
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Roosevelt Academy

115 E ST, Lake Wales, FL 33853

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/rooseveltacademy>

Demographics

Principal: Carla Wiggs

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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	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: 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.

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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Roosevelt Academy

115 E ST, Lake Wales, FL 33853

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/rooseveltacademy>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>High School 6-12</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>%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>Alternative Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>%</p>

School Grades History

<p>Year</p> <p>Grade</p>	<p>2012-13</p>
--	-----------------------

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.

To provide a supportive and caring environment in which students can be successful in meeting high expectations for academic success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Roosevelt is a learning community that fosters a culture of high quality educational practice to challenge all students to achieve at their greatest potential.

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
Kindel, Deborah	Principal	The School Leadership Team is comprised of the grade level chairs and the subject area chairs as well as the behavior specialist and administration. The Chairs act as the liaisons for their content; bringing information to and from the Leadership team. The Chairs are respected by both teachers and administration. They are leaders in their area and therefore trusted to act in the best interest of the school.
Dooley, John	Assistant Principal	
Boyd, Kim	Teacher, ESE	
Bagby, Amy	Teacher, ESE	
Woodford, Tamara	Teacher, K-12	
Hendrick, Stefanie	Teacher, K-12	
Hansell, Kelly	Instructional Coach	
Cobb, Tracy	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Carla Wiggs

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

29

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	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: 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	30	32	48	37	35	20	34	236
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	12	8	9	6	5	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	5	1	1	1	19
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	20	41	28	28	13	2	145
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	18	30	21	0	0	0	78
December 2019 Star Reading Level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	22	31	27	24	1	0	120
December 2019 Star Mathematics Level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	15	26	0	0	0	0	57

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	18	23	43	27	26	14	7	158

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/15/2020

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	27	30	50	37	41	24	36	245
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	22	45	32	35	21	32	206

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	1	0	1	2	0	0	4

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	30	50	37	41	24	36	245
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	22	45	32	35	21	32	206

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	1	0	1	2	0	0	4

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	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%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	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	9%	48%	-39%	54%	-45%
	2018	7%	41%	-34%	52%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	4%	42%	-38%	52%	-48%
	2018	2%	42%	-40%	51%	-49%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	2%	48%	-46%	56%	-54%
	2018	2%	49%	-47%	58%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	45%	-45%	55%	-55%
	2018	4%	43%	-39%	53%	-49%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
10	2019	5%	42%	-37%	53%	-48%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	13%	42%	-29%	53%	-40%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	12%	47%	-35%	55%	-43%
	2018	7%	40%	-33%	52%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	16%	39%	-23%	54%	-38%
	2018	4%	40%	-36%	54%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	16%	35%	-19%	46%	-30%
	2018	13%	34%	-21%	45%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	2%	41%	-39%	48%	-46%
	2018	0%	42%	-42%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	8%	54%	-46%	67%	-59%
2018	19%	59%	-40%	65%	-46%
Compare		-11%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	22%	70%	-48%	71%	-49%
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	7%	57%	-50%	70%	-63%
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	5%	50%	-45%	61%	-56%
2018	4%	60%	-56%	62%	-58%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	4%	53%	-49%	57%	-53%
2018	3%	41%	-38%	56%	-53%
Compare		1%			

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	5	29	44	13	43	46	3	17		63	
ELL	4	36		19	33						
BLK		17			62						
HSP	2	28	56	11	35	25	5	13			
WHT	8	35	42	16	41	69	5	21			
FRL	2	27	38	9	34	45	3	15		64	
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
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

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	26
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	261
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	23
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1

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	20
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	22
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

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	30
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	26
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

Reading Achievement Levels showed the lowest performance, it is a trend in district and in school. A high percentage (greater than 85%) of our students are SWD. Typically, SWD struggle in reading.

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

Reading achievement levels exhibited the greatest decline therefore, reading achievement levels have the greatest opportunity for increased growth.

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.

Reading Achievement Levels for all grade levels.

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

Math Gains increased by at 5% for the second year in a row due to increased articulation and collaborative planning with the math department.

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

A high percentage of the student population are classified as Students with disabilities (above 80%). Typically, SWD struggle in reading.

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

1. All teachers will use standards based instruction.
2. Core content teachers will conduct formative assessment checks daily and weekly regarding the content using various approaches.
3. Core content teachers will use validated focused note taking techniques to deepen student understanding of content.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to the 2019 FSA ELA data, reading is our lowest area and reading affects every other content area

Measurable Outcome: Increase reading learning gains by 5% for 2021 FSA ELA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: John Dooley (john.dooley@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Language Arts Teachers will conduct formative checks daily and weekly regarding the content using various approaches. Students will participate in STAR and Achieve 3000 progress monitoring checks 3 times per year. Teachers will use the data to monitor student learning to provide ongoing feedback and improve focused teaching.
2. Reading teachers will incorporate computer-based Achieve 3000 into classroom lessons to improve comprehension.
3. The reading coach will conduct PLC's on targeted reading strategies as indicated by formative student data.
4. All teachers will use research validated focused note taking techniques for students: Focused note taking skills help students organize, process and remember the content.
5. Teachers will utilize paired reading activities to help struggling readers engage with content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Formative assessment strategies in the classroom provide both teachers and students with valuable information about what students understand, and what they don't. ... When formative assessments are used consistently, and effectively, neither teachers nor students are surprised by their final grades.
2. Achieve 3000 is a proven research-based instructional reading program
3. Instructional changes may be necessary in responses to student data.
4. Focused note taking is a proven research based strategy to improve student engagement with and understanding of content.
5. Collaborative reading pairs will support students who struggle with independent reading.

Action Steps to Implement

Action Steps to Implement are as follows:

1. Analyze Student Work & provide feedback to students.
2. Teachers will track which students need enrichment and which students require reteaching.
3. Teachers will conduct data chats with students
4. The Literacy Coach will create, maintain and share the monthly data with teachers and administrators.
5. Teachers will use varied research-based instructional strategies such as homework, quizzes, Round Robin, Strategic Questioning, 3-Way Summaries, Think-Pair-Share, 3–2–1 Countdown, Classroom Polls, and Exit/Admit Tickets.

Person Responsible John Dooley (john.dooley@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Student achievement data the 2019 FSA Math is below the district and state data. Math is an important for student academic success as math skills build with each successive year and math is a life skill for students.

Measurable Outcome: Increase math gains by 5% on the 2021 FSA Math

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: John Dooley (john.dooley@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Math Teachers will conduct formative checks daily and weekly regarding the content using various approaches. Students will participate in unit formative checks related to the skills using the curriculum workbooks and assessments. Teachers will use the data to monitor student learning to provide ongoing feedback and improve focused teaching.
2. Math Teachers will use research validated focused note taking techniques for students: Focused note taking skills help students organize, process and remember the content.
3. Teachers will increase the use of questions that are written in alignment with the FSA Mathematics and EOC standards in the appropriate courses.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Formative assessment strategies in the classroom provide both teachers and students with invaluable information about what students understand, and what they don't. ... When formative assessments are used consistent and effective evidence of student learning is provided.
2. Focused Notes are a proven focused note-taking method. Focused Notes are student created and used by students during class lectures, class power points, and during collaborative and independent practice with math problems..
3. Teacher questions should be aligned with the content standards as evidenced by the end of course assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

Action Steps to Implement are as follows:

1. Teachers will analyze student work & provide feedback to students
2. Teachers will track which students need enrichment and which students require reteaching.
3. Teachers will conduct data chats with students
5. Teachers will use varied researched-based strategies such as homework, tests, and quizzes. Such as; Round Robin Charts, Strategic Questioning, 3-Way Summaries, Think-Pair-Share, 3–2–1 Countdown, Classroom Polls, and Exit/Admit Tickets.

Person Responsible John Dooley (john.dooley@polk-fl.net)

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: School leadership has been shown through research to be a factor in student learning. An understanding of content curriculum standards and effective progress monitoring is necessary in communicating with teachers and providing them with applicable teaching resources to improve student achievement.

Measurable Outcome: Student achievement on progress monitoring data will increase on average by 5% from the Fall administration to the spring administration on each of the district quarterly assessments and STAR.during the 2020/2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: John Dooley (john.dooley@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Progress monitoring data will be collected for district quarterly assessments and STAR in the Fall, Winter, and Spring
2. School leadership will conduct data chats with teachers based upon district assessments, STAR, after each test administration
3. School leadership will communicate with parents about student progress monitoring during parent meetings and via mail during the school year.
4. School Leadership will collaborate with teachers to determine appropriate revisions to instruction
5. School leadership will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor classroom strategies
6. Behavior Interventionist will train teachers on behavior intervention strategies to use to support students' task engagement

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Progress monitoring data is necessary to track student progress
2. School leadership and teachers must have a common understanding of data and how to align with instruction
3. To ensure consistent use of data, school leadership and teachers must communicate on best practices to address student learning needs
4. Parent involvement with student progress is important to student success
5. Monitoring expectations for instruction is important to ensure classroom implementation
6. Behavior in the classroom impacts student focus on content and subsequent adequate progress in learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaborate with Reading Coach & Testing Coordinator to set school schedule for progress monitoring
2. Collect data from quarterly district assessment and STAR
3. Leadership will review data with reading coach and math department chair
4. Teacher data chats will be conducted
5. Teacher PLCs will be used to developed adjustments to instruction based upon data
6. School Leadership will conduct classroom walkthroughs and provide teacher feedback

Person Responsible Tracy Cobb (tracy.cobb@polk-fl.net)

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:****Measurable Outcome:****Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]**Evidence-based Strategy:****Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

- 1. Develop a school-wide understanding of standards-based instruction**
- 2. Provide teacher resources such as cPalms and student learning maps to guide teachers on standards**
- 3. Communicate expectations for the format, frequency, and use of formative assessments**
- 4. Schedule time for PLCS for teachers to discuss and share data trends**
- 5. Schedule teacher collaborative planning time to discuss & share research-based teaching strategies aligned to content standards**

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.

Roosevelt will use a variety of strategies to build a positive school culture to include -

1. Behavior interventionist will set up a school-wide positive student behavior system to support expectations for positive student behavior.
2. Behavior interventionist will provide teachers with training on classroom intervention strategies to promote positive student behavior
3. School will host parent nights including Open House, College Awareness, Testing Information, and Transition Nights
4. Participate in Community Organizations such as Chamber of Commerce & Rotary Club meetings
5. Participate in district-wide Academy Showcase In October to engage with the public about Roosevelt

program

6. School will host two school-based Academy Showcases, one in December and one in April, to engage with the public about Roosevelt programs

7. School will host four School Advisory Council meetings a year inviting any parent and business partner to participate

8. Partner with Polk State College and Southeastern University for college visits

9. A See attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan for any further details on how we plan to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school’s mission and support the needs of students.

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				\$79,033.08
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			1381 - Roosevelt Academy	Title, I Part A		\$2,412.65
			<i>Notes: Purchase of 2 computers for Reading Classroom Achieve 3000 computer-based reading program</i>			
	6400		1381 - Roosevelt Academy	Title, I Part A		\$76,620.43
			<i>Notes: Reading Coach is paid through district Title 1 to train teachers on effective classroom reading strategies</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development				\$79,667.35
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	100-Salaries	1381 - Roosevelt Academy	Title, I Part A		\$79,067.35
			<i>Notes: Behavior Interventionist salary and benefits. Behavior interventionist works with teachers on classroom positive behavior interventions.</i>			
	6120		1381 - Roosevelt Academy	Title, I Part A		\$600.00
			<i>Notes: Postage to mail parent invitations and progress monitoring data to parents.</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:				\$0.00
Total:						\$158,700.43