George W. Jenkins Senior High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

George W. Jenkins Senior High

6000 LAKELAND HIGHLANDS RD, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

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 that each student is prompt, polite and prepared.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is that each student will graduate with the skills necessary to be successful in college or in a career.

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
Patton, Tom	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school-based team implements sound instructional practices, conducts evaluation of school staff, ensures implementation as well as documentation of multitiered system of interventions and supports, ensures that adequate professional development opportunities represent research base, educational best practices that serve to enhance both the depth and breadth of the school's abilities both academic and beyond. The principal also ensures that appropriate and diverse methods of communication are in place to inform parents and other community stakeholders of school based plans and activities.
Emmerling, Lacy	Assistant Principal	Assist and facilitate the common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school based team is implementing research-based, effective instructional strategies, conduct both informal and formal assessments of school staff, ensure implementation/ documentation of multitiered system of interventions and supports, ensure that adequate professional development opportunities represent research-based, educational best practices that serve to enhance both the depth and breadth of the campus instructional capacity, and communicate with parents regarding school based plans and activities.
Hiers, William	Assistant Principal	Assist and facilitate the common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school based team is implementing research-based, effective instructional strategies, conduct both informal and formal assessments of school staff, ensure implementation/ documentation of multitiered system of interventions and supports, ensure that adequate professional development opportunities represent research-based, educational best practices that serve to enhance both the depth and breadth of the campus instructional capacity, and communicate with parents regarding school based plans and activities.
Simpson, Tanishia	Assistant Principal	Assist and facilitate the common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school based team is implementing research-based, effective instructional strategies, conduct both informal and formal assessments of school staff, ensure implementation/documentation of multitiered system of interventions and supports, ensure that adequate professional development opportunities represent research-based, educational best practices that serve to enhance both the depth and breadth of the campus instructional capacity, and communicate with parents regarding school based plans and activities.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bonilla Aponte, Carmen	Assistant Principal	Assist and facilitate the common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school based team is implementing research-based, effective instructional strategies, conduct both informal and formal assessments of school staff, ensure implementation/documentation of multitiered system of interventions and supports, ensure that adequate professional development opportunities represent research-based, educational best practices that serve to enhance both the depth and breadth of the campus instructional capacity, and communicate with parents regarding school based plans and activities.
Guira, Kyle	Assistant Principal	Assist and facilitate the common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the school based team is implementing research-based, effective instructional strategies, conduct both informal and formal assessments of school staff, ensure implementation/documentation of multitiered system of interventions and supports, ensure that adequate professional development opportunities represent research-based, educational best practices that serve to enhance both the depth and breadth of the campus instructional capacity, and communicate with parents regarding school based plans and activities.
Iatarola, Nicole	Instructional Coach	The instructional Coach provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, help facilitate instructional and intervention supports, collaborates with staff to improve and implement intervention supports, and integrates materials and instructional techniques within the framework of the district curriculum maps.

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 includes faculty meetings to discuss school data, school climate/ culture, and other pertinent school related issues. In addition, the School Advisory Council (SAC) and Academic Booster Club (ABC) meets monthly to discuss various school related items. Input and feedback from the SAC, ABC groups, as well as parents and families provide feedback via surveys and meetings. The input and feedback from all stakeholders is used to develop the School Improvement Plan.

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 School Improvement Plan will be regularly monitored and revised as necessary based on student needs and academic achievements. Students with the greatest achievement gap will be provided opportunities to meet the challenging Florida State Academic Standards. The School Improvement Plan will be monitored and revised quarterly to ensure continuous alignment with school goals.

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 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	52%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	69%
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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	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	
	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	83
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	393
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	430
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	435
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	492
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	407
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	399

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	559

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	97
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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*	48	38	50	53	41	51	49		
ELA Learning Gains				52			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			41		
Math Achievement*	31	24	38	39	35	38	25		
Math Learning Gains				40			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				34			27		
Science Achievement*	55	50	64	61	26	40	56		
Social Studies Achievement*	56	50	66	62	39	48	63		
Middle School Acceleration					41	44			
Graduation Rate	94	84	89	97	52	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	59	54	65	66	55	67	73		
ELP Progress	62	40	45	47			49		

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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	405
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	94

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	593
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	97

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	37	Yes	4	
ELL	34	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	44			
HSP	53			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	50			

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%
2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
SWD	30	Yes	3	1
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	43			
HSP	50			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	46			

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)

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
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	48			31			55	56		94	59	62
SWD	20			13			16	39		37	6	
ELL	16			14			16	15		32	7	62
AMI												
ASN	65			39			75	67		92	6	
BLK	40			20			31	50		33	6	
HSP	39			27			42	49		57	7	59
MUL	39			17			40	67		83	6	
PAC												
WHT	56			37			69	62		64	6	
FRL	38			23			42	44		45	7	67

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	53	52	42	39	40	34	61	62		97	66	47
SWD	19	32	26	18	18	12	30	31		94	18	
ELL	23	56	47	20	38	40	47	43		92	87	47
AMI												
ASN	76	77		60			80	73		100	82	
BLK	37	49	39	18	23	30	45	43		100	49	
HSP	44	51	43	33	39	23	50	61		95	62	45
MUL	57	50		42	70		57	58		95	67	
PAC												
WHT	61	52	42	49	43	42	69	69		96	71	
FRL	38	47	38	24	33	30	49	52		96	55	39

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	49	51	41	25	22	27	56	63		97	73	49
SWD	14	35	34	11	39	41	26	31		92	33	
ELL	24	38	30	15	20	23	35	36		92	57	49
AMI												
ASN	68	64		45			67	71		100	92	
BLK	32	43	40	13	16	25	33	47		96	63	
HSP	47	53	43	21	22	26	55	59		95	62	50
MUL	43	44	36	12	7		35	56		100	81	
PAC												
WHT	57	53	43	32	27	34	66	69		98	80	
FRL	32	40	40	16	21	27	45	49		95	61	50

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	48%	40%	8%	50%	-2%
09	2023 - Spring	50%	39%	11%	48%	2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	26%	37%	-11%	50%	-24%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	40%	37%	3%	48%	-8%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	54%	50%	4%	63%	-9%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	54%	49%	5%	63%	-9%

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 showed the lowest performance was Students With Disabilities. The contributing factors for last year's low performance included the lack of standard based instruction and student task alignment. In addition, students were not frequently exposed to equivalent experiences.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was Social Studies Achievement. The factors that contributed to this decline were a lack of consistent standard based instruction and student task alignment. In addition, students were not frequently exposed to equivalent experiences when compared to other tested subject areas.

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 I data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The factors that contributed to this gap or trend is that the data included all accelerated tests taken in middle school. The majority of students taking the Algebra I assessment historically are low performing.

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 Math Achievement in Geometry. The actions that our school took to improve in this area were intentional common planning, common assessment, re-teaching of various standards, analyzing and reviewing progress monitoring and state testing data. Frequent classroom walkthroughs and feedback to teachers were also a deliberately conducted.

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

Areas of concerns are Students With Disabilities and Social Studies Achievement.

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

1. Increase test scores in US History with an emphasis on the average classrooms.
2. Increase test scores in Biology with an emphasis on the average classrooms.
3. Focus on learning gains in English Language Arts.
4. Focus on learning gains in Mathematics (Algebra I and Geometry).
5. Focus on learning gains for Students With Disabilities in English, Mathematics and Social Studies.

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 Students with Disabilities

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.

One area of focus is Student With Disabilities subgroup. This group was identified as a crucial need because data reviewed indicated this component fell below the ESSA Federal Index of 41%.

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

The school plans to focus on Students With Disabilities. We will work to increase in the areas of ELA Achievement, ELA Language Arts, ELA Learning Gains, Mathematics Achievement, Mathematics Learning Gains, Science Achievement and Social Studies Achievement by 2 percentage points.

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored by each administrator. The administrators will increase classroom walkthroughs to ensure that Standard based instruction, student task are aligned and equivalent experiences are evident and observed. Quarterly assessment data will be reviewed and analyzed to drive instruction. Administrators will ensure that Students With Disabilities are receiving support in the core content areas. We will utilize the integration of district support and provide feedback to teachers as needed. Administrators will participate in collaborative planning and weekly administrative meetings. Students With Disabilities were meticulously placed with content and support teachers. Support teachers will communicate monthly with parents to provide student updates and feedback. Weekly tutoring will be provided to students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lacy Emmerling (lacy.emmerling@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.)

The evidence based strategies that will be implemented in order to increase learning for our Students With Disabilities will be common planning, analyzing and reviewing progress monitoring and state exam data. In addition, we will utilize District and school level coaching with an emphasis on standards based instruction in the classroom. Students will use programs such as Achieve 3000 actively Learn, Chalk Talk, Apple Routh, Image Learning, to increase student learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The reason for selecting this specific strategy will ensure sustainability and gives us the opportunity to continually review student data to implement necessary instructional strategies to improve academic achievement for students with disabilities.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs on a weekly basis to observe standard based instruction.

Administrators will meet Tuesdays to discuss student data and provide feedback on their content area.

Student data will be reviewed after each FAST Assessment is administered.

Support teachers will communicate monthly with the parents of SWD regarding academic achievement and concerns.

Person Responsible: Lacy Emmerling (lacy.emmerling@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 2023 September 2023 November 2023 December 2023

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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

This area of focus was identified as a crucial need because data trends indicate a moderate turnover in teachers and school counselors on a yearly basis.

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

The schools plans to retain 90% of new hires for 2023-2024 school year.

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

Instructional Coach will meet monthly with new hires to review instructional expectations, school polices, and provide feedback to determine areas needing support. Instructional coach will conduct non-evaluative classroom visits, complete coaching cycles, and build mentor relationships with new teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Iatarola (nicole.iatarola1@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.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus is collaborative planning to assist with Learning Arc implementation, Schoology groups, and PLC's to share resources and best practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected because research and data shows that teachers who receives extensive supports are more successful in the classroom and thus continue their career in the profession.

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.

Monthly new hire meetings
Classroom Walkthroughs
One on One Mentor relationships
Personalized coaching cycles
Provide opportunities for new hires to participate in focused observation with highly effective veteran teachers

Person Responsible: Nicole Iatarola (nicole.iatarola1@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 31th through May 30th

#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.

Instructional Practice, specifically benchmark aligned instruction was selected as an area of focus because data reviewed from common planning and District Instructional reviews indicated inconsistencies with bench mark aligned instruction and aligned student task in core content classrooms.

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

The measured outcome the school plans to achieve is an increase in learning gains as measured by state standardized assessments.

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored by the administrators the instructional coach. Each administrator will conduct at least six standard base walkthroughs. In addition, collaborative walks will be conducted with our Principal. Qualtrics data will be reviewed, analyzed, and actionable feedback will be provided to stakeholders. Administrators, Instructional Coach and Senior Coordinators of Curriculum will participate in common planning and professional development using the Learning Arc template.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lacy Emmerling (lacy.emmerling@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.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus are Instructional Review Action Plan, Quarterly Assessment data, focused professional development and coaching.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy to ensure that targeted instructional support is provided to teachers.

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.

Teachers will review newly updated curriculum guides provided in Schoology.
Training on Learning Arcs including modeling and collaborative creation of benchmark specific learning arcs.

Person Responsible: Tom Patton (tom.patton@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 25th Common Planning will begins and will occur weekly throughout the school year.

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 administrative team led by our Principal meets throughout the year to discuss funding allocations to ensure resources are distributed to improve student achievement. The process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated base on needs is done via our monthly School Advisory Council (SAC), participation in Data Com, Summer Leadership Academy, School Improvement Meetings and Training, PURE Process to review technology and Regional and Office of School Transformation review of School Improvement Plans.