

Polk County Public Schools

# Jewett School Of The Arts 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>16</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>27</b>

## Jewett School Of The Arts

2250 8TH ST NE, Winter Haven, FL 33881

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

### 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.**

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

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

The Vision of Jewett School of the Arts is to provide the pathway for students, staff, parents, faculty, 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, and acceptance of diversity and the community.

### 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
Sears, Michael	Principal	Administrator responsible for monitoring all of the SIP and ensuring fidelity is occurring throughout the year.
Dean, Samantha	Assistant Principal	Head committees and initiatives of SIP goals. Providing updates and information to leadership team on progress of each goal.
Smith, Linda	Teacher, K-12	Assisting in establishing goals and contributing to discussion on updates during leadership team meetings.
Grooms, Judah	Teacher, K-12	Assisting in establishing goals and contributing to discussion on updates during leadership team meetings.
blocker, shandra	Administrative Support	Maintain discipline, focus on PBIS, support educational initiatives in all areas.
Goodrich, Cassandra	Math Coach	Focus on math curriculum, pacing, support instructional staff with coaching, modeling, and feedback. Provide support in Title I as well.
Downing-Walker, Juliana	Instructional Coach	Focus on literacy curriculum, pacing, support instructional staff with coaching, modeling, and feedback.
Rodriguez, Abdel	Teacher, K-12	PBIS chair and assist in establishing goals and contributing to discussion on updates during leadership team meetings.

### 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 process for involving stakeholders deals with survey input on academics, school culture, and fine arts activities. We utilized the results to determine the primary factors we will focus on for the SIP and the upcoming school year.

### 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 SIP plan will be monitored by reviewing progress for goals every month. The administration will provide evidence to support the positive/negative progress for the SIP goals. Walk-through data aligned to state benchmark walk-throughs will be presented to the staff and students. Data chats will occur monthly with the students with the greatest achievement gap along with strategies to improve their

learning. Interventions will all be research-based and provided by the district to monitor the student's progress. Progress monitoring findings will be presented in the School-Based Leadership Team meeting. The school will utilize the plan to revise the method to determine the effectiveness and success of the students that are working to increase their achievement levels.

### 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)	Combination School PK-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>	74%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	98%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<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)* 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: C  2019-20: B  2018-19: B  2017-18: B
<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	16	18	15	13	19	15	2	5	11	114
One or more suspensions	5	6	10	12	23	15	2	5	11	89
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	19	20	25	33	26	142
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	34	35	22	27	16	150
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	6	7	11	13	10	10	14	13	88

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	4	5	4	18	24	33	22	32	25	167

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	2	4	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	11	12	5	11	12	5	0	3	59
One or more suspensions	0	5	4	6	11	7	11	18	17	79
Course failure in ELA	2	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	14	13	23	23	20	100
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	18	23	29	28	12	124
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	38	39	16	9	8	2	3	5	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	5	12	6	21	23	39	33	25	164

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	11	12	5	11	12	5	0	3	59	
One or more suspensions	0	5	4	6	11	7	11	18	17	79	
Course failure in ELA	2	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	14	13	23	23	20	100	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	18	23	29	28	12	124	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	38	39	16	9	8	2	3	5	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	5	12	6	21	23	39	33	25	164

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	14
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*	42	48	53	51	51	55	47		
ELA Learning Gains				53			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			29		
Math Achievement*	37	49	55	46	37	42	43		
Math Learning Gains				51			27		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			28		
Science Achievement*	39	47	52	41	48	54	27		
Social Studies Achievement*	55	68	68	70	53	59	58		
Middle School Acceleration	68	61	70	60	43	51	54		
Graduation Rate		54	74		46	50			
College and Career Acceleration		39	53		71	70			
ELP Progress	57	50	55	35	55	70	80		

\* 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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	340
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50

**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	497
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100
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	24	Yes	4	1
ELL	27	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	41			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	41			

**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	39	Yes	3	
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	50			

**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	69			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	45			

**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	42			37			39	55	68			57
SWD	15			19			16	46			4	
ELL	13			10							3	57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33			23			18	50			5	
HSP	40			35			54	53	43		7	47
MUL	60			73							2	
PAC												
WHT	56			56			57	67	86		6	
FRL	32			29			28	50	64		7	53

**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	51	53	43	46	51	47	41	70	60			35
SWD	24	55	50	27	49	56	12					
ELL	29	50		21	46	55						35
AMI												
ASN												

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	41	47	36	31	49	46	31	58	54			
HSP	51	60	56	42	46	48	32	74	55			37
MUL	65	67		76	67							
PAC												
WHT	63	51	50	63	56		57	83	72			
FRL	38	51	47	33	43	40	34	58	58			44

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	47	40	29	43	27	28	27	58	54			80
SWD	24	24	15	18	24	24	10					
ELL	33	35		37	30							80
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	33	29	27	21	25	13	52	38			
HSP	48	46	46	51	34	29	20	58	64			
MUL	56			56								
PAC												
WHT	61	49	17	57	30	35	47	62	59			
FRL	37	33	28	33	21	25	17	65	48			

### 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
05	2023 - Spring	49%	43%	6%	54%	-5%
07	2023 - Spring	35%	36%	-1%	47%	-12%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	45%	39%	6%	47%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	47%	53%	-6%	58%	-11%
06	2023 - Spring	36%	35%	1%	47%	-11%
03	2023 - Spring	43%	42%	1%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	40%	38%	2%	54%	-14%
07	2023 - Spring	24%	35%	-11%	48%	-24%
03	2023 - Spring	48%	51%	-3%	59%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	35%	56%	-21%	61%	-26%
08	2023 - Spring	40%	42%	-2%	55%	-15%
05	2023 - Spring	38%	44%	-6%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	31%	33%	-2%	44%	-13%
05	2023 - Spring	47%	39%	8%	51%	-4%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	37%	45%	50%	32%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	37%	34%	48%	23%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	54%	65%	-11%	66%	-12%

### 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.**

The data component that demonstrates the greatest need for improvement is Science proficiency. The contributing factors to low performance were based upon the misalignment of instruction in 8th grade science throughout the calendar year. Lack of planning support with learning arcs for the middle school core areas due to 4 day work weeks causing us to lose the ability to support learning arc creation, implementation, and feedback.

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

The data component that demonstrates the greatest need for improvement is ELA proficiency. 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.

**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.**

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Math with a 19% deficit. The factors that contributed to the achievement gap were due to missing 2 certified instructors for 7th and 5th-grade math levels.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was EOC learning gains at an 8% increase from the previous year. The accelerated master schedule was altered for Algebra.

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

The two areas of concern are the number of level 1 students in Math and ELA.

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

- Standards-based instruction
- ELA proficiency
- Math proficiency
- Decreasing Out of School Suspensions
- Increasing Acceleration proficiency

#### Area of Focus

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



**#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other****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.

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 reduce the number of discipline referrals and also reduce the number of out-of-school and in-school suspensions for students of color by 5%.

**Monitoring:**

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

- Disciplinary data will be monitored weekly by the administration utilizing FOCUS reports.
- Disciplinary data will be reviewed with the administration and PBIS committee every month.
- Disciplinary data will be reviewed with the school leadership team during leadership team meetings.
- Disciplinary data will be reviewed with the SAC during monthly SAC meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Samantha Dean (samantha.dean@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.)

- 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

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- PBIS - research-based programs that emphasize acknowledging and celebrating positive choices and behaviors. The 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 - a district-supported strategy used to equip students with the resources to diffuse situations using verbal communication instead of physical altercations.
- CHAMPS - a research-based strategy designed to improve communication of learning expectations.
- Drumbeat - a 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.

### **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.

Action Step 1- Assign members to the PBIS Committee

**Person Responsible:** Rhoda Huyhn (rhoda.huyhn@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** August 15, 2023

Action Step 2- Create calendar items for PBIS Committee meetings

**Person Responsible:** Rhoda Huyhn (rhoda.huyhn@polk-fl.net)

**By When:** August 15, 2023

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

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

**By When:** September 15, 2023

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

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

**By When:** August 30, 2023

Action Step 5- Train leadership team on PBIS walkthrough tool

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

**By When:** August 30, 2023

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

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

**By When:** September 29, 2023

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

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

**By When:** September 29, 2023

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

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

**By When:** September 29, 2023

**#2. 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.

The three year trend data from FSA and FAST scores display a pattern with student proficiency and lack of growth indicating that the majority of tasks are not aligned to the rigor of the standards.

**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 and content areas. Additionally, 5% of the students just below the proficiency line will become 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.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Michael Sears (michael.sears@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.)

- 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.
- Math and Reading coaches will model standards driven instruction and provide constructive feedback to classroom teachers.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- 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.

**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.

Strategy- Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 1- Create calendar item for calibration walks

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

**By When:** August 11, 2023

Strategy- Standards Walkthrough Tool Monitoring

Action Step 2- Refresh current leadership team and train new members on walkthrough tool.

Lead by principal, 6 Walks per week by administrators with 2 as a team (coaches, dean, and district support)

Pull Qualtrics done on walks and discuss during Leadership Team Meeting

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

**By When:** September 29, 2023

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)

**By When:** Ongoing for the 2023 - 2024 school year

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)

**By When:** September 29, 2023

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)

**By When:** Ongoing for the 2023 - 2024 school year

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)

**By When:** Prior to the start of the 2023 - 2024 school year

Strategy 2- Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 2- Train facilitators (reading and math coach)

New to role Literacy Coach

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

**By When:** September 1, 2023

Strategy 2- Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 3- Conduct planning on a weekly basis.

Review Learning Arc steps 1 - 5 during planning, discuss resources, tasks, objectives. Providing feedback on lesson development by grade level.

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

**By When:** Ongoing for the 2023 - 2024 school year

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)

**By When:** Ongoing for the 2023 - 2024 school year

Strategy 2- Planning with Arc Framework

Action Step 5- Compare findings between SWT and Benchmarks

Utilizing data to drive planning & focus of learning arc construction.

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

**By When:** Ongoing for the 2023 - 2024 school year

Strategy 2 - Planning with Arc Framework

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

**By When:** Ongoing for the 2023 - 2024 school year

### #3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

#### 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.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

#### Monitoring:

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

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

#### 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.)

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

#### 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.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

### 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).

The resources at the school were based upon our FAST results and utilizing our parent survey to determine the areas of need at Jewett School of the Arts. All funding will be directly attributed to student results. We added staff members in the areas of Literacy Coach, Math Coach based upon the trends of student performance data for JSOTA. These supports will provide us with the necessary personnel to train and support our instructors to provide a more quality education. We also funded a dean based upon our disciplinary data and culture goal to decrease student discipline in areas of OSS and ISS. The position provides the opportunity to support students with a full time dedicated staff member to address the students behavioral and emotional needs.

Title I/UniSIG Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)

- Data Com
- Summer Leadership Academy/Retreat
- School Improvement Plan Meetings/Trainings
- PURE Process
- Regional and Office of School Transformation review SIP plans

## Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

### **Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

FOCUS on phonics based program to ensure the students are prepared to become more complete readers. Students will use Florida Wonders and the district-approved Corrective Reading intervention program to

develop necessary skills to improve reading and writing. Data-driven small-group instruction to address individual student needs using research-based resources and teaching strategies will also be used to close achievement gaps across subgroups.

### **Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA**

Florida Wonders Tier 2 instructional resources will be used to support struggling readers and accelerate learning for Tier 1 students. Data-driven small-group instruction to address individual student needs using research-based resources and teaching strategies will also be used to close achievement gaps across subgroups.



**Measurable Outcomes**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes**

STAR PM3 2023:

Kindergarten Early Lit Proficiency: 97%

Grade 1 Reading Proficiency: 52%

Grade 2 Reading Proficiency: 43%

**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

FAST 2023:

Grade 3 Reading Proficiency: 43%

Grade 4 Reading Proficiency: 47%

Grade 5 Reading Proficiency: 49%

Measurable Outcome: State data will show a minimum of +7% proficiency increase as well as 15% increase of the students just below the proficiency line becoming proficient.

**Monitoring****Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Ongoing progress monitoring using accountability spreadsheets to track student progression towards mastery of benchmarks.

**Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Sears, Michael, michael.sears@polk-fl.net

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs**

**Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Evidence-based practices; literacy remediation through Targeted Small Groups.

Evidence-based programs; Smarty Ants & I station.

The aforementioned program has been identified as a strong evidence-based intervention to target specific skills needed for grade-level proficiency.

**Rationale:**

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The programs are researched based and have been carefully selected in order to meet the students needs for remediation in the elementary level. The programs have displayed the record of effectiveness and survived the vetting process of the district for supported remediation programs for all PCPS.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning



Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
The Principal and Literacy Coach will lead professional development in effective small group instruction for teachers and paraeducators to close foundational gaps and ensure adequate student growth	Sears, Michael, michael.sears@polk-fl.net
Provide the opportunity to ensure that students are writing daily in response to text with teachers modeling and providing specific feedback using grade-appropriate rubrics.	blocker, shandra, shandra.blocker@polk-fl.net

## Title I Requirements

### Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))**

List the school's webpage\* where the SIP is made publicly available.

- School Messenger
- Flyers
- School social media sites
- PTA Meeting
- SAC Meeting
- Copy in the front office for parent review
- School/District Webpage
- PEN Notebook
- Parent/Family/Community Input Meetings
- Annual Meeting

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.**

List the school's webpage\* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Building Capacity Events

- <https://jsa.polkschoolsfl.com/>
- PTA Meeting
- SAC Meeting
- Title 1 Parent and Stakeholder Meeting
- Family Nights
- Participation in community events

- Parent Portal help desk available during orientation
- Email report cards and interim reports to parents and guardians
- Teacher led conferences
- Staff Capacity Building Professional Development
- Family/school relationship
- Family/Community Input
- Data Chats/Conferences
- Annual Meeting
- Preventing Barriers

**Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))**

- Supplemental Staff (academic coaches, interventionists, paraprofessionals)
- Supplemental Resources
- Extended Learning
- Professional Development
- Collaborative Planning
- MTSS – Tier Support for Students

**If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))**

- Data Com
- School Improvement Planning Trainings
- Regional (area) Meetings
- Summer Leadership Academy
- Title I Technical Assistance – Use of Funds, PFE Input, Back to School Mtg
- Comprehensive Needs Assessment Technical Assistance

#### **Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan**

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

**Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))**

<https://polkschoolsfl.com/mentalhealth/>

- Individual Counseling
- Group Counseling
- School Consultations
- Drumbeats
- Collaboration with community providers – Peace River Center, Watson Clinic Behavioral Health, Sweet Center – Winter Haven Hospital
- Support Groups
- Grief Support
- Children's Home Society

**Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))**

- Dual Enrollment
- IB/Cambridge
- Career Academies
- Vocational Schools
- Building Capacity of Events – Transition events

**Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).**

- PBiS
- RTI
- MTSS
- Behavior Interventionist, Mental Health Counselors, School Counselors, Deans

**Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))**

- Professional Learning Communities to improve instruction and data
- Data Com
- RTD
- Recruitment and Educator Quality Department - PCPS Culture Ambassador Program

**Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))**

- Early Childhood - <https://polkschoolsfl.com/earlychildhood/>
- VPK (Title I, ESE and non-Title I)
- Kindergarten Round Up
- Kindergarten Readiness Camps

## Budget to Support Areas of Focus

### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>

### Budget Approval

**Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.**

No