
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Rosabelle W. Blake Academy

510 HARTSELL AVE, Lakeland, FL 33815

<http://www.blakeacademy.com/>

Demographics

Principal: Ava Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 5/27/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Rosabelle W. Blake Academy

510 HARTSELL AVE, Lakeland, FL 33815

<http://www.blakeacademy.com/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>93%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>67%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We Learn -We lead -We Serve

Our vision at Blake Academy is to provide a solid academic and leadership foundation for student success that prepares them for high school, college and/or career, as well as, successful future leaders and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our mission at Blake Academy is to provide a rigorous education that addresses the academic needs of all students, cultivates personal responsibility, and builds leadership skills, that will enable them to contribute positively to our school and community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Reimer, Dr. Ruth	Principal	
Champion, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	
Tedder, Rachael	Assistant Principal	
Cummings, Albert	Other	
Hutchins, Katrina	Instructional Coach	
Thiede, Kira	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 5/27/2020, Ava Brown

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	72	70	70	75	57	65	94	87	85	0	0	0	0	675
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	4	10	5	5	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	10	12	20	13	15	23	34	29	24	0	0	0	0	180
Course failure in ELA	2	2	12	16	1	2	8	17	4	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in Math	20	3	0	6	10	1	16	12	3	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	4	14	12	11	19	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	6	27	20	28	15	0	0	0	0	100
Dec. 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	7	15	21	17	22	15	20	14	0	0	0	0	131
Dec. 2019 STAR Mathematics Level 1	0	17	28	21	27	21	29	23	10	0	0	0	0	176

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	5	3	7	10	11	20	22	28	20	0	0	0	0	126

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 5/27/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	66	69	67	63	60	60	99	101	97	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	7	13	16	5	5	5	8	10	12	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	4	9	8	6	18	4	38	22	29	0	0	0	0	138
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	9	18	15	12	10	47	39	39	0	0	0	0	195
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	10	20	27	27	27	0	0	0	0	116

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	5	9	7	11	9	36	28	23	0	0	0	0	128

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	66	69	67	63	60	60	99	101	97	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	7	13	16	5	5	5	8	10	12	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	4	9	8	6	18	4	38	22	29	0	0	0	0	138
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	9	18	15	12	10	47	39	39	0	0	0	0	195
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	10	20	27	27	27	0	0	0	0	116

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	5	9	7	11	9	36	28	23	0	0	0	0	128

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	53%	61%	61%	59%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	58%	59%	56%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	49%	54%	48%	44%	51%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	55%	61%	62%	47%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	52%	56%	59%	42%	50%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	52%	52%	42%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	43%	52%	56%	44%	49%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	79%	78%	80%	68%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey										
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	52%	0%	58%	-6%
	2018	57%	51%	6%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	46%	48%	-2%	58%	-12%
	2018	58%	48%	10%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	55%	47%	8%	56%	-1%
	2018	39%	50%	-11%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019	54%	48%	6%	54%	0%
	2018	57%	41%	16%	52%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
07	2019	56%	42%	14%	52%	4%
	2018	42%	42%	0%	51%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	49%	48%	1%	56%	-7%
	2018	60%	49%	11%	58%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	56%	1%	62%	-5%
	2018	57%	56%	1%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	29%	56%	-27%	64%	-35%
	2018	62%	57%	5%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-33%				
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
05	2019	46%	51%	-5%	60%	-14%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
06	2019	46%	47%	-1%	55%	-9%
	2018	54%	40%	14%	52%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
07	2019	58%	39%	19%	54%	4%
	2018	43%	40%	3%	54%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	63%	35%	28%	46%	17%
	2018	27%	34%	-7%	45%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		36%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	45%	45%	0%	53%	-8%
	2018	34%	51%	-17%	55%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	42%	41%	1%	48%	-6%
	2018	49%	42%	7%	50%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	70%	5%	71%	4%
2018	97%	84%	13%	71%	26%
Compare		-22%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	89%	50%	39%	61%	28%
2018	82%	60%	22%	62%	20%
Compare		7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%
2018	89%	41%	48%	56%	33%
Compare		11%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	11	50	55	7	44	45		10			
ELL	30	65		35	59						
BLK	40	38	36	43	44	45	22	66	62		
HSP	54	62	64	51	54	52	45	76	85		
MUL	57	36		71	55						
WHT	63	59	48	69	57	48	55	81	63		
FRL	43	47	43	46	45	39	38	69	69		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	14	27	30	11	37	37	45				
ELL	22	35		35	46	50					
BLK	45	44	39	44	45	34	29		77		
HSP	53	46	41	53	53	58	41	100	78		
MUL	31	29		31	23						
WHT	61	49	48	64	58	55	56	96	63		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
FRL	46	43	38	49	48	38	36	97	75		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	33	58	62	33	54	50	17				
ELL	17	38	45	13	27	36					
BLK	43	48	33	34	44	46	27	61	69		
HSP	62	55	50	41	40	38	43	90	58		
MUL	78	64		53	50						
WHT	69	61	61	59	44	44	56	88	65		
FRL	54	55	44	39	41	44	35	78	52		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	498
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant 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 learning gain category was the lowest-performing area. Learning gains for ELA were 21% and math 28%. Learning gains of the bottom quartile are much higher at 52% in ELA and 53% in Math. That being said, the problem is both with higher-performing and lower-performing students. In fourth grade ELA four students scored a level 5, however, none of them were on track to make a learning gain. There were also 4 students who scored a level 1, again none of which were on track to make a learning gain. The numbers were similar in 4th-grade math as well. Fifth grade showed similar data, however they were able to move more of the lower students.

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

Based on the data available Civics was predicted to have a larger decline decreasing from 76% to 66% based on the Quarter two progress monitoring

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.

Science had the largest gap when compared to the state average. The school science achievement score was 43% the state average was 56% with a difference of 13%. The way the classes are compartmentalized Math and Science are taught by the same teacher in the same block. In elementary grades, Science can either be taught to a less rigorous degree or left out in lieu of additional math instruction.

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

From 17-18 to 18-19 the school component that grew the most was ELA learning gains. From 18-19 to 19-20 there was a large improvement in Middle School Math. Part of the improvement was due to having a school-based math coach and regional math coach in place who worked to build teacher capacity. Additionally, the math positions were all filled with qualified individuals and the team collaborated well together. In years past there were substitutes and/or vacancies.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Teacher attendance, Students with one or more suspensions (27% of student population), Overall academic performance on progress monitoring in reading, math, and science in grades 2-7.

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

1. Teacher turnover/attendance-impact on quality of instruction
2. Quality of instruction for students with special needs (ESSA)
3. Quality of MTSS/RtI process for both academics and behavior (learning gains)
4. Teaching to the full depth of standard using appropriate tasks (students mastering standards-learning gains and proficiency)

5. Communicating with students and families (are students and parents aware of student performance, grade, ability etc...)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The data reflects that students are not making appropriate learning gains. Learning gains go hand and hand with proficiency. If students are being provided differentiation they will have the best chance at learning, regardless of their abilities, strengths, and weaknesses. This will be vital coming back to school after the COVID pandemic. Students will have had varied learning experiences for many months prior to the school year amplifying the differences in student ability and readiness. Engaging instruction at appropriate levels will better equip students to make appropriate learning gains, maintaining or improving their proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

Learning gains in both ELA and Math were 52% on the last Florida Standards Assessment administration. The learning gains for the bottom quartile were ELA 47% and Math 49%. After implementing evidence-based strategies learning gains for ELA and math will increase to 55% or better.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Implement Tier 2 and 3 MTSS with fidelity to ensure students are getting interventions needed to close achievement gaps.
 Data meetings to drive planning decisions.
 *Collaborative Planning with substitute coverage so teachers can build their capacity, providing well planned effective instruction.
 Small group/differentiated instruction in all core classes at all grade levels.
 *Math and Literacy coach will provide support and build teacher capacity.
 *Increase student engagement through cooperative learning tasks, improved classroom conditions, and additional access to technology (ipads).
 *Students will be able to take field trips to provide real-world connections to what is being learned in the classroom.
 *Tutoring and tutoring materials will be provided in core content areas
 Collaborative instruction provided by ESE or Gifted and General Education teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In the data analysis, it became obvious many classes had appropriate core instruction, however students who were either above or below average/ESE/ESL were not receiving the support needed to make appropriate growth. MTSS will meet the needs of students performing below level. Small group instruction will allow teachers to meet the needs of their diverse learners regardless of ability. In addition, cooperative learning can provide a better learning environment for reaching all students by creating a safe way for students to engage in productive struggle and develop 21st-century skills while engaging with content. To support teachers as they implement these strategies planning days will be provided. Coaching is a research-based practice shown to make an impact on the quality of instruction and student performance. In classes where the teachers were goal setting and regularly meeting with students about their goals, the students had greater gains.

Action Steps to Implement

The leadership team created and communicated MTSS plan. Coaches/Counselors/Admin will meet with teachers monthly to track progress and address the appropriateness of the interventions. Counselors will help with initial paperwork and parent meetings.
 ESE students were placed into cohorts to help ensure that ESE teachers could better provide assistance in the classrooms. Training is scheduled to help classroom teachers better work with ESE teachers to meet student needs.
 Coaches have created schedules to ensure teachers will receive support during planning, PLCs, and in

their classrooms.

Expectations about learning targets, success criteria, rigorous and differentiated instruction were shared. Classes are to set goals, track data, and conference with students.

MTSS data tracking to see how ESE/struggling learners are doing compared to other children receiving Tier 2 and 3 interventions.

Accountability logs completed by ESE teachers to ensure ESE students are receiving their services with fidelity.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Teacher turnover/attendance-This is a concern because when teachers are not in attendance there is a negative impact on the quality of instruction. The data from the first semester of the 2019-2020 school year reflects that at the district level 19% of teachers had been in attendance less than 90% of the time, at Blake Academy 30% of the teachers had been in attendance less than 90% of the time additionally 31% of teachers were out between 90-94.99% of the time. To help encourage teacher attendance the leadership team intends to offer Incentives for teacher attendance and create a positive environment where teachers want to come to work and teachers will be held accountable for their attendance.

Another area of need is communicating with students and families (for example, are students and parents consistently aware of student performance, grades, ability etc...). Communication with families and students is vital in working collaboratively and ensuring success. This includes setting grading practices that accurately reflect student performance on standards-based target aligned tasks. Communicating both grading policies and grades to students and families in a timely fashion. Communicating student ability as demonstrated through ongoing progress monitoring in a timely fashion. Making contact with parents each time a progress report is sent home and logging this information for administrator review.

PBIS-As a school new to the Positive Behavior Intervention and Support program a behavior interventionist will be working with teachers to help them implement PBIS initiatives and provide support as they deal with behavior concerns in the classroom. The rationale for this is based in the discipline data. At the end of the 2018-2019 school year, Blake had processed 1, 368 discipline referrals, in the first semester of the 2019-2020 school year, Blake had processed over 1,000 discipline referrals.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Blake Academy continually works at building positive relationships with families and the community in many different ways.

Please see the attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan for full details on how we plan to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders, to fulfill the school’s mission and to support the needs of students. Parents are invited to become involved at Blake Academy by volunteering, or by joining the School Advisory Council (SAC). Additionally, Blake Academy has a school website and Facebook page where school information is posted and updated frequently. All students are provided a daily agenda for communication between the classroom and home. Teachers also communicate with parents via telephone calls, text messages, Remind101, ClassDojo, and face-to-face conferences throughout the year. There are multiple opportunities for family engagement events including monthly parent nights that have a planned instructional purpose.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00