

Polk County Public Schools

# Lawton Chiles Middle Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Lawton Chiles Middle Academy

400 FLORIDA AVE N, Lakeland, FL 33801

<http://www.lcmaknightsonline.com/>

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## **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 Department 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.

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

We are an internationally-minded community committed to fostering curious minds in an educational environment that produces resilient, respectful and empathetic students, empowering them to exemplify academic integrity and exhibit responsiveness to our ever-changing global community.

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

The Lawton Chiles Middle Academy family, consisting of students, faculty, staff, parents, and the community are partners in guiding our students' education by:

- Developing a high interest in all academic areas with an emphasis on math, science, and technology;
- Enabling students to maximize the development of their talents in music and the arts;
- Providing a safe and orderly environment that is student-centered;
- Promoting high expectations academically, socially and technologically;
- Equipping students to work at their highest capability;
- Stressing verbal and written communication;
- Focusing on the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills;
- Integrating real world situation into the classrooms;
- Encouraging an acceptance of cultural differences, ideas, feelings and talents through cooperative learning and social skills development;
- Linking technology to learning in the classroom and developing proficiency in computer usage; and
- Demonstrating strong parent support and commitment for the education of their child.

### School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

#### School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Price, Angela	Principal	Provides leadership for and management of programs and processes related to instruction, school operations, personnel management, business management, student support services, student activities and community involvement.
Thompson, Alonzo	Assistant Principal	Assist Principal in all things school-related, including presenting SIP to specific stakeholders.
Hanson, Deborah	Other	Testing Coordinator for all progress monitoring / quarterly assessments as well as all state / district testing.
Julius, Gretchen	Teacher, K-12	Ensure that all students learn the basic and essential skills for each subject area and grade level taught.
Mahmood, Jessica	Instructional Coach	The School-based Coaches are responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. They are also be responsible for coaching teachers about: data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools.

### Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The bylaws of the LCMA SAC committee states their purpose is to develop and oversee the implementation of the SIP plan. The SAC committee members are active participants in the assessment of needs, development of priorities, identification and use of resources based on the school data relative to its needs. The current committee membership is comprised of parents, community stakeholders, students and staff.

### SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SAC committee meets monthly to review data and discuss plans to address current and future school needs . The School based leadership team meets bi-weekly to discuss the various areas of need to allocate appropriate levels of support necessary to promote increased achievement or progress towards our SIP goals.

**Demographic Data**

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	54%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	62%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**Early Warning Systems**

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	224	210	195	629	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	47	40	132	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	22	24	66	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	22	19	77	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	32	36	109	

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	28	21	79

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

#### **Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	20	21	63	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	27	37	106	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	24	21	72	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	18	27	73	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	38	38	120	

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	10	27

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	6	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	20	21	63	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	27	37	106	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	24	21	72	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	18	27	73	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	38	38	120	

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	10	27

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	6	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review****ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	61	36	49	71	40	50	73		
ELA Learning Gains				55			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			43		
Math Achievement*	63	40	56	68	34	36	73		
Math Learning Gains				57			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			35		
Science Achievement*	62	34	49	66	40	53	68		
Social Studies Achievement*	83	66	68	80	49	58	88		
Middle School Acceleration	81	70	73	80	46	49	81		
Graduation Rate					36	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	80	31	40	50	68	76	42		

\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

#### ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	430
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	619
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)****2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	26	Yes	2	2
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	54			
HSP	65			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	54			

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	19	Yes	1	1
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	52			
HSP	56			

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	52			

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

**2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	61			63			62	83	81			80
SWD	17			26			10	50			4	
ELL	36			40							3	80
AMI												
ASN	83			83			89	92	89		5	
BLK	44			39			44	71	74		5	
HSP	57			57			53	80	76		5	
MUL	63			63				100			3	
PAC												
WHT	68			72			67	86	84		5	
FRL	47			43			39	73	70		5	

**2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2020-21</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2020-21</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	71	55	39	68	57	53	66	80	80			50
SWD	12	20	15	13	24	30	8	27				
ELL	47	34	30	37	42	45		25				50
AMI												
ASN	94	76		90	76		95	100	94			

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	51	48	31	48	59	57	40	63	68			
HSP	69	52	35	58	47	38	61	71	76			
MUL	82	69		76	40							
PAC												
WHT	77	54	51	79	58	59	74	87	82			
FRL	56	53	34	49	52	51	45	65	62			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	73	57	43	73	42	35	68	88	81			42
SWD	22	15	11	30	26	19		50				
ELL	45	50	48	45	31	35		100				42
AMI												
ASN	94	72		96	51		100	95	97			
BLK	56	45	29	48	31	25	37	67	77			
HSP	68	56	51	70	45	41	63	100	73			42
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	79	60	45	80	45	40	76	93	81			
FRL	55	46	33	52	33	28	44	75	67			

### Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	56%	36%	20%	47%	9%
08	2023 - Spring	66%	39%	27%	47%	19%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	57%	35%	22%	47%	10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	60%	38%	22%	54%	6%
07	2023 - Spring	62%	35%	27%	48%	14%
08	2023 - Spring	24%	42%	-18%	55%	-31%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	61%	33%	28%	44%	17%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	37%	52%	50%	39%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	37%	50%	48%	39%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	65%	18%	66%	17%

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

Based on FAST assessment data math proficiency was the area with the lowest percentage for proficiency. Teacher vacancy was a likely contributor to student performance as there was a (1) year-long vacancy and (1) long term sub for two math sections. In addition (1) additional teacher was out for medical reasons for more that 1/4 of the year. Student instruction was not at level that would support the needs of all student in those sections.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.**

Based on FAST assessment data math proficiency was the area with the lowest percentage for proficiency. Teacher vacancy was a likely contributor to student performance as there was a (1) year-long vacancy and (1) long term sub for two math sections. In addition (1) additional teacher was out for medical reasons for more that 1/4 of the year. Student instruction was not at level that would support the needs of all student in those sections.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

Our 8th grade math proficiency data had the greatest gap in comparison to state proficiency data. Contributing factors to this include:

1. Teacher changes for that population on our campus multiple times during the school year
2. Students who had previously been proficient in 7th grade were placed in algebra and there for only left students who had previously not been proficient taking the 8th grade FAST math assessment.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

Civics showed a 3.2% improvement over last year. Some actions steps take to achieve this began with rescheduling some students into Law Studies that were not progressing after the first quarter grading. We also developed a RTD process for students who needed additional supports as part of our 65 day plan to address areas of deficiency.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.**

We have 66 students in ELA and 77 in Math that scored a level 1 this past school year. This effectively represent 10% or more of the student population in each of these academic areas.

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.**

1. ELA and Math Proficiency
2. Sub Group data for ELL & SWD
3. Improving ELA and Math Proficiency
4. School Culture and Environment

### **Area of Focus**

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)



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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Math - 12.5% decrease

ELA - 11.2% decrease

Science - 4.3% decrease

Civics - 3.2% increase

**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 3% just below the proficiency line of 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:**

Angela Price (angela.price@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Monitor students engaging in equivalent experiences aligned to state expectations using SWT.
2. Engage teachers in standards-based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

TNTP's The Opportunity Project speaks to the relationship between academic success and ensuring students are able to engage in grade level standards-based expectations. It is imperative we both monitor for aligned and planned for teachers' understanding of the Benchmarks and aligned task and assessments.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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.

Create a calendar for leadership team calibration walks using Standards Walkthrough Tool.

**Person Responsible:** Alonzo Thompson (alonzo.thompson@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** 8/31/2023

Train leadership team on walkthrough tool in first two calibration walks.

**Person Responsible:** Angela Price (angela.price@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** 8/31/23

Conduct calibration walks until team shows 90-100% calibrated consistency with rationale.

**Person Responsible:** Angela Price (angela.price@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** 12/18/23

Review SWT data including evidences during every leadership team meeting and establish protocol to review SWT data with instructional staff.

**Person Responsible:** Alonzo Thompson (alonzo.thompson@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** Throughout school year

Monitor impact between data review from SWT and planning per content/course/grade

**Person Responsible:** Angela Price (angela.price@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** Throughout school year.

**#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In "Shaping School Culture,," Terrance Deal and Kent Peterson found that "Creating a positive school culture increases productivity school-wide, supports successful change and school improvement, improves the motivation of both students and staff, and most importantly, focuses attention and behavior on what is valued and important." Positive Culture and Environment are essential to both staff performance and student growth. Focusing on the school's culture will yield positive results school-wide.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Survey Data will show a minimum of +1% increase in positive school culture.

**Monitoring:**

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

Survey will be administered three times per year. The Leadership Team collect and analyze data. The team will then share results with the school-wide community.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Deborah Hanson (deborah.hanson@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Provide recognition for teacher retention contributing to positive school culture through monthly celebrations.
2. Provide support for teachers through feedback and intentional communication.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. The National School Boards Association states that strong, positive culture is a factor in teacher retention.
2. Feedback is rated at 0.7 of Hattie's effect size list. (Dec. 2017). Marzano: Classroom Instruction that works: Research-based Strategies for Improving Student Achievement. Teachers understand that the way they do their work has a significant impact on student results -- for better or worse. Involves stopping teachers from using other factors (i.e., home influence, poverty, lack of motivation) as an excuse. Making a difference despite hindrances. Collective Teacher Efficacy is rated at a 1.57 of Hattie's effect size. (Dec. 2017)

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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.

Provide recognition for teachers by contributing to positive school culture through monthly celebrations through a monthly calendar.

**Person Responsible:** Alonzo Thompson (alonzo.thompson@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** 8/31/23

Recognize You Rock Award for outstanding contributions or classroom work for teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Angela Price (angela.price@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** monthly

Provide support for teachers through feedback and intentional communication through bi-weekly leadership meetings and assigning leadership members to each subject area.

**Person Responsible:** Angela Price (angela.price@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** throughout the year.

Establish round tables for open communication when challenges arise and solutions need to be considered. Round tables are by grade level and will provide support to classroom and grade level specific interventions.

**Person Responsible:** Alonzo Thompson (alonzo.thompson@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** quarterly

### CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

N/A