Bill Duncan Opportunity Center

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bill Duncan Opportunity Center

3333 WINTER LAKE RD, Lakeland, FL 33803

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

Demographics

Principal: Leigh Ann Cooley

Start Date for this Principal: 4/25/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
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)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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.](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

Bill Duncan Opportunity Center

3333 WINTER LAKE RD, Lakeland, FL 33803

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

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)
High School 6-12	No	%

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

School Grades History

Year

Grade

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.

Bill Duncan Opportunity Center will provide an individualized curriculum for each student which will allow them the flexibility to transition to their zoned school prepared to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student will transition back to their home school equipped with social skills and study habits necessary to be successful.

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
Cooley, Leigh Anne	Principal	
Gentry, Sheryl	Assistant Principal	
Serrano, Pete	SAC Member	
Andino, Samaria	Other	School Social Worker
Israel, Adrian	School Counselor	
Bangley, John	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 4/25/2016, Leigh Ann Cooley

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

16

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
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)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	13	28	15	6	5	0	83
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	11	20	13	5	5	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	12	26	13	2	4	0	72
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	14	4	2	1	1	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	5	2	1	2	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	17	9	4	3	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	17	8	2	2	0	42

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	15	12	26	14	5	5	1	78

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	3	0	16	7	0	1	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	0	0	0	13

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/3/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	26	26	16	11	13	1	108
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	22	22	14	10	10	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	26	25	15	9	12	1	103
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	5	2	3	1	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	19	18	9	1	8	0	61

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	12	22	22	13	7	12	0	88

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	1	1	0	1	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	1	8

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	26	26	16	11	13	1	108
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	22	22	14	10	10	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	26	25	15	9	12	1	103
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	5	2	3	1	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	19	18	9	1	8	0	61

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	12	22	22	13	7	12	0	88

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	1	1	0	1	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	1	8

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	0%	47%	56%	0%	44%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	46%	51%	0%	41%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	37%	42%	0%	33%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	43%	51%	0%	37%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	45%	48%	0%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	44%	45%	0%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	58%	68%	0%	56%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	61%	73%	0%	60%	70%

Indicator	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(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
06	2019	17%	48%	-31%	54%	-37%
	2018	6%	41%	-35%	52%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	11%	42%	-31%	52%	-41%
	2018	0%	42%	-42%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	33%	48%	-15%	56%	-23%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		33%				
Cohort Comparison		33%				
09	2019	17%	45%	-28%	55%	-38%
	2018	0%	43%	-43%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
10	2019	0%	42%	-42%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	42%	-42%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	0%	47%	-47%	55%	-55%
	2018	5%	40%	-35%	52%	-47%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	19%	39%	-20%	54%	-35%
	2018	13%	40%	-27%	54%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
08	2019	17%	35%	-18%	46%	-29%
	2018	6%	34%	-28%	45%	-39%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	13%	41%	-28%	48%	-35%
	2018	0%	42%	-42%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	36%	54%	-18%	67%	-31%
2018	0%	59%	-59%	65%	-65%
Compare	36%				

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	39%	70%	-31%	71%	-32%
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	36%	57%	-21%	70%	-34%
2018	0%	57%	-57%	68%	-68%
Compare	36%				

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	0%	50%	-50%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	60%	-60%	62%	-62%
Compare	0%				

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	0%	53%	-53%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	41%	-41%	56%	-56%
Compare	0%				

Subgroup Data

	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
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups											

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	0
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	0
Total Components for the Federal Index	1
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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.

There is not enough student data to form subgroups to be significant.

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

There is not enough student data to form subgroups to be significant.

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.

There is not enough student data to form subgroups to be significant.

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

There is not enough student data to form subgroups to be significant.

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

Only 7% of our students were on-level for Reading performance based on STAR testing prior to the pandemic (Covid-19 distance learning) changes.
Also, 7% of math students were on-level for Math performance based on the same metric.

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

1. Improve reading performance
2. Improve math performance
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student reading and Math achievement on STAR assessments is well below targets for FSA learning gains and lowest 25% learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	At least 50% of our students will make ELA and math learning gains on FSA/ELA and math or EOC math assessments to a level which meets the new standards for learning gains as outlined by FLDOE.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sheryl Gentry (sheryl.gentry@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards aligned instruction delivered with support through Edgenuity content platform with fidelity and scaffolded for students with needs will allow for this level of learning gains.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Consistent content delivery allows us to monitor the content and measure student progress from each classroom regardless of the teacher since the content is provided via Edgenuity. The supports can then be prescriptive for the individual based on their unique needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Enroll all students in Edgenuity courses for Reading and Math as required per the Student Progression Plan.
2. Monitor student academic progress weekly by teachers, admin and MTSS team.
3. Use quarterly assessments to predict or confirm learning gains.
4. Plan and implement interventions for students who are not making adequate gains in progress monitoring.
5. Maintain supports for those students who are progressing adequately.

Person Responsible	Adrian Israel (adrian.israel@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

By addressing the instructional differentiation related to ELA and Math, we will impact student learning gains in those areas.

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.

BDOC hosts a new student orientation weekly for incoming students and their parents. During this time, we establish relationships with families and open lines of communications. We are a small, intimate school with frequent opportunities to contact parents, work with students one-on-one and give personalized attention and social and emotional support.
At the end of a student's term here, we have a transition meeting with the parent and the zoned school to review the progress academically as well as socially in an effort to support a smooth transition back to the traditional school setting.

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**