Polk County Public Schools

Roosevelt 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 22

Positive Culture & Environment 27

Budget to Support Goals 28

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
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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2020-21: No Grade 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade
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 22

Title I Requirements 0

Budget to Support Goals 28

Roosevelt Academy

115 E ST, Lake Wales, FL 33853

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

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)
High School 6-12	No	%

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

School Grades History

Year	2012-13
Grade	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Roosevelt Academy of Leadership & Applied Technology will strive to provide a supportive and caring environment to equip students for success in college and career.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Roosevelt Academy of Leadership & Applied Technology 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kindel, Deborah	Principal	School supervision and school operations
Dooley, John	Assistant Principal	School supervision and school safety
Hansell, Kelly	Instructional Coach	Conducts literacy training for school staff and coaches reading teachers in best practices
Cobb, Tracy	Graduation Coach	Is student success coach monitoring seniors grades and academic credits and provides interventions as needed
Gifford, Michelle	School Counselor	Monitors students academic needs and provides emotional support and interventions to students
Woodford, Tamara	Behavior Specialist	Implements and monitors school-wide PBIS

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

29

Total number of students enrolled at the school

271

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

4

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

5

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	48	36	42	49	39	28	271
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	12	12	16	10	11	0	78
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	11	7	8	0	0	43
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	9	10	0	43
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	2	6	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	20	41	28	28	13	2	145
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	18	30	21	0	0	0	78
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	20	41	28	28	13	2	145

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	36	28	29	41	34	11	0	179

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	4	5	6	0	22

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/24/2021

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	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	
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	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

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	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	
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	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

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					47%	56%		46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains					46%	51%		47%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					37%	42%		39%	44%
Math Achievement					43%	51%		44%	51%
Math Learning Gains					45%	48%		42%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					44%	45%		38%	45%
Science Achievement					58%	68%		65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement					61%	73%		63%	71%

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**
06	2021					
	2019	9%	48%	-39%	54%	-45%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	4%	42%	-38%	52%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
08	2021					
	2019	2%	48%	-46%	56%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
09	2021					
	2019	0%	45%	-45%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
10	2021					
	2019	5%	42%	-37%	53%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2021					
	2019	12%	47%	-35%	55%	-43%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	16%	39%	-23%	54%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
08	2021					
	2019	16%	35%	-19%	46%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2021					
	2019	2%	41%	-39%	48%	-46%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	8%	54%	-46%	67%	-59%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	22%	70%	-48%	71%	-49%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	7%	57%	-50%	70%	-63%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	5%	50%	-45%	61%	-56%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	4%	53%	-49%	57%	-53%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

In the 2020/2021 School Year, STAR Reading & Math was used in Grades 6-11.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	15	13	7
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	16	10
	Students With Disabilities	10	3	3
	English Language Learners	11	10	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14	18	12
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	19	8
	Students With Disabilities	11	12	9
	English Language Learners	22	13	30

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25	25	17
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	25	14
	Students With Disabilities	20	22	12
	English Language Learners	15	15	8
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13	28	13
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	33	18
	Students With Disabilities	6	28	12
	English Language Learners	15	31	31
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30	15	22
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	6	16
	Students With Disabilities	27	14	25
	English Language Learners	35	20	25

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17	18	07
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	9	21
	Students With Disabilities	9	8	13
	English Language Learners	0	10	13
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	23	13
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	22	10
	Students With Disabilities	15	14	4
	English Language Learners	29	38	10
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16	15	5
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	17	8
	Students With Disabilities	14	14	5
	English Language Learners	8	20	9

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13	19	14
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	11	7
	Students With Disabilities	6	15	9
	English Language Learners	0	7	7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	13	12
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	4	8
	Students With Disabilities	0	13	9
	English Language Learners	0	23	31
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	34	17	8
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	13	6
	Students With Disabilities	29	13	6
	English Language Learners	38	22	10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	36	22	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	16	23
	Students With Disabilities	31	17	18
	English Language Learners	37	22	25

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9	12	11
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	13	8
	Students With Disabilities	7	10	8
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5	4	12
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	0	19
	Students With Disabilities	6	5	13
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	34	17	8
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	13	6
	Students With Disabilities	29	13	6
	English Language Learners	38	22	10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	36	22	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	16	23
	Students With Disabilities	31	17	18
	English Language Learners	37	22	25

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13	4	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	100	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	4	5
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	8
	Students With Disabilities	0	4	5
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

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	10	27	28	6	21	52	10	17		96	32
ELL	12	31		5	15			27			
BLK	8	25	10	5	36			15			
HSP	16	28	31	7	16	56	6	19		90	
WHT	17	35	41	13	26	55	19	32		100	38

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
FRL	16	31	41	10	21	63	5	10		94	25
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

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	31
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
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	345
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	93%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	15
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	17
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	30
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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	38
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	32
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?

A trend in the number of students that struggle with reading is evident across grade levels and subgroups. Along with reading, a trend in students scoring below proficiency in math is evident as well.

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

Reading is the greatest need. The school is awarded a state improvement rating based upon student learning gains in reading and math rather than performance levels 1-5. Based upon the 2019 FSA Assessments, 30% learning gains were reported for ELA and 42% for math. For STAR progress monitoring, reading proficiency ranged on average from 11% to 25% for grade levels 6-11 and math proficiency ranged from 12% to 28%.

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

As an alternative school setting, a significant part of the student population has learning needs, particularly in reading and/or math. Student transitions in learning modalities and more frequent schedule changes may have been contributing factors to low performances in progress monitoring. Learning supports may not have been as consistent as expected. Reading and math PLCs focused on data did not meet as regularly as in past years. In semester 1, reading rotations were not consistent in the reading classrooms.
Actions to address the need for improvement:
1. Regularly scheduled reading and math PLCs that focus on student progress data and instructional strategies.
2. Implementation of reading rotations in reading classrooms with fidelity.
3. Implementation of ACHIEVE 3000 in all reading classrooms with fidelity.
4. The use of weekly common assessments in ELA and math classrooms.
5. Quarterly teacher/administrative data chats

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

Based on STAR Math progress monitoring data, 7th grade math showed the most improvement from an average of 13% in the Fall to an average 28% proficiency in the Winter test administration.

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

One possible contributing factor is the weekly student reflections in 7th grade math.
Students in 7th grade math used journals to record reflections on their learning each week.

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

1. Regular dialogue about student data by students, teachers, and administration
2. Teacher common planning for target-task alignment
3. Consistent Integration of reading & writing in all content areas
4. School-wide focus on implementing student engagement strategies

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.

1. Student Engagement Strategies, particularly higher order questioning
2. Using Formative Assessments
3. Quick Writing Activities for all content

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

Classroom walkthroughs with a focus on school-wide student engagement strategies
Coaching and modeling as needed by instructional coach
Development of model classrooms for observation of best practices
Administrative feedback to teachers on classroom observations

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reading is the greatest need. The school is awarded a state improvement rating based upon student learning gains in reading and math rather than performance levels 1-5. Based upon the 2019 FSA Assessments, 30% learning gains were reported for ELA . For STAR progress monitoring, reading proficiency ranged on average from 11% to 25% for grade levels 6-11.
Measurable Outcome:	On the 2022 FSA ELA, increase reading learning gains by 5% from the 2021 FSA ELA learning gains performance level.
Monitoring:	Results of weekly common assessments. Quarterly Administrative/Language Arts Data Chats Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs Evidence from weekly PLCs
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	John Dooley (john.dooley@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Weekly Language Arts PLCs focused on standards alignment and common assessments 2. School-wide incorporation of content reading/writing 3. School-wide implementation of priority student engagement strategies (i.e. student content dialogue, small groups, partner talk, technology use, reciprocal teaching)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. To ensure that a focus is placed on participation by all students at higher levels as indicated by the standards. Provides consistency in how students are assessed and monitored. Promotes teacher dialogue about content and student achievement. 2. The integration of reading and writing deepens student comprehension of content and encourages writing as a communication tool. 3. Active engagement with content increases the likelihood of students learning concepts.

Action Steps to Implement	
1. Develop weekly common assessments in PLCs	
Person Responsible	Kelly Hansell (kelly.hansell@polk-fl.net)
2. Review data from common assessments twice monthly in PLCs	
Person Responsible	John Dooley (john.dooley@polk-fl.net)
3. Implement reading remediation through small groups	
Person Responsible	Kelly Hansell (kelly.hansell@polk-fl.net)
4. Conduct Administrative/Teacher Data Chats	
Person Responsible	Deborah Kindel (deborah.kindel@polk-fl.net)
5. Implement teacher professional development on student engagement strategies	

Person Responsible	Deborah Kindel (deborah.kindel@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math is important academically and as a life skill. The school is awarded a state improvement rating based upon student learning gains in math rather than performance levels 1-5. Based upon the 2019 FSA Assessments, learning gains for math was 42%. For STAR progress monitoring, math proficiency ranged from 12% to 28%.
Measurable Outcome:	On the 2022 FSA math, increase math learning gains by 5% from the 2021 FSA ELA learning gains performance level.
Monitoring:	Results of weekly formative assessments. Quarterly Administrative/Language Arts Data Chats Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs Evidence from weekly PLCs
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deborah Kindel (deborah.kindel@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Weekly math PLCs focused on standards alignment and formative assessments 2. Develop student math literacy skills to increase problem solving ability 3. School-wide implementation of priority student engagement strategies (i.e. student content dialogue, small groups, partner talk, technology use, reciprocal teaching)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. To ensure that the focus of achievement is participation by all students at higher levels. Provides consistency in how students are assessed and monitored. Promotes teacher dialogue about content and student achievement. 2. Reading math content and word problems is important in students analyzing and processing math concepts. 3. Active engagement with content increases the likelihood of students learning concepts.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop weekly common assessments in PLCs

Person Responsible	Kelly Hansell (kelly.hansell@polk-fl.net)

2. Review data from weekly formative assessments twice monthly in PLCs

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

3. Train teachers on literacy strategies for reading math problems in math PLCs

Person Responsible	Kelly Hansell (kelly.hansell@polk-fl.net)

4. Conduct Administrative/Teacher Data Chats

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

5. Implement teacher professional development on student engagement strategies

Person Responsible	Deborah Kindel (deborah.kindel@polk-fl.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	70% of the student population is labeled as ESE while the remaining 30% is labeled as regular education students. Also a significant portion of the population has not been academically successful at previous schools and are considered struggling learners. Teaching to the level of the Florida Standards has been a learning curve for teachers in regard to a general perspective of ESE students' potential. Also, some of the ESE students do not have high expectations for their own success in school. Thus, raising expectations for students by all staff promotes a culture of high expectations for students to achieve at their greatest potential.
Measurable Outcome:	1. The number of student participating in advanced coursework 2. The number of students earning A's and B's each quarter 3. The number of seniors accepted into post-secondary programs or career fields
Monitoring:	1. Focus enrollment data will be used each semester to determine the number of students participating into advanced classes 2. Focus grade data will be used each quarter to review student grades 3. Senior end of year intent forms will provide data on those applying to college, technical schools, military, or jobs
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deborah Kindel (deborah.kindel@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Implementation of advanced courses for grades 6-12 in Language Arts, math, science and social studies 2. Implementation of district course progression along with student option for placement into advanced coursework 3. Review data with staff to affirm student progress or initiate additional academic supports for students 4. Communicate student academic success through celebrations such as "shout outs" on email and intercom 5. Conduct a book study "Becoming a Growth Mindset School" with teachers
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1 .Access to accelerated curriculum should be equitable for all students 2. Establishing guidelines for student placement into courses provides consistency as well as providing for student choice 3. Reviewing data determines any needed changes to student placement and if additional academic supports are necessary 4. Celebrating small and large student successes helps to validate for staff and students that higher expectations can be accomplished 5. Engaging teachers in the background and research on a growth mindset will promote dialogue about the connection between mindset and the expectations of students

Action Steps to Implement

1. The principal, guidance counselor, assistant principal, and school student success coach will review the district course progression and develop a written school plan for student placement into advanced courses

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

2. Student data for course placement and grades will be reviewed quarterly by the principal, assistant principal, student success coach, and school academic committee to determine continuation of placement or need for classroom supports

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

3. Weekly emails and morning announcements along with quarterly assemblies will be used to celebrate students' academic success

Person Responsible	Deborah Kindel (deborah.kindel@polk-fl.net)

4. A book study of "Becoming a Growth Mindset School" will be implemented as professional development with teachers

Person Responsible	Deborah Kindel (deborah.kindel@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

56 of 270 students generated 180 referrals for 2020/2021. From these referrals, there were 62 Out of School Short Term Suspensions, 3 Out of School Long Term Suspensions, 64 In School Suspensions, and 51 other types of interventions such as detentions. These referrals reported 9 fighting without injury, 53 abusive language, 56 disruptive classroom behaviors, and 11 insubordination. In comparison with other middle or high schools either district or state-wide, Roosevelt's incidences of fighting was low. There were no reported incidents of more serious nature such as drugs, battery, or weapons so no comparison was possible across schools. A primary area of school concern are disruptive classroom behaviors, in which students are not complying with classroom/school rules such that instruction can not proceed. For the upcoming school year, a new positive behavior intervention system will be implemented that will be based upon a reward system for appropriate student behaviors in the classroom and other school areas. While a positive intervention system has already been in place, the current system is a bit more labor intensive for teachers and thus not always used consistently. The new system is simpler and places more accountability on the student to track behavior thus should promote more consistent use by teachers. The school culture and environment will be monitored through transparency and communication in several ways. First, staff meetings will occur to introduce the new behavior intervention system and receive feedback to revise as needed. Then, the number of students earning rewards can be monitored in comparison to the number and type of referrals. Each quarter this data can be shared with staff have an understanding of the school-wide progress on improving student behavior. Feedback from staff can be used to progressively improve the behavior system.

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.

Students and staff are recognized as both individuals and school community members through various means during the year. Celebrations and recognitions are an important part of the culture.
For students -
Quarterly award ceremonies are held to recognize students for academic success, efforts, and good citizenship
Birthdays are celebrated daily through school announcements.
A PBIS provides students with reinforcement of appropriate behavior through earning Eagle Bucks to participate in preferred activities
Intercom and email "shout outs" to publicize student accomplishments
Use school website and social media to promote student achievement and activities
For teachers -
Birthdays are celebrated daily through school announcements
Intercom and email "shout outs" to publicize staff accomplishments
Quarterly staff breakfast or luncheons to foster relationships
Book Study for developing a growth mindset to promote positive expectations for school members
Use school website to publicize their accomplishments and programs

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

School administration
Responsible for creating a safe learning environment through PBIS and campus safety drills
Communicating school mission and vision to all stakeholders
Establishing opportunities for students and staff to reach their potential and achieve success
Engage with community to foster partnerships
School Staff
Build relationships with students and families
Communicate expectations of success to students and families
Participate in district and school-based professional development
Students
Adhere to school policies and procedures
Communicate issues to school administration through student government
Build relationships with teachers and staff
Community Groups

Provide students with college and career experiences
Participate and support school career and technical academies
Support meal donations to specifically identified students of low economic status

Part V: Budget

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$600.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5200	510-Supplies	1381 - Roosevelt Academy	General Fund		$600.00
			Notes: Copy paper for teachers to print data reports			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$400.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5200	510-Supplies	1381 - Roosevelt Academy	General Fund		$400.00
			Notes: Scientific calculators to provide student practice in alignment with FSA Math calculator problems			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity**				**$700.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5200	510-Supplies	1381 - Roosevelt Academy	General Fund		$700.00
					Total:	**$1,700.00**