

Polk County Public Schools

Union Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Union Academy

1795 WABASH ST E, Bartow, FL 33830

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

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.

Our mission is to fully develop the physical, social, emotional and intellectual potential, and to build the character of each individual in our culturally diverse community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Union Academy Magnet School community of staff, parents, business partners, and civic partners work together to guide our students' education by:

Emphasizing academics with a special focus on the Middle Years Programme of IB. Developing life-long learners through a comprehensive curriculum, stressing verbal and written communication.

Using advanced technology, innovative strategies, and traditional values to prepare students for future success. Challenging students to do their best by nurturing their academic, aesthetic, physical, social, and emotional potential. Developing critical thinking and problem solving skills. Accepting and understanding cultural differences through cooperative learning and social skills development.

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
Scheloske, Stephen	Principal	<p>I oversee and am responsible for all aspects of Union Academy. I am responsible for the education of our students, the development, support and guidance of our staff, the inclusion of our community and parents, our facilities, and all aspects of running a successful school. Some of those responsibilities include but are not limited to the oversight and operation of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the daily operation of Union Academy • evaluation of staff • progress of all students • testing • federal, state and local mandates • monitoring and use of data to drive instruction and planning • professional development • finances • budget management • purchasing • payroll • facilities • awards and ceremonies • athletics • community relations • parent and advisory groups • school advisory council • implementation of the International Baccalaureate Middle Years Program
Kowallek, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	<p>Assist Principal in providing vision and leadership of school Oversee results on student learning goals and data analysis for instructional improvement Develop and implementation of quality standards-based curricula Work collaboratively to develop and implement an instructional framework aligning effective instructional practices, student learning needs and assessments recruiting, retaining and developing and effective and diverse faculty and staff facilitating effective professional development Providing structure and monitoring of the school learning environment to improve learning for all students Managing the process for making decisions and articulating who makes decisions Cultivating, developing and supporting other leaders within the school Managing the process for communication to staff and community by keeping all stakeholders engaged in the work of the school Maintaining high visibility at the school and in the community</p>

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 overarching structure of our SIP has been developed by the school administration. Oversight and monitoring will be the responsibility of the school administration and leadership team. Once there is a developed working plan it will be presented to the SAC and PTA for review.

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))

Ongoing action research is our method of operation here at Union Academy. Long established practices and procedures are in place to allow for a focus on the planning, delivery, instruction, practice, and assessment of student progress. Our SIP is developed, monitored and adjusted to meet the ongoing progress and needs of our students.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	68%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	2	13	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	1	12	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	6	10	45	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	15	17	62	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	7	2	1	10

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	12	10	14	36	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	12	28	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	17	14	47	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	

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	3	3	2	8

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	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	12	10	14	36	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	12	28	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	17	14	47	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	

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	3	3	2	8

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	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*	62	36	49	68	40	50	71		
ELA Learning Gains				62			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60			46		
Math Achievement*	78	40	56	64	34	36	65		
Math Learning Gains				59			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61			32		
Science Achievement*	64	34	49	68	40	53	67		
Social Studies Achievement*	77	66	68	81	49	58	81		
Middle School Acceleration	68	70	73	77	46	49	72		
Graduation Rate					36	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress		31	40		68	76			

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	349
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	600
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

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

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	47			
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN	96			
BLK	64			
HSP	61			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	75			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	59			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	54			
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	69			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	61			

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

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	62			78			64	77	68			
SWD	29			65							2	
ELL	25			88							2	
AMI												
ASN	100			92							2	
BLK	53			71			45	77	75		5	
HSP	55			70			50	70	58		5	
MUL	67			83							2	

2022-23 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	66			84			78	79	69		5	
FRL	53			68			47	72	56		5	

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
All Students	68	62	60	64	59	61	68	81	77			
SWD	39	53	55	42	56			80				
ELL	47	67		33	67							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	59	52	52	48	50	36	48	71	45			
HSP	59	70	81	55	63	73	65	69	89			
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75	64	50	75	61	64	77	88	79			
FRL	58	52	49	55	56	55	69	77	75			

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	71	57	46	65	37	32	67	81	72			
SWD	44	59	55	39	41							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57	49	34	41	30	24	36	73	29			
HSP	66	59	52	58	35	28	73	83	74			
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	77	59	49	75	41	41	79	83	79			
FRL	60	52	44	53	34	26	57	74	54			

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	57%	36%	21%	47%	10%
08	2023 - Spring	60%	39%	21%	47%	13%
06	2023 - Spring	65%	35%	30%	47%	18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	83%	38%	45%	54%	29%
07	2023 - Spring	74%	35%	39%	48%	26%
08	2023 - Spring	63%	42%	21%	55%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	64%	33%	31%	44%	20%

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	97%	37%	60%	48%	49%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	65%	12%	66%	11%

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.

Our overall ELA (6-8) scores were the lowest area. There is no single factor that we can easily identify. Our 8th grade ELA teacher is experienced but was returning to teaching ELA after many years in another area. Our 6th grade student can into the school year with high ELA scores and lower Math scores. At the end of the year those had flip flopped. Although not a huge change we switched from FSA to BEST. BEST Benchmarks are complex and have multiple layers. Our teachers did use Study Sync, we are questioning how well it was integrated into their grade level curriculum. Accelerated Reading has been a staple at Union Academy but it has been more difficult to get students to read over the past few years.

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

Our overall ELA (6-8) score was the biggest area of decline from the previous scores. There is no single factor that we can easily identify. Our 8th grade ELA teacher is experienced but was returning to teaching ELA after many years in another area. Our 6th grade student can into the school year with high ELA scores and lower Math scores. At the end of the year those had flip flopped. Although not a huge change we switched from FSA to BEST. BEST Benchmarks are complex and have multiple layers. Our teachers did use Study Sync, we are questioning how well it was integrated into their grade level curriculum. Accelerated Reading has been a staple at Union Academy but it has been more difficult to get students to read over the past few years.

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 two largest gaps were 49 points in Geometry and 39 points in Algebra. The factors for the large gaps in these two areas are us having the correct teachers with the correct students taking each course. Our teachers also go above and beyond to ensure our students are receiving direct instruction when they are having a difficult time with a concept. This is a continued trend with similar results from previous years.

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

Math overall but specifically 6th Grade Math.

We hired a new 6th grade teacher and moved our previous 6th grade math teacher to 7th grade.

Our 7th grade math students also had increased proficiency and high levels of performance in Alg. 1 H.

8th Grade also saw similar increased performance in all areas of Math.

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

The increased number of students scoring level 1 in ELA and Math.

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

1. Focus on the planning, delivery, assessment and re-teaching of ELA on all grade levels.
2. Focus on proficiency as a minimum expectation for all students.
3. Addressing the needs of our quickly growing population of ESE students.
4. Maintaining our progress in Math
5. Improving proficiency in Civics and Science

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.

We are continuing our development and progress with Benchmark and standard aligned planning, instruction and assessment. We are focusing on standards-based instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our measurable outcome is multi-leveled. Overall we want to see at least a 1 point gain in all areas school wide. Additionally, we want to see grade level improvement in areas. Individually, we want to see our student make learning gains beyond the grade level increases.

Monitoring:

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

Ongoing classroom walks, formal observations, informal observations, walk-throughs, internal review, review of IB Unit Plans, Learning Arcs, and Lesson Plans. We will also be monitoring this through our PLC's and Anchor Assemblies. The ongoing review of data will also assist us in monitoring progress towards our goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Kowallek (rebecca.kowallek@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.)

Effective planning is the most important strategy for ensuring the access to success. Without a properly planned lesson the chances of success are greatly decrease. All area of the plan need to be well developed and checked to be sure they are addressing the benchmark or standard.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Plan, Present, Assess, Reflect, and Revise

Our IB Unit Plans are key to the success we have had here at Union. IB Unit Plans are all encompassing of what a learning arch is to an individual benchmark or standard. Our method of planning, presenting, assessing, reflecting, and revising has served us well.

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.

1. Professional Development will take place bi-weekly and focus on standards-based instruction. Teachers will provide proof of using strategies from the Professional Development, by sharing their evidence with other teachers in follow-up PLC's.

2. Data Walks will take place on a more regular basis to ensure teachers are focusing on the Learning Arc and all of its components.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Kowallek (rebecca.kowallek@polk-fl.net)

By When: 1. During the second PLC of each month, teachers will bring evidence of standards-based instruction and share it with their departments. 2. Evidence of data walks will be recorded as needed.

#2. 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.

How a person feels is paramount to achievement. If a person does not feel welcomed, appreciated, safe, or successful, they likely will not be motivated to work hard or be an engaged positive member of the school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Feedback from our stakeholders is vital to our success. If our stakeholders feel that our focus is on the success of our students and the advancement of our school and community, we will continue to grow closer to our stakeholders. As our stakeholders become more connected to the school our success becomes their success. School climate surveys are vital to our continued success and growth.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through interaction with our stakeholders and feedback from our stakeholders. There are a lot of traditions and expectations here at Union. Many of them preceded our current students and families. Teaching our expectations and culture is vital to having them understand our purpose. This is important for all our stakeholders.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephen Scheloske (stephen.scheloske@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.)

Setting a clear vision, school norms, goals, and expectations that support social, emotional, and physical safety

Establishing school safety for a more positive climate

Advocating for students as well as parent's involvement in school policies and practices

Engaging teachers and administrators

Setting boundaries through school and classroom rules

Creating fun and positive experiences

Creating a healthy physical, emotional, and social environment for student growth

Improving your current school climate through assessments and surveys

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As a leader, I have a huge impact on how our employees feel. A telling brain-imaging study found that, when employees recalled a supervisor that had been unkind or un-empathic, they showed increased activation in areas of the brain associated with avoidance and negative emotion while the opposite was true when they recalled an empathic leader.

In studies by the Queens School of Business and by the Gallup Organization, disengaged workers had 37% higher absenteeism, 49% more accidents, and 60% more errors and defects.

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.

1. Focus on making sure the school vision and mission are carried out by adhering to our school mission statement.
2. Establish school safety for a more positive climate, with the help of our school resource officer and more staff on duty throughout each day to ensure safety.
3. Advocate for students and parents by involving parents more and being more of a listening ear. I will respond to emails in a timelier manner and post school happenings through our new "Student Union" Schoology page. The School Advisory Committee and PTA will be more involved as well.
4. Communicate better with the staff through the use of our "2023-2024 Union Academy" Schoology page.

Person Responsible: Stephen Scheloske (stephen.scheloske@polk-fl.net)

By When: As the year progresses, surveys and online assessments will be used to see how the culture is improving.

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).