Bethune Academy

leadership

analysis

Florida

college and career

mission

students

school improvement

ambitious

family and community involvement

striving

achievement

teaching

relationships

needs assessment

success

resources

areas of focus

instruction

strategic planning

collaboration

vision

learning

supportive environment

growth

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bethune Academy

900 AVENUE F, Haines City, FL 33844

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

Demographics

Principal: Robin Hewitt   Start Date for this Principal: 6/4/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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

Bethune Academy

900 AVENUE F, Haines City, FL 33844

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	98%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	80%

School Grades History

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

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.

Bethune Academy values the unique qualities of each person and believes that everyone has the capacity to learn. We expect all learners to attend and show effort, meet the required curriculum, develop responsibility, citizenship, and leadership. We dedicate ourselves to the success of this mission.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is our vision to be a leader in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) education by inspiring and preparing generations of critical and creative thinkers to meet the challenges of a global society through innovation and collaboration.

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
Carns, Michelle	School Counselor	
Knowles, Sharon	Principal	
Rivera, Deborah	Instructional Coach	
Wilkins, Lucus	Assistant Principal	
McIntee, Ashlee	Instructional Coach	
Bataille, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Kobs, Mary	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 6/4/2020, Robin Hewitt

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
34

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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	69	79	74	69	73	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	454
Attendance below 90 percent	5	12	5	5	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	5	6	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
December Star 2019 ELA Level 1	0	0	0	10	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
December Star 2019 Math Level 1	0	0	0	8	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	1	1	7	8	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/4/2020

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	69	73	71	71	76	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	450
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	69	73	71	71	76	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	450
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	5	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	56%	51%	57%	60%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	51%	58%	63%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	49%	53%	47%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	57%	57%	63%	56%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	56%	62%	57%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	47%	51%	43%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	47%	53%	44%	46%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(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	63%	52%	11%	58%	5%
	2018	74%	51%	23%	57%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	48%	10%	58%	0%
	2018	59%	48%	11%	56%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2019	49%	47%	2%	56%	-7%
	2018	59%	50%	9%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	56%	-2%	62%	-8%
	2018	63%	56%	7%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	56%	-1%	64%	-9%
	2018	56%	57%	-1%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	60%	51%	9%	60%	0%
	2018	60%	56%	4%	61%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	59%	51%	8%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison	-9%					
Cohort Comparison						

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	27			27							
ELL	45	37	40	56	61	40	39				
BLK	37	49	48	37	49	42	44				
HSP	60	47	36	64	63	44	51				
WHT	75	58		71	73		50				
FRL	46	46	39	44	52	40	44				

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	38			54							
ELL	49	45	46	49	35	30					
BLK	52	41	22	51	52	33	41				
HSP	68	53	50	62	48	42	75				
WHT	74	54		68	61		72				
FRL	62	46	32	54	49	37	56				

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	12			28	40						
ELL	49	67		38	57	55					
BLK	51	58	36	42	41	38	27				
HSP	64	70	58	60	67	53	43				
WHT	68	60		71	64		65				
FRL	51	56	46	53	55	42	27				

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	418
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	53
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	65
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	47
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 data component that showed the lowest performance is our ELA lowest 25%. The contributing factors to last years low performance were the following: Poor attendance in school and after school tutoring programs, and lack of consistency among teachers for interventions SWD population identified by ESSA. Currently they are performing at 27% proficiency.

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 from the prior year is our black population in the area of reading and math proficiency. Currently they are performing at 37% proficiency. The factors that contributed to this decline are the following: lack of time due to COVID-19 school closures to provide interventions for proficient gains.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was ELA lowest 25%. The factors that contributed to this decline are the following: lack of time due to COVID-19 school closures to provide interventions for proficient gains.

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 school wide discipline. The total number of referrals dropped by 57% from the current school year. The new action that was implemented was The Ron Clark Academy House System.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data from part 1 (D), the identified area of concern is attendance.

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

1. Improve lowest 25% in ELA.
2. Improve overall performance of our SWD population.
3. Improve school-wide attendance/tardies.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus is our lowest 25% in ELA; this is the greatest area of deficiency among all subgroups.
Measurable Outcome:	Our specific measurable outcome our school plans to achieve is 48% proficiency based on district provided achievable targets.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashlee McIntee (ashlee.mcintee@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In-school using differentiated instruction in small group.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research proves that small group differentiated instruction increases the academic achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Analyze the assessment data to determine small groups.
Determine the skills based on area of weakness.
Develop the resources based on student need.
Assign student groups to instructional staff.
Utilize progress monitoring through weekly formative assessments.

Person Responsible	Ashlee McIntee (ashlee.mcintee@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the Federal ESSA Report we fell below our targeted performance in the area of SWD.
Measurable Outcome:	SWD are currently performing at 27% proficiency and we must increase this subgroup to 40% based on Federal ESSA Mandate.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lucus Wilkins (lucus.wilkins@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The following strategy will be implemented for success: MTSS, in-school tutoring by Instructional Coaches, mentoring provided by the Leadership Team and the Learning Science Institute's (LSI) best practice of Academic Teaming. Additional ESE staff will be added for student support.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	"The brain that does the work is the brain that learns" as quoted from the Power of Student Teams by Toth and Sousa. Student engagement increases as students have the opportunity to share their thinking, respectfully challenge the thinking of their peers and deepen their learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development on the Power of Student Teams.
2. Implement the practice of Student Teams in all grade levels.
3. On-Going support provided through weekly PLC's.

Person Responsible	Lucus Wilkins (lucus.wilkins@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

After identifying the Area(s) of Focus, we have determined that student attendance and tardies as a needed priority.

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.

Our school culture has established a safe and intentionally welcoming environment that nurtures the social-emotional needs of all students. Our Administration and Guidance Counselor have an open door policy that fosters communication among all stakeholders. They are readily available at the time of need.
Students who exhibit additional social-emotional needs are matched with staff mentors and/or various counseling groups.

Our outreach to stakeholder groups is evident through continuous support with donations, student mentoring and staff support.

The school builds a culture of respect, confidence and cooperation by utilizing and expanding The Ron Clark Academy House System to include grades three through five. Morning meetings are also held in each classroom every morning to focus on the positive characters traits using Keys To Character and Harmony.

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: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00