

Polk County Public Schools

Kathleen Senior High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 22 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 22 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 24 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Kathleen Senior High School

1100 RED DEVIL WAY, Lakeland, FL 33815

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

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 Kathleen Senior High School is to provide professional, respectful and great customer service to all students allowing them to graduate prepared for college, post-secondary and/or to be career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All Kathleen High School students will graduate with a personalized, collaborative, and diverse education. Through an engaged family of educators and community partners, students are empowered, confident, and purposeful. Instruction is authentic and student-centered, ensuring all graduates are prepared for college, career, and life.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Jones, Daraford | Principal | Manages and Oversees All Areas and Aspects of School |
| Westberry, Gary | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal of Curriculum -Content Areas - Math, ESE, ESOL Staff Under Direct Supervision - Math Department, ESE Department, ESOL Department, Guidance/School Counselors, Math Coach, Math Interventionist, Success Coach, Testing Coordinator |
| Akins, Ladreda | Other | Head of Program for all main campus CTE - Content Areas - Social Studies, CTE on Main Campus, Arts, Edgenuity Staff Under Direct Supervision - Social Studies Department, CTE Department and Fine Arts/Band Departments, Secretaries (excluding Principal's Secretary & Financial Secretary), School Nurse, Network Manager |
| Lasseter, Matthew | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal of Administration -Content Areas - Science, Foreign Language, JROTC Staff Under Direct Supervision - Science Department, Foreign Language Department, Deans, Custodians, ISS Paras, Athletic Director |
| Gulley, Jon | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal -Curriculum and Administration - Content Areas - English, Reading, Physical Education Staff Under Direct Supervision - English Department, Reading Department, Physical Education Department, Reading Coach, Reading Interventionist, Behavioral Interventionist |
| Sasser, Jennifer | Other | Head of All CTE on CFAA campus - Content Areas - All on CFAA Campus Staff Under Direct Supervision - All CFAA Staff |
| Redd, Jennifer | Instructional Coach | Instructional Coach for Reading and ELA. and Title 1 Coordinator - Responsibilities are coach ELA and Reading teachers and complete all required Title 1 activities and information. |
| Laster, Terri | School Counselor | School Counselor Department Head. Oversees all school counselors and students' schedules. |

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.

Administration Meetings, School Advisory Council, Leadership Team Meeting and Community Stakeholders Meeting

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))

Our progress monitoring for ELA is the FAST. The progress monitoring tools for math, social studies and science is quarterly district exams. Administrators are assign a content area to oversee. The administrator for each content will review quarterly data, present the data during administration meeting and administration team will review SIP for continuous improvement.

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) | High School PK, 9-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 69% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| 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)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)* |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C |
| 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 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 753 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 428 | |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 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 | 367 | |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 994 |

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 | 36 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 0 | |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | |

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* | 35 | 38 | 50 | 31 | 41 | 51 | 32 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 35 | | | 35 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 27 | | | 28 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 17 | 24 | 38 | 17 | 35 | 38 | 20 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 36 | | | 20 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 45 | | | 21 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 43 | 50 | 64 | 54 | 26 | 40 | 41 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 49 | 50 | 66 | 47 | 39 | 48 | 48 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 41 | 44 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | 75 | 84 | 89 | 89 | 52 | 61 | 92 | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | 47 | 54 | 65 | 39 | 55 | 67 | 45 | | |
| ELP Progress | 42 | 40 | 45 | 44 | | | 25 | | |

** 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 | 44 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 308 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Percent Tested | 93 |
| Graduation Rate | 75 |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 42 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 464 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 96 |
| Graduation Rate | 89 |

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 | 31 | Yes | 4 | 2 |
| ELL | 29 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | Yes | 4 | |
| HSP | 41 | | | |
| MUL | 46 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | | | |
| FRL | 42 | | | |

| 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 | 30 | Yes | 3 | 1 |
| ELL | 36 | Yes | 3 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 70 | | | |
| BLK | 37 | Yes | 3 | |
| HSP | 39 | Yes | 1 | |
| MUL | 36 | Yes | 1 | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | | | |
| FRL | 38 | Yes | 1 | |

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 | 35 | | | 17 | | | 43 | 49 | | 75 | 47 | 42 |
| SWD | 15 | | | 11 | | | 15 | 30 | | 15 | 7 | 50 |
| ELL | 10 | | | 7 | | | 24 | 29 | | 38 | 7 | 42 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 24 | | | 8 | | | 26 | 33 | | 36 | 6 | |
| HSP | 28 | | | 12 | | | 40 | 46 | | 47 | 7 | 45 |
| MUL | 48 | | | 16 | | | 75 | | | | 3 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | | | 33 | | | 57 | 65 | | 52 | 6 | |
| FRL | 30 | | | 12 | | | 39 | 44 | | 46 | 7 | 51 |

| 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 | 31 | 35 | 27 | 17 | 36 | 45 | 54 | 47 | | 89 | 39 | 44 |
| SWD | 11 | 23 | 19 | 8 | 44 | 45 | 27 | 19 | | 87 | 12 | |
| ELL | 10 | 29 | 30 | 12 | 41 | 65 | 34 | 13 | | 86 | 27 | 44 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 67 | 73 | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 22 | 32 | 25 | 13 | 38 | 47 | 39 | 32 | | 92 | 25 | |
| HSP | 26 | 34 | 27 | 13 | 35 | 48 | 51 | 38 | | 86 | 32 | 42 |
| MUL | 21 | 20 | | 18 | | | 40 | | | 75 | 42 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 45 | 38 | 32 | 28 | 39 | 36 | 70 | 69 | | 90 | 53 | |
| FRL | 26 | 34 | 26 | 13 | 33 | 45 | 45 | 41 | | 87 | 33 | 38 |

| 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 | 32 | 35 | 28 | 20 | 20 | 21 | 41 | 48 | | 92 | 45 | 25 |
| SWD | 11 | 20 | 19 | 16 | 18 | 25 | 18 | 32 | | 89 | 17 | 27 |
| ELL | 8 | 24 | 31 | 10 | 14 | 19 | 18 | 25 | | 90 | 26 | 25 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 19 | 29 | 29 | 11 | 14 | 14 | 21 | 36 | | 94 | 40 | |
| HSP | 26 | 29 | 25 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 37 | 45 | | 92 | 40 | 23 |
| MUL | 37 | 39 | | 18 | 30 | | | | | 92 | 33 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 47 | 45 | 31 | 32 | 25 | 32 | 56 | 57 | | 89 | 57 | |
| FRL | 25 | 30 | 25 | 16 | 17 | 14 | 37 | 45 | | 90 | 38 | 21 |

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 |
| 10 | 2023 - Spring | 36% | 40% | -4% | 50% | -14% |
| 09 | 2023 - Spring | 32% | 39% | -7% | 48% | -16% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 13% | 37% | -24% | 50% | -37% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 24% | 37% | -13% | 48% | -24% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 41% | 50% | -9% | 63% | -22% |

| HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 49% | -3% | 63% | -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.

Algebra 1 showed the lowest performance with 18% proficiency. The primary factor for the decline was that teachers did not effectively implement the Assessment portion of Learning Arc, which negatively impacted students understanding and preparedness for the subject. Another factor was that Instruction was not at the depth or effectively aligned with state assessments.

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

Biology showed the greatest decline from the prior year with 12%. The primary factor to this decline was students lacking foundational skills in the area of Biology. Another factor that contributed to the decline is teacher inexperience. Among biology teachers, two were new to the teaching profession. The final factor that contributed to the decline was scheduling. Biology teachers were all teaching seven out of seven class periods, which meant co-plannings had to be scheduled after school.

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.

Algebra 1 had the greatest gap when compared to the state average with a 13% gap. Teachers did not effectively implement the Assessment portion of Learning Arc. Instruction was not at the depth or effectively aligned with state assessments.

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

ELA - The effective implementation of Learning Arc.

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

Algebra 1
English Language Arts

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

Algebra 1
English Language Arts

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

Students with Disabilities has three consecutive years of below 41% and one year of being below 32%. English Language Learners have three consecutive years of below 41%. Black/African-American students have three consecutive years of below 41%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The plan is for SWD students ELL students, and African American/Black students to show quarterly increase of 2-5% on quarterly assessments. Students with Disabilities are expected to show 2-5% increase on FAST progress monitoring assessment 1, 2 and 3.

Monitoring:

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

Math - Quarterly Assessments Results, Biology-Quarterly Assessments Results, US History- Quarterly Assessments Results and F.A.S.T progress monitoring results from first and second administrations. Formatives created from weekly/biweekly Learning Arc Equivalent Experiences - Monthly Assessments Results,

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gary Westberry (gary.westberry@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.)

Foundational Math - Math 180 Program
Literacy Strategies - Corrective Reading Program

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Math 180 focuses on student deficiencies in mathematics. The program is scripted and individualized for students and has a small group teaching component. Corrective reading is scripted promoting reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension skills. Students will be identified Performance Matters data and provided additional support through Response to Data (RTD)

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 3 - Promising 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.

Professional development provided throughout the year to ESE VE teachers focused on student performance as opposed to just compliance. Professional development will include Math 180 and Corrective reading data chat strategies. Pull out strategies focused on small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Gary Westberry (gary.westberry@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly Ongoing

Coaching teachers. Coaching cycle will include gathering data through SBI classroom walks, modeling strategies as needed, providing feedback for targeted interventions.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Redd (jennifer.redd@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Monitor quarterly data reports to analyze trends in data and create targeted interventions as needed. Data chats conducted by Sr. Coordinators with all tested subject areas. Monitor monthly formative data reports.

Person Responsible: Jon Gulley (jon.gulley@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly - Quarterly Ongoing

Co-planning with subject area teachers. ESE and ELL will support planning sessions by analyzing data and providing targeted strategies and interventions. Sr. coordinator works in collaboration with administrator to fully implement Learning Arc with fidelity. Specifically focusing on Steps 5, 6 and 7 for Learning Arc entire staff to provide students with equivalent experience.

Person Responsible: Gary Westberry (gary.westberry@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly- Ongoing

#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.

Positive Culture and Environment is identified as a crucial need from the data of three subgroups having three consecutive years of below 41% being proficient. One of the subgroups has one year of being below 32% proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The plan is for SWD, ELL, and Black/African American students to show quarterly increase of 2-5% on quarterly assessments. Students in these subgroups are expected to show 2-5% increase on FAST progress monitoring assessment 1 and 2.

Monitoring:

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

Math - Quarterly Assessments Results, Biology-Quarterly Assessments Results, US History- Quarterly Assessments Results and F.A.S.T progress monitoring results from first, second and third administrations. Formatives created from weekly/biweekly Learning Arc Equivalent Experiences - Monthly Assessments Results

Monthly Meet and Greet with staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daraford Jones (daraford.jones@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.)

Math 180 focuses on student deficiencies in mathematics. The program is scripted and individualized for students and has a small group teaching component.

Corrective reading is scripted promoting reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Math 180 focuses on student deficiencies in mathematics. The program is scripted and individualized for students and has a small group teaching component.

Corrective reading is scripted promoting reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension skills.

Students will be identified Performance Matters data and provided additional support through Response to Data (RTD)

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.

Professional development provided throughout the year to ESE VE, ELL, and all core teachers focused on student performance as opposed to just compliance. Professional development will include Math 180 and Corrective reading data chat strategies. Pull out strategies focused on small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Daraford Jones (daraford.jones@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Weekly and Monthly meetings with clubs promoting staff climate and culture. Developing staff development for entire staff.

Person Responsible: Ladreda Akins (ladreda.akers@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly

Monitor quarterly data reports to analyze trends in data and create targeted interventions as needed. Monitor biweekly formatives.

Person Responsible: Daraford Jones (daraford.jones@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Co-planning with subject area teachers. ESE and ELL will support planning sessions by analyzing data and providing targeted strategies and interventions.

Person Responsible: Daraford Jones (daraford.jones@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly- ongoing

#3. 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.

Tested areas ELA and Mathematics increased by a small margin of two to three, Social Studies decreased by a small margin of one, but Science decreased by the greatest by 12. KHS ELA AL- 34% increased by 3, Mathematics -19% increased by 2, Science - 42% - decreased by 12, Social Studies - 46%, decreased by 1. The lack of effectively aligning standard based instruction, student task, and student assessment resulted in the results.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The FAST test measures Achievement Levels (AL) for ELA. Therefore, only Achievement Level outcomes are represented.:

KHS ELA AL - 40%

Math Quarterly Progress Monitoring (PM) and End of Course Exam (EOC) measures Achievement Levels for Math. Therefore, only Achievement Level outcomes are represented:

KHS Math AL - 30%

Monitoring:

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

FAST Progress Monitoring - 35% of all tested students after the first administration of FAST will earn achievement level 3 or higher.

Math Quarterly Progress Monitoring - 35% of all tested after the first administration of Math Quarterly Assessment will earn achievement level 3 or higher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darafor Jones (darafor.jones@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.)

Learning Arc implementation with all core curriculum areas. (ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies) Standards Based Instruction (SBI) Data Walks - Data will be used to drive discussion during common planning.to effectively implement aligned tasks, aligned assessments, and equivalent experiences..

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Learning Arc improves teacher planning to improve instructional delivery in the classroom by aligning benchmark, student tasks, and assessments to provide the student with an equivalent experience.

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.

Learning ARC Implementation in all core curriculum subject areas Administrators and Support Staff will be trained on Learning ARC Process..

Person Responsible: Daraford Jones (daraford.jones@polk-fl.net)

By When: Since this will be year two for the Learning ARC implementation. Additional support will be provided to all core teachers by end of quarter 1.

Administration and Support Staff will conduct SBI Walks to gather data from findings.

Person Responsible: Daraford Jones (daraford.jones@polk-fl.net)

By When: First day of school for students: August 11, 2023 First week to begin individual administrator SBI Walks by core subject areas: Week of August 14, 2023 First Calibration Walk to gather data: Week of August 28, 2023

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).

Title 1 Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)

Data Com

Summer Leadership Academy/Retreat

School Improvement Plan Meetings/Trainings

PURE Progress

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

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA**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**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes****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.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

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?

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****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/District Webpage
- 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
- Staff Capacity Building Professional Development
 - Conferencing
 - family/school relationship
- Family/Community Input
- Data Chats/Conferences
- Webpage
- 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

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
- ESE, Migrant, Early Childhood, Cambridge/IB, Work Force

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
- Collaboration with community providers – Peace River Center, Watson Clinic Behavioral Health, Sweet Center – Winter Haven Hospital
- o Support Groups
- o Grief Support
- o 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
- 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, Student Success Coaches, 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
- UniSIG Supplemental Teacher/Administrator Allocation
- Collective Bargaining Stipends – Title I, Critical Shortage Area, Highly Effective
- 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/>