  | 28  | 63  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 119   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |    |    |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            |             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9     | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| 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                           |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | Total |   |    |    |    |       |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                           |   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8     | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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  |       |

## 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).

| Sahaal Grada Component      |        | 2022     |       |        | 2021     |       |        | 2019     |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 44%    | 40%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 48%    | 48%      | 54%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 45%    |          |       |        |          |       | 53%    | 52%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 40%    |          |       |        |          |       | 51%    | 48%      | 47%   |
| Math Achievement            | 43%    | 34%      | 36%   |        |          |       | 58%    | 50%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 51%    |          |       |        |          |       | 56%    | 50%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 59%    |          |       |        |          |       | 62%    | 48%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 36%    | 40%      | 53%   |        |          |       | 37%    | 44%      | 51%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 74%    | 49%      | 58%   |        |          |       | 87%    | 72%      | 72%   |

#### **Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

|            |                   |        | ELA      |                                   |       |                                |
|------------|-------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year              | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06         | 2022              |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019              | 55%    | 48%      | 7%                                | 54%   | 1%                             |
| Cohort Con | Cohort Comparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07         | 2022              |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019              | 38%    | 42%      | -4%                               | 52%   | -14%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison          | -55%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08         | 2022              |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019              | 53%    | 48%      | 5%                                | 56%   | -3%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison          | -38%   |          |                                   |       |                                |

|            |          |        | MATH     | I                                 |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 60%    | 47%      | 13%                               | 55%   | 5%                             |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 34%    | 39%      | -5%                               | 54%   | -20%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -60%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 61%    | 35%      | 26%                               | 46%   | 15%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -34%   |          |                                   | •     |                                |

|            |          |        | SCIENC   | E                                 |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Cor | mparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Co  | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08         | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 38%    | 41%      | -3%                               | 48%   | -10%                           |
| Cohort Co  | mparison | 0%     |          |                                   | •     |                                |

|      |        | BIOLO    | GY EOC                      |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 0%     | 54%      | -54%                        | 67%   | -67%                     |
|      |        | CIVIC    | S EOC                       |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 87%    | 70%      | 17%                         | 71%   | 16%                      |
|      |        | HISTO    | RY EOC                      |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 |        |          |                             |       |                          |

|      |        | ALGE     | BRA EOC                     |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 88%    | 50%      | 38%                         | 61%   | 27%                      |
|      |        | GEOME    | TRY EOC                     |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2022 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 100%   | 53%      | 47%                         | 57%   | 43%                      |

# Subgroup Data Review

|   |             | 2022      | SCHOO             | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |  |
|---|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 |  |
| SWD                                       | 9           | 45        | 57                | 16           | 50         | 64                 | 17          | 30         |              |                         |                           |  |
| ELL                                       | 33          | 40        | 35                | 38           | 51         | 50                 | 18          | 70         | 60           |                         |                           |  |
| BLK                                       | 32          | 40        | 35                | 33           | 46         | 49                 | 28          | 63         | 68           |                         |                           |  |
| HSP                                       | 47          | 48        | 40                | 46           | 53         | 67                 | 36          | 78         | 62           |                         |                           |  |
| MUL                                       | 9           | 36        |                   | 36           | 55         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |  |
| WHT                                       | 58          | 45        |                   | 55           | 55         | 70                 | 50          | 84         | 65           |                         |                           |  |
| FRL                                       | 40          | 43        | 39                | 42           | 51         | 57                 | 35          | 68         | 70           |                         |                           |  |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |             |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |  |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |  |
| SWD                                       | 10          | 21        | 24                | 13           | 36         | 47                 |             |            |              |                         |                           |  |
| ELL                                       | 37          | 48        | 43                | 36           | 45         | 41                 | 21          | 50         | 29           |                         |                           |  |
| BLK                                       | 40          | 43        | 35                | 31           | 33         | 38                 | 33          | 72         | 32           |                         |                           |  |
| HSP                                       | 47          | 48        | 42                | 41           | 41         | 46                 | 45          | 70         | 43           |                         |                           |  |
| MUL                                       | 33          | 27        |                   | 50           | 55         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |  |
| WHT                                       | 57          | 43        | 17                | 43           | 27         |                    | 47          | 67         | 47           |                         |                           |  |
| FRL                                       | 42          | 45        | 37                | 34           | 35         | 42                 | 38          | 74         | 38           |                         |                           |  |
|   |             | 2019      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMP     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |  |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |  |
| SWD                                       | 9           | 50        | 36                | 21           | 41         | 38                 |             |            |              |                         |                           |  |
| ELL                                       | 18          | 45        | 53                | 43           | 52         | 46                 | 19          | 73         |              |                         |                           |  |
| ASN                                       | 100         | 82        |                   | 91           | 73         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |  |
| BLK                                       | 47          | 51        | 43                | 51           | 56         | 67                 | 32          | 81         | 74           |                         |                           |  |
| HSP                                       | 45          | 53        | 59                | 57           | 55         | 58                 | 32          | 88         | 81           |                         |                           |  |
| MUL                                       | 67          | 50        |                   | 75           | 75         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |  |
| WHT                                       | 50          | 49        | 50                | 63           | 51         | 55                 | 55          | 94         | 78           |                         |                           |  |
| FRL                                       | 44          | 51        | 52                | 55           | 53         | 57                 | 35          | 85         | 75           |                         |                           |  |

## **ESSA Data Review**

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

| 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  | 49   |
| 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                                       | 491  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |
| 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%       | 0    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 43   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |
| 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  |
| 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  | 51  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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   | 34  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | YES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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   | 60  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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                                | 47  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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?

Attendance data revealed that a trend emerged across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas of poor attendance.

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

The only data components based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessment, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement is Science.

# 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 main contributing factor to this need for improvement was our 8th grade science teacher had to go out on maternity leave early based on a high risk pregnancy.

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

The data component, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement was in math learning gains.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement was the addition to a well qualified teacher to teach 8th grade math, math teaching interventions, and after school tutoring.

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

One strategy we are implementing is blocking classes. This way the teacher had students have twice as long in that accelerated course to learn and practice. In addition, we will also offer after school tutoring and more small group instruction based on a station system.

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 will be supported by district coaches and a new textbook adoption.

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

Sustainability of improvement in the next year will be supported by maintaining qualified teachers in those positions, maintaining the double block periods to support teaching, learning, with practice and continue to offer after school tutoring.

#### **Areas of Focus**

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

:

#### #1. 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.

Data from the district data dashboard shows that ELL STAR 3-year average proficiency at 37% which demonstrates that tasks were not aligned to the standards. 6th grade had the lowest percent averaging 31%, 7th grade at 32% and 8th grade at 48%. These data when compared to FSA shows a trend of of 3-7% proficiency loss from grade to grade.

#### 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 +2% proficiency increase for all grades as well as a 5% of the students just below the proficiency line becoming proficient.

#### Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be outcome.

Progress monitoring data offered by district level assessments platforms will be used to ensure students are mastering Benchmarks being taught after monitored for the desired planning is properly implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lakiesha Spann (lakiesha.spann@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

Describe the evidencebased strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

- 1. Monitor target/task alignment to state expectations through walk-through check to CPALMS.
- 2. Engage teachers in standards-based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: **Explain the rationale for** selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

A learning arc is an interactive microlearning experience created using a series of interactions that are linked together that address contend areas and student needs. Monitoring alignment through teacher planning supports the teacher's understanding of the Benchmarks and aligns tasks and assessments...

#### **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.

- 1. Standards Walkthrough Monitoring-create a calendar for AP and Principal calibration-Principal
- 2. Walkthrough calibration in first two walks-Principal/AP
- 3. Continue calibration walks until AP and Principal show 90-100% consistency.-Principal/AP
- 4. Add Walkthrough data to Leadership Team meetings for discussion-Principal
- 5. Compare walkthrough data to ELL planning evidence-Principal/AP/Coach
- 6. Use evidence data to show importance for planning alignment-Principal/AP/Coach
- 7. Train all ELL teachers planning using the Arc Framework-Principal/Coach
- 8. Use the Walkthrough data compared to the planning evidence to be shared with Leadership Team-Principal

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

#### #2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to discipline

# Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Based on the number of referrals recorded and parent, student, teacher conferences.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

To decrease by 3% the number of referrals written each 9-weeks. To reduce the number of parent/ teacher/student conferences based on parent/student complaints.

#### **Monitoring:**

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

View and analyze discipline data and parent/ teacher conference data every 9-weeks and develop strategies to assist teachers in : problem solving, relationship building, and classroom management.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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

Collaboratively setting acceptable behaviors in the classroom, hallways, and cafeteria ,and buses. Professional development to target relationship building as well as effective communication with students and families.

# Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Rationale based on exploration of online and internet research sources. The research criteria was: research based strategies to reduce behavioral referrals and relationship building for classroom teachers.

#### **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.

- 1. Analyze discipline data and counselor's parent /teacher conference notes.
- 2. Identify common themes and or problems.
- 3. Provide targeted professional development to address themes and issues.
- 4. Develop a parent/student survey addressing the common themes and issues.
- 5. Administer the survey to parents and students in the first 2-weeks of school.
- 6. Analyze the feedback data by the school Leadership team.
- 7. Schedule professional development based on analyzed data.
- 8. Continue to monitor discipline referrals, conference data, and administered parent/student survey every 9-weeks.
- 9. Hold one-one conferences with teachers who have increased referral writing to support positive growth for teachers.

#### Person Responsible

Kathryn Blackburn (kathryn.blackburn@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.

The school addresses building a positive school culture and environment in the following ways: monthly we honor and a specific group of staff members, we have a positivity box where staff members can write nice things about their peers, students are voted into two different leadership positions to represent their peers on either the Student Academic Leadership Team of the JAG Council, events are planned each 9-weeks for the students to use JAG bucks they have earned for positive behavior and doing the right thing, parents are encouraged to give the school feedback through surveys they complete to support improvement, academic nights are offered for parents and families to participate in their student's learning and we maintain a school website, Facebook Page, and Instagram to support effective communication.

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

Kayla Isom-Title 1, Testing Coordinator,- preparing the Positivity Box and maintaining the campaign Kate Blackburn- Principal- organizing and guiding the Academic Student Leadership Team Alissiea Wilder- Assistant Principal- organizing and guiding the JAG Council Hector Burgos-Dean- organizing and maintaining the JAG BUCK Events LaKeisha Spann and Kayla Isom- organizing and support planning of the curriculum nights Kayla Isom and Kate Blackburn-Title 1 and principal- organizes and support implementation of the monthly staff celebrations

Alissiea Wilder- AP- maintain social media communication Kayla Isom- Title 1-Maintain school website Kate Blackburn-principal- create and monitor parent feedback surveys