

Polk County Public Schools

Polk County Sheriffs Regional Detention Center



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Polk County Sheriffs Regional Detention Center

2325 BOB PHILLIPS ROAD, Bartow, FL 33830

[no web address on file]

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 provide students with a continuity of educational services while in the facility and continue progress to be productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision in the detention setting is to engage students with positive educational experiences. We will provide classrooms that support self-improvement, self-awareness, and personal academic success. We want better outcomes for the students in the Juvenile Justice System and will provide the skills that will support the students beyond the program.

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
Wiggs, Ricky	Principal	Provide leadership for the instructional program, as well as coordinating the implementation, review, and revision of the curriculum at the building level. Manages the operation and all functions of all DJJ sites. Supervises school staff regarding instruction, curriculum, student programs and issues, and building operations. Schedules and attends meetings, as appropriate. Leads the site improvement process.
Mitchell, Chauncey	Assistant Principal	Supports Principal in providing leadership for the instructional program, as well as coordinating the implementation, review, and revision of the curriculum at the building level. Assist in managing the operation and all functions of all DJJ sites. Supervises school staff regarding instruction, curriculum, student programs and issues, and building operations. Schedules and attends meetings, as appropriate. Leads the site improvement process.

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.

Stakeholders met to identify the school's reasons for school's identification for ESSA support and improvement, the school's performance on each accountability indicator, prioritization through data analysis, and selection of interventions.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will monitored through classroom walkthroughs and student progress monitoring. Data will be shared and discussed monthly with the leadership team. The Leadership Team will look to make adjustment if the data shows any abnormalities resulting in downward trends.

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 5-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	81%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	0%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
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)	White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: F
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	1	2	5	8	
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	1	0	0	3	5	7	16	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	7	16	
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		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	8	13	26	

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	1	0	0	3	5	7	16

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	1	2	
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	

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	1	1	
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*		38	50		41	51			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*		24	38		35	38			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		50	64		26	40			
Social Studies Achievement*		50	66		39	48			
Middle School Acceleration					41	44			
Graduation Rate	8	84	89	9	52	61			
College and Career Acceleration		54	65		55	67			
ELP Progress		40	45						

** 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	8
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	8
Total Components for the Federal Index	1

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	8

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	9
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	9
Total Components for the Federal Index	1
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	9

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	0	Yes	1	1
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	17	Yes	2	2
FRL	0	Yes	2	2

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	9	Yes	1	1
FRL	7	Yes	1	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										8		
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK											1	
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT											1	
FRL											1	

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										9		
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										9		
FRL										7		

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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.

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 graduation rate was the data component that showed the lowest performance. The low performance was due to our highly transient population.

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

Our graduation rate was the data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior. The decline was due to our highly transient population.

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.

N/A

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

N/A

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

ELA and Math scores are two areas of concern.

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

Graduation rate

Tracking students who have been released from our facilities

Professional Development for teachers

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 Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning**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.

Our staff expressed interest over the last year regarding Best standards, practices, and other opportunities. During the 22-23 school year, only two PDs were held for teachers. Teachers took a survey reflecting a want and need for professional development. 100% of teacher surveys collected reflected the need for professional development.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the school year, we aim to the professional development days focused on standard alignment, instructional practices, differentiation, data analysis, and small groups from 10 to 11 PD days. This will be achieved by offering targeted and engaging professional development opportunities, providing ongoing support and resources, and actively promoting the benefits of these sessions among our teaching staff.

Monitoring:

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

The assistant principal and the resource teacher will be responsible for monitoring. Teachers will be required to complete follow up assignments for each professional development opportunity. This will serve as a fidelity check, as well as an opportunity for teachers to acquired PD points for recertification.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chauncey Mitchell (chauncey.mitchell@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.)

Our director hired a resource teacher to develop and facilitate professional development and learning opportunities for our staff. These PD's will be specific to the detention and residential education setting.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Studies show that meaningful professional development can improve teacher effectiveness by making teachers more confident in their ability to meet the needs of their students and to better use the research-based practices in their classroom.

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.

Develop a PD calendar for the 2023-2024 school year.

Person Responsible: Chauncey Mitchell (chauncey.mitchell@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 1, 2023

Plan professional development opportunities for the 2023-2024 school year.

Person Responsible: Chauncey Mitchell (chauncey.mitchell@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 1, 2023

#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.

The School Climate Perception Survey given to our programs identified only 58% of teachers felt like students treated them with respect.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We would like to see a 10% increase on the 2023-2024 School Climate Perception Survey.

Monitoring:

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

The progress of the area of focus will be monitored daily by the assistant principal. School climate surveys given at the beginning, middle and end of the school year will be used to track progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chauncey Mitchell (chauncey.mitchell@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.)

Polk County Sheriffs Regional Detention will be using strategies from Positive Action. Positive Action provides a research-based framework and key strategies for educational leaders to improve and support their school climate. Here are the key steps to building a positive school culture:

1. Set a clear vision, school norms, goals, and expectations that support social, emotional, and physical safety.
2. Establish school safety for a more positive climate.
3. Engage teachers and administrators.
4. Set boundaries through school and classroom rules.
5. Create fun and positive experiences.
6. Create a healthy physical, emotional, and social environment for student growth.
7. Improve our current school climate through assessments and surveys.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School climate affects student learning. A negative school climate can harm students and raise liability issues within the residential and detention settings. Negative school climate is linked to lower student achievement and graduation rates, and it creates opportunities for violence, bullying, and even suicide.

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.

Development and distribution of the school climate survey.

Person Responsible: Chauncey Mitchell (chauncey.mitchell@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 10, 2023- Beginning of the year January, 10, 2024- Middle of the year June 10, 2024- End of year

Develop a clear vision, school norms, goals, and expectations for the school year.

Person Responsible: Chauncey Mitchell (chauncey.mitchell@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

#3. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation**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.

Our graduation rate was the data component that showed the lowest performance and showed a decline from the prior year. This low performance was due to our highly transient population and not tracking student enrollment back into regular properly upon release.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the school year, transition specialists will work with youth and stakeholders to schedule re-entry hearings and increase student enrollment from 61% to 65%. This will include students coming from Detention, Eckerd, Pace, and Commitment Programs.

Monitoring:

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

Once a student is released from a Detention, Eckerd, Pace, or a Commitment Program, the transition specialist along with the assistant principal will intensively track the student's enrollment into regular school with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chauncey Mitchell (chauncey.mitchell@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.)

Parents will be contacted via phone, email and certified letters to encourage enrollment. Title 1, Part D funds have been allocated to pay for mileage for home visits. PCPS vehicles are available to transport families to school to enroll if they are experiencing transportation issues.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With the significant correlation between our graduation rate and dropout rate, it was decided that this was the best course of action.

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.

Parent contact via phone, email and certified letters to encourage enrollment.

Person Responsible: Jaclyn Carlino (jaclyn.carlino@polk-fl.net)

By When: September, 2023

Home visits

Person Responsible: Jaclyn Carlino (jaclyn.carlino@polk-fl.net)

By When: September, 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).

In July of 2023, Polk County Sheriffs Regional Detention Center administration collaborated with the district Title 1 and ESE personnel in the disaggregation of historical data to determine the needs of the school.