

Polk County Public Schools

Rosabelle W. Blake Academy



2021-22 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	21
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	24

Rosabelle W. Blake Academy

510 HARTSELL AVE, Lakeland, FL 33815

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

Demographics

Principal: Ava Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Rosabelle W. Blake Academy

510 HARTSELL AVE, Lakeland, FL 33815

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Blake Academy is to be a premier learning organization that provides all scholars with an academic foundation for success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Richardson, Myra	Principal	To be the primary instructional leader and provide a safe learning environment for all scholars and stakeholders.
Cummings, Albert	Assistant Principal	To ensure that all instructors are able to provide impeccable instruction. To create and cultivate positive school culture and climate.
Kieffer, Rayna	Assistant Principal	To ensure that all instructors are able to provide impeccable instruction. To create and cultivate positive school culture and climate.
Graham , Maude	Instructional Coach	Provide goal-oriented guidance and steps to success, as well as encourage active participation for all scholars and instructors.
Hutchins, Katrina	Math Coach	Provide goal-oriented guidance and steps to success, as well as encourage active participation for all scholars and instructors.
Wiersema, Brett	Science Coach	Provide goal-oriented guidance and steps to success, as well as encourage active participation for all scholars and instructors.
Jones, Fabriene	School Counselor	Provide MTSS support for academics and behavior to all scholars, instructors, and stakeholders.
Bennett, Jasmar	Other	Ensure campus compliance with federal, state, and district requirements for funding and testing.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Ava Brown

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

0

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

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Total number of students enrolled at the school

686

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

17

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	61	63	79	72	62	69	78	115	87	0	0	0	0	686
Attendance below 90 percent	0	13	9	5	10	4	12	9	5	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	3	4	3	10	5	27	18	15	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	24	11	11	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	35	16	27	0	0	0	0	85
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	18	19	18	17	47	32	27	0	0	0	0	182

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	4	10	5	12	24	58	39	41	0	0	0	0	193	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/8/2021

2020-21 - 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	72	70	70	75	57	65	94	87	85	0	0	0	0	675	
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	4	10	5	5	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	50	
One or more suspensions	10	12	20	13	15	23	34	29	24	0	0	0	0	180	
Course failure in ELA	2	2	12	16	1	2	8	17	4	0	0	0	0	64	
Course failure in Math	20	3	0	6	10	1	16	12	3	0	0	0	0	71	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	4	14	12	11	19	0	0	0	0	66	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	6	27	20	28	15	0	0	0	0	100	
Dec. 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	7	15	21	17	22	15	20	14	0	0	0	0	131	
Dec. 2019 STAR Mathematics Level 1	0	17	28	21	27	21	29	23	10	0	0	0	0	176	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - 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	72	70	70	75	57	65	94	87	85	0	0	0	0	675	
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	4	10	5	5	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	50	
One or more suspensions	10	12	20	13	15	23	34	29	24	0	0	0	0	180	
Course failure in ELA	2	2	12	16	1	2	8	17	4	0	0	0	0	64	
Course failure in Math	20	3	0	6	10	1	16	12	3	0	0	0	0	71	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	4	14	12	11	19	0	0	0	0	66	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	6	27	20	28	15	0	0	0	0	100	
Dec. 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	7	15	21	17	22	15	20	14	0	0	0	0	131	
Dec. 2019 STAR Mathematics Level 1	0	17	28	21	27	21	29	23	10	0	0	0	0	176	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				53%	61%	61%	53%	54%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	58%	59%	46%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	49%	54%	41%	46%	52%
Math Achievement				55%	61%	62%	54%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains				52%	56%	59%	51%	54%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	52%	52%	46%	51%	52%
Science Achievement				43%	52%	56%	43%	48%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				76%	79%	78%	96%	85%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	52%	52%	0%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	46%	48%	-2%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	47%	8%	56%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
06	2021					
	2019	54%	48%	6%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
07	2021					
	2019	56%	42%	14%	52%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2021					
	2019	49%	48%	1%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	57%	56%	1%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	29%	56%	-27%	64%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	51%	-5%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
06	2021					
	2019	46%	47%	-1%	55%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
07	2021					
	2019	58%	39%	19%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
08	2021					
	2019	63%	35%	28%	46%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	45%	45%	0%	53%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	42%	41%	1%	48%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	75%	70%	5%	71%	4%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	89%	50%	39%	61%	28%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

STAR Early Lit
 STAR Reading
 Science quarterlies
 Civic quarterlies

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	55	86	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	80	69
	Students With Disabilities	38	63	25
	English Language Learners	25	100	75
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	77	79	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	74	73	59
	Students With Disabilities	50	50	25
	English Language Learners	50	67	50
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	77	71	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	68	69	47
	Students With Disabilities	33	-	20
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	53	72	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	75	68
	Students With Disabilities	50	40	33
	English Language Learners	-	-	-

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52	47	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	41	33
	Students With Disabilities	25	17	33
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	58	65	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	58	53
	Students With Disabilities	40	50	33
	English Language Learners	67	33	33
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53	51	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	43	40
	Students With Disabilities	33	-	-
	English Language Learners	33	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	50	69	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	68	51
	Students With Disabilities	-	25	-
	English Language Learners	-	67	33

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33	31	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	20	30
	Students With Disabilities	-	-	-
	English Language Learners	20	40	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29	28	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	23	24
	Students With Disabilities	-	-	-
	English Language Learners		20	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	31	25	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	19	31
	Students With Disabilities	17	-	-
	English Language Learners	29	26	30
Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52	53	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	38	38
	Students With Disabilities	14	22	11
	English Language Learners	44	57	56
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	46	43	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	33	34
	Students With Disabilities	25	22	11
	English Language Learners	-	-	11

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52	52	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	32	24
	Students With Disabilities	-	25	-
	English Language Learners	33	20	33
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50	52	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	26	26
	Students With Disabilities	25	25	25
	English Language Learners	17	20	33
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	71	43	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	62	30	45
	Students With Disabilities	50	14	29
	English Language Learners	70	46	58

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56	57	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	45	49
	Students With Disabilities	17	17	-
	English Language Learners	17	43	14
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40	65	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	61	52
	Students With Disabilities	-	-	33
	English Language Learners	17	29	43
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60	43	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	-	35	37
	Students With Disabilities	-	7	33
	English Language Learners	50	40	54

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	12	19	20	9	12	18					
ELL	27	33	18	21	37		18				
BLK	28	29	17	30	34	23	21	67	57		
HSP	44	47	35	38	46	45	32	63	74		
MUL	53	33		60	50						
WHT	51	42	35	61	51	84	32	79	90		
FRL	32	32	23	36	38	33	18	65	70		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	11	50	55	7	44	45		10			
ELL	30	65		35	59						
BLK	40	38	36	43	44	45	22	66	62		

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
HSP	54	62	64	51	54	52	45	76	85		
MUL	57	36		71	55						
WHT	63	59	48	69	57	48	55	81	63		
FRL	43	47	43	46	45	39	38	69	69		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	14	27	30	11	37	37	45				
ELL	22	35		35	46	50					
BLK	45	44	39	44	45	34	29		77		
HSP	53	46	41	53	53	58	41	100	78		
MUL	31	29		31	23						
WHT	61	49	48	64	58	55	56	96	63		
FRL	46	43	38	49	48	38	36	97	75		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	409
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	13
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	26
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	49
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Students with disabilities and Black students continue to decline in academic proficiency in all content areas.

Science proficiency remains constant; however, 43% is lower than state and district averages.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Students with disabilities in all content areas and Science proficiency demonstrate the greatest needs for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

There was a lack of collaboration between ESE and core content teachers. This limited their ability to plan and deliver effective instruction to ESE students.

There was also a lack of focus on science content in primary grade levels.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELL students showed the most improvements growing from 35% to 65% ELA learning gains.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

During this time frame, we were afforded an ELL paraprofessional to assist teachers with instructional needs.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Teachers will implement best practices in order to improve core instruction. Additionally, intentional science focus in primary grade levels and small group instruction will extend and accelerate student achievement.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

To improve critical thinking and MTSS, we will revisit LSI strategies and best practices.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

The addition of a science coach, an ESOL para and intentional focus on instructional delivery in PLC meetings.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 2018-2019 data reveals that students with disabilities are underperforming their peers at an alarming rate. In 2018, 14% of SWD students were proficient in ELA and 11% were proficient in math. In 2019, there was a 3% decrease in ELA and 4% decrease in math.

Measurable Outcome: Blake Academy will improve the SWD federal index by 15%.

Monitoring:

1. Identify all SWD using Focus and Enrich.
2. Progress monitor using STAR and quarterlies.
3. Implement appropriate strategies for remediation
 - a. MTSS
 - b. Pack time
4. Establish a pull out program (3-8).

The desired outcome will be an understanding of where students are and what it takes to move each of them individually. Then, upon implementation of the differentiated instruction, SWD should improve academically in each content area.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Albert Cummings (albert.cummings@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Data analysis for differentiated small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Each student is a unique individual; therefore, instruction should be customized to meet their needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professionally develop Reading and Math teachers to plan and implement small group instruction.
2. Provide teachers with an in-service on how to pull data from Renaissance.
3. STAR test and campus based common assessments for all SWD.
4. Analyze and review data.
5. Develop small groups and create differentiated lessons for PACK time.
6. Repeat

Person Responsible: Rayna Kieffer (rayna.kieffer@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on current data (2021 FSA), student proficiency of standards in all content areas (excluding the accelerated courses) have a negative trajectory. decreased 15%. Additionally, science proficiency remains consistently subpar at 43%.

Measurable Outcome: Blake Academy plans to achieve a 30 percentage point increase in science proficiency, 15 percentage point increase in ELA proficiency, and 10 percentage point increase in Math.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through review of STAR data, quarterlies, grades, and walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Myra Richardson (myra.richardson@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Target to Task alignment and effective use of success criteria are strategies used for this area of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: When used with fidelity, target to task alignment and effective use of success criteria increases student mastery of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professionally develop teachers to use LSI strategies in their instructional delivery
2. Review and analysis of STAR and quarterlies.
3. Collaborative PLCs with teachers, coaches, and admin.
4. Walkthroughs, coaching cycles, and modeling.
5. Analysis of student work.
6. Observation of impeccable delivery.
7. Analysis of student work.
8. Timely feedback from coaching sessions

Person Responsible Myra Richardson (myra.richardson@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	
Description and Rationale:	Based on current data (2021 FSA), student proficiency in grades 3 - 5 ELA is less than 35% proficient (mean percent of 3 grades). Student proficiency in grades 6 - 8 is also less than 45% in ELA (mean percent of 3 grades).
Measurable Outcome:	Blake Academy will improve Reading achievement by 7% in each grade level.
Monitoring:	We will monitor this growth through formative assessments (STAR Renaissance), walkthroughs, AR data and MTSS data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Myra Richardson (myra.richardson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Accelerated Reader (AR) Small Group Instruction/MTSS Grade level Text Phonemic Awareness.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Student will read 20 minutes per day and be allowed to demonstrate comprehension using Accelerated Reader (AR). Student performing at 85% proficiency who meet their point goal are projected to be proficient on FSA. Using AR also builds stamina concerning lengthy reading passages which will also improve student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.SafeSchoolsforAlex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Based on 2019 data, Blake is ranked 301 out 313 combination schools concerning discipline. Our rank within the district is "Very High" at 6 out of 6. Our primary concern is to improve Positive Behavior Intervention System to decrease our disruptive behavior.

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.

1. Parents and community partners will be invited to our campus at least once a month to partner in the education of our students.
2. Weekly positive posts will be made to our social media sites and on our marquee.
3. Blake will host schoolwide activities that promote positive participation from all students, parents, and community partners.
4. Blake will have open, transparent, and timely communication with our student, parents, and community.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

1. Staff Members- open, transparent, and timely communication
2. Students- take pride and promote positive participation in academics and school functions
3. Parents- actively engage in campus activities in a positive manner
4. Community Members- actively engage in campus activities in a positive manner
5. Volunteers - aid and assist teachers with all academic and cultural obligations in a positive manner

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00