

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Blake High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Blake High School

1701 N BOULEVARD, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Valerie Newton

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	97%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Blake High School

1701 N BOULEVARD, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

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 9-12	No	68%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

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 Hillsborough 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.

Blake High School will provide all students with the knowledge and skills necessary to achieve at the highest level.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Blake High School will partner with students to attain the highest achievement in academics and the arts.

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
Salters, Jesse	Principal	
Dixon, Keisha	Assistant Principal	
Seivwright-Lue, Althea	Teacher, ESE	
Thomas, Duane	Instructional Coach	
Post, Stephanie	Other	
Sandager, Alicia	Teacher, K-12	
Gaskins-Jones, Khadijah	Instructional Coach	
Reid, Claudette	School Counselor	
Sinwich, Lilas	Instructional Coach	
Barrs, Calvin	Attendance/Social Work	
McFarland, Martha	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/24/2020, Valerie Newton

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.*

1

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

93

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	97%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	399	418	397	381	1595	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	138	92	132	470	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	8	8	11	43	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	137	159	119	523	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	131	104	109	455	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	115	112	43	380	

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	9	8	7	10	34	

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	15	0	0	1	16	
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 10/29/2020

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	0	0	0	450	470	436	371	1727	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	101	88	105	383	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	40	22	8	99	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	142	128	94	488	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	118	120	89	492	

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	173	187	174	168	702	

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	4	0	1	4	9
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	0	0	0	450	470	436	371	1727
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	101	88	105	383
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	40	22	8	99
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	142	128	94	488
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	118	120	89	492

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	173	187	174	168	702

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	4	0	1	4	9
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	55%	56%	56%	45%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	54%	51%	43%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	41%	42%	24%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	37%	49%	51%	42%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	39%	48%	48%	40%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	45%	45%	34%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	60%	69%	68%	54%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	75%	73%	72%	74%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	55%	55%	0%	55%	0%
	2018	49%	53%	-4%	53%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	50%	53%	-3%	53%	-3%
	2018	47%	52%	-5%	53%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	66%	-9%	67%	-10%
2018	53%	62%	-9%	65%	-12%
Compare		4%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	73%	-9%	70%	-6%
2018	69%	70%	-1%	68%	1%
Compare		-5%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	20%	63%	-43%	61%	-41%
2018	20%	63%	-43%	62%	-42%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	42%	57%	-15%	57%	-15%
2018	56%	56%	0%	56%	0%
Compare		-14%			

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	14	35	31	18	28	32	35	52		71	15
ELL	14	44	44	7	24	37	23	33		65	25
ASN	85	83									
BLK	37	39	28	25	34	39	43	50		76	28
HSP	52	52	40	32	34	32	58	72		76	50
MUL	61	61		55	53		77	57		100	56
WHT	82	67	47	63	55		87	96		91	62
FRL	38	43	32	27	35	39	47	59		74	34
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	17	35	30	18	26	29	22	44		74	36
ELL	18	34	33	28	29	15	24	33		69	50
ASN	91	40									
BLK	29	40	32	25	34	42	36	55		71	33
HSP	50	48	30	40	38	23	61	73		84	51
MUL	52	44		60	46		59	91		89	76
WHT	80	53		75	50	46	84	90		91	69
FRL	34	40	31	29	34	33	42	61		73	43

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	10	31	28	17	27	26	18	35		63	23
ELL	8	28	27	19	41	40	16	41		46	44
ASN	91	91		67	55						
BLK	24	31	21	25	34	34	33	56		77	41
HSP	45	42	25	46	44	39	54	83		71	54
MUL	42	52		41	29		47	88		94	71
WHT	75	59	36	59	43	26	85	84		90	69
FRL	29	34	24	33	35	33	38	63		71	38

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	550
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	84
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	65
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	72
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	42
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.

Due to COVID Testing Restriction our data remain the same from 2018-2019. Review of our 2018-2019 School Data, shows Algebra 1 FSA as our lowest performing component. Algebra maintained from 2017 to 2018. Compared to the state and district it also had the largest proficiency gap. We are currently 41% points below the state average. We are currently 43% points below the district average. This has been a trend over the last few years.

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

Due to COVID Testing Restriction our data remain the same from 2018-2019. Review of our 2018-2019 School Data, Geometry FSA showed the greatest decline from the previous year. Geometry saw the largest drop from 2018 to 2019 (-14% points). We are currently 15% points below the state average. We are currently 15% points below the district average.

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.

Due to COVID Testing Restriction our data remain the same from 2018-2019. Review of our 2018-2019 School Data, shows Algebra 1 FSA as our lowest performing component. Algebra maintained from 2017 to 2018. Compared to the state and district it also had the largest proficiency gap. We are currently 41% points below the state average. We are currently 43% points below the district average. This has been a trend over the last few years.

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

Due to COVID Testing Restriction our data remain the same from 2018-2019. Review of our 2018-2019 School Data, the largest improvements can be seen within the ELA Proficiency and the ELA Gains . ELA Proficiency increased compared to the 2017-2018 school year by 6% points. ELA Gains increased compared to the 2017-2018 school year by 6% points. Our 9th grade ELA is directly correlated to the state's and district's proficiency percentage at 55%.

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

N/A

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

1. Implement Reading Strategies across all content areas
2. Lesson Planning and Designs using standard aligned activities
3. Increase support and resources to our ELL populations in the areas of academics and behavior
4. Increase support and resources to our ESE populations in the areas of academics and behavior
5. Increase support and resources to our African American populations in the areas of academics and behavior

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Due to COVID Testing Restriction our data remain the same from 2018-2019. Review of our 2018-2019 School Data, the largest achievement gap is within the ELA lowest 25th. We are currently 8% points below the state average. We have increased in this area compared to the 2017-2018 school year by 3% points. We are currently 43% points below the district average. This has been a trend over the last few years. The largest achievement gap is within the ELA Proficiency. We currently show a 68% point differential between our ESE and ELL students and our white students. There's a 45% point differential between our black students and our white students.

Measurable Outcome: On the 2021 School Data we would like to see a 5% increase in all three ELA areas (Proficiency, Lowest 25th, Gains).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jesse Salters (jesse.salters@hcps.net)

Teachers will:
Models, reinforces, or requires the use of reading strategies(chunking, previewing text, marginal text notation, and selective highlighting); Incorporates text in the lesson; Creates and verbalizes learning targets that reference literacy strategies.

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will:
Verbalize which reading strategy they are utilizing during the lesson; Utilizing reading strategies (chunking, previewing text, marginal text notation, and selective highlighting); Use text in EVERY lesson; Engaged in text dependent activities.

Environment will:
Utilized text and aligned to curriculum (culturally/socially relevant as needed). Reference literacy strategies in the learning targets

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide faculty with more in depth knowledge around literacy standards.
2. Create and implement school-wide walk through plan and trainings around reading strategies.
3. Have meeting with the faculty to review school data for specific target groups around literacy standards.
4. Work with PLC to facilitate data driven decisions around the standards and instructional priorities.
5. Design/Implementing Professional Development for teachers based on observation data, & School Data.
6. Conduct book studies with faculty on the books Two Backpacks & This is Real Talk

Person Responsible Jesse Salters (jesse.salters@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Due to COVID Testing Restriction our data remain the same from 2018-2019. School Data shows Geometry with the largest drop from 2018 to 2019 (-14% points). Algebra 1 FSA as our lowest performing component. Algebra maintained from 2017 to 2018. Compared to the state and district it also had the largest proficiency gap. We are currently 41% points below the state average. We are currently 43% points below the district average. This has been a trend over the last few years. The largest achievement gap is within the ELA Proficiency. We currently show a 68% point differential between our ESE and ELL students and our white students. There's a 45% point differential between our black students and our white students. US History shows a 5% point dip this year. Biology has shown a variances in the last 3 years, this current year show an increase of 6% points, but we still fail below the district (-9%) and State (-10%).

Measurable Outcome:

On the 2021 School Data we would like to see a 5% increase in all four areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will:

Uses a variety of formative assessments to the complexity level of the learning targets; Refers to the learning target throughout the lesson; Explain the what, why and how of the lesson/learning target in a student-friendly version.

Students will:

Work on different tasks towards mastery of the days learning target; Verbalize the what, why, and how of the learning target; Engaged in challenging and complex activities which require thinking aligned with the standard and students engaged in a productive struggle (rigor).

Environment will:

Have posted learning targets that are aligned to standards complexity level; Utilize small group instruction, student-centered coaching, and/or differentiated instruction is provided based on student mastering of the learning target.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide faculty with more in depth knowledge around content standards and cognitive complexity.
2. Create and implement school-wide walk through plan and trainings around content standards and cognitive complexity.
3. Have meeting with the faculty to review school data for specific target groups around content standards and cognitive complexity.
4. Work with PLC to facilitate data driven decisions around the standards and instructional priorities.
5. Design/Implementing Professional Development for teachers based on observation data & School

Data.

6. Provide introductory training with faculty on the book Jim Burke's Academic Moves

Person
Responsible Jesse Salters (jesse.salters@hcps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our African American students with Disabilities are 1.55 times more likely to receive an office referral because there is a lack of positive relationships among all stakeholders (students, teachers, and families). If we increase the awareness or acknowledgement of cultural differences it will allow us to build the relationships, which would alleviate the reason to skip class.

Measurable Outcome: We expect to see at least a 50% reduction in the rate of skipping.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Althea Seivwright-Lue (althea.seivwright-lue@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Specific trainings about how to build personal, culturally, socially, and educationally relevant interactions with students (authentic interactions lead to authentic relationships)
- Teach the why, how, and what behind those interactions

Teachers are unaware of the cultural and social economic statuses of student population (implicit bias), and teachers do not have the skills and knowledge of how to build positive relationships with students that are culturally, socially, and educationally relevant which leads to a disconnect with the student and their respective class and/or teacher(s).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

- Our focus groups report that teachers do not try to get to know students and/or do not know them.
- Parents/Students report that they do not have a relationship with teacher or that they have not heard from the teachers.
- Students report that they lack relationships with their teachers and report that the teachers do not care about them.

Action Steps to Implement

Initial Steps (Tier 1):

- Positive morning greetings to students (Tier 1), via either personal/face-to-face greetings and/or whole-school announcements
- Positive referrals for each student (Tier 1) during pre-set timeframes (positive phone calls, text messages, emails, social media posts, etc.)
- 'Award Walls' in a high-traffic area/cafeteria to commemorate traditional and magnet student successes ("Who's Buzzin'")
- Students use QR Codes (posted around school) to nominate teachers/administrators/staff that made them feel 'special' that day (use it as a contest for teachers to amplify their positive comments and interactions with students)
- Mid- and end-of-quarter student-to-teacher evaluations for the course (with questions which help the student and teacher identify best practices, improvement strategies, etc.)
- Implementation of "Train up First" (TUF) Program for student use
- Faculty book study to aid in building student-to-faculty relationships (Do You Know Enough About Me to Teach Me: A Student's Perspective, by Stephen G. Peters [2006]; ISBN: 097900280X)
- Student book study to aid in building relationships (Dear Martin, by Nic Stone [2018]; ISBN: 1101939524)
- Faculty Incentives for participation

Follow-Up Steps (Tier 2):

The RTI-B facilitator will triage meetings for Tier 2 behavior targeting students with 5 or more out of school suspensions (OOS). This facilitator will also maintain the CCEIS triage database for the targeted students who received OOS. As a priority, the RTI-B facilitator will also monitor students referred to RTI/FBA and help to establish mentoring programs and outreach. This individual will not only mentor students (with use of 'behavioral support push-in' methods to mentor and model to faculty positive behavioral options), he or she will also utilize a check in system embedded for intervention purposes. A variety of Professional Development will be offered to the teachers on relationship building and how to relate to students. Facilitating training will be based on those needs, introducing plans for teachers to utilize best practices. An Implicit Bias training will be offered during preplanning prior to students' return, and teachers will also be trained on Insights for Behavior to understand the functionality of students' behavior. Job embedded professional development will be offered monthly as follow up throughout the school year. We will also implement Social Emotional Learning skills for students; therefore, funding will be needed to implement a "Train up First" (TUF) Program at our school site that will service our Tier 2 students. Additional funding will be needed to set up a program called, "The Jacket's Nest" (an alternative to ISS) where students will continue to receive instruction and support upon receipt of a consequence that does not require a student to be sent home (Technology - hardware & software). We will require at least 10 laptops for students to receive instruction virtually on campus. We would also require some funds to introduce some incentive programs, which will be used to host movie nights/days, "The Breakfast Club" (morning meetings), special food, treats, offer mentoring programs, and develop a system that would allow students to be rewarded for good behavior and improved behavior.

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.

N/A

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.

Initial Steps (Tier 1):

- Positive morning greetings to students (Tier 1), via either personal/face-to-face greetings and/or whole-

school announcements

- Positive referrals for each student (Tier 1) during pre-set timeframes (positive phone calls, text messages, emails, social media posts, etc.)
- ‘Award Walls’ in a high-traffic area/cafeteria to commemorate traditional and magnet student successes (“Who’s Buzzin”)
- Students use QR Codes (posted around school) to nominate teachers/administrators/staff that made them feel ‘special’ that day (use it as a contest for teachers to amplify their positive comments and interactions with students)
- Mid- and end-of-quarter student-to-teacher evaluations for the course (with questions which help the student and teacher identify best practices, improvement strategies, etc.)
- Implementation of “Train up First” (TUF) Program for student use
- Faculty book study to aid in building student-to-faculty relationships (Do You Know Enough About Me to Teach Me: A Student’s Perspective, by Stephen G. Peters [2006]; ISBN: 097900280X)
- Student book study to aid in building relationships (Dear Martin, by Nic Stone [2018]; ISBN: 1101939524)
- Faculty Incentives for participation

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: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00