Lake Wales Charter Schools

Edward W Bok Academy North



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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Edward W Bok Academy North

401 N 4TH STREET, Lake Wales, FL 33853

www.bokacademy.org

Demographics

Principal: Donna Drisdom

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	70%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2020-21: C (41%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info	ormation*
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

N/A

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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Edward W Bok Academy North

401 N 4TH STREET, Lake Wales, FL 33853

www.bokacademy.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School	Vaa	F70/

6-8

Yes

57%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	48%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	С	С	С

School Board Approval

N/A

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 noncharter 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.

Edward W. Bok North will create and educate critical thinkers for the digital age.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Edward W. Bok North's curriculum will provide a global perspective, an ethos of service, and a keen understanding of the digital world and the exposure to the integration of the nature of knowledge and life.

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
Drisdom, Donna	Principal	The duties and responsibilities of the Principal include but are not limited to creating a welcoming climate and culture that markets and promotes school and district programs by promoting student, parent and community involvement. Directs curriculum and instruction as well as provide enrichment and interventions through the differentiation of instruction for all students. The principal maintains the overall site operations, receiving, distributing and communicates information to enforce school, district and state policies while maintaining safety of the school environment; coordinates school activities, communicate information to staff as deemed appropriate. Moreover, the principal addresses situations and problems and/or conflicts that may negatively impact the school. She works as an advocate for all stakeholders within the school and school's community to be a positive change agent.
	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Donna Drisdom

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.

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

10

Total number of students enrolled at the school

200

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

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

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		
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	206	187	0	0	0	0	558
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/22/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level											Total		
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	219	191	183	0	0	0	0	593
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	19	21	21	0	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	19	28	0	0	0	0	71

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

Indiantos							Grad	le Lev	⁄el					Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	129	131	0	0	0	0	405

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total			
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	219	191	183	0	0	0	0	593
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	19	21	21	0	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	19	28	0	0	0	0	71

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

Indiantos	Grade Level										Total			
Indicator		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	129	131	0	0	0	0	405

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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 Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	53%			62%		54%			53%
ELA Learning Gains	44%			56%		54%			54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	28%			54%		47%			47%
Math Achievement	44%			65%		58%			58%
Math Learning Gains	22%			48%		57%			57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	19%			33%		51%			51%
Science Achievement	43%					51%	·	·	52%
Social Studies Achievement	58%					72%			72%

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	62%			54%	8%
Cohort Co	mparison					
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Co	mparison	-62%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Co	mparison	0%			•	

	MATH											
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison						
06	2021											
	2019	65%			55%	10%						
Cohort Con	nparison											

	MATH											
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison						
07	2021											
	2019											
Cohort Com	parison	-65%										
08	2021											
	2019											
Cohort Com	nparison	0%										

	SCIENCE											
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison						
08	2021											
	2019											
Cohort Com	nparison											

		BIOLO	OGY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
		CIVI	CS EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
•		HISTO	ORY EOC	•	
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
		ALGEI	BRA EOC	'	
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
		GEOME	TRY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

		Grade 6		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	47	54	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	40	67	

		Grade 7		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	46	34	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	56	72	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

		Grade 8		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	43	44	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	61	78	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	17	48	

Subgroup Data Review

		2021	SCHOO	OL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	19	29	30	21	28	24	8	43			
ELL	31	40	38	23	22	15	13	29	20		
ASN	71	50		57	25						
BLK	26	29	19	20	10	9	23	28	36		
HSP	46	41	32	35	19	15	36	40	60		
MUL	48	40		36	19						
WHT	63	50	31	56	27	36	52	78	55		
FRL	43	38	28	37	21	19	28	49	52		
		2019	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	29	57		14	21						
ELL	29	41		35	25						

		2019	SCHO	DL GRAD	E COMP	PONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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
BLK	48	44		45	41	25					
HSP	60	66	47	60	38	23					
MUL	45	45		55	45						
WHT	68	58	67	74	54	43					
FRL	50	53	56	50	41	28					
		2018	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMP	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	405
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	27
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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

Native American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	51
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	22
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	36
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	36
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% Economically Disadvantaged Students	
<u> </u>	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students	34 YES

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?

The students within low socio-economic and those who receive accommodations are not emerging with their peers who are making learning gains. Though students did not make gains across the spectrum, the students were able to perform well enough to maintain the school's grade of "C". The impact of COVID-19 lent itself to stretch instructors to go outside of the box of the classroom to build relationships with students and parents as well as expand the way in which instruction was given.

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

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

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

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

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.

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

Edward W Bok Academy North as compared to other Middle/Junior High Schools within the state, ranked #17 out of 553 which is a very low ranking in the area of discipline. The school reported 0.5 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the Statewide middle/junior school rate of 4.2 incidents per 100 students. The school ranked in the very low area in all areas of incidents. The school reported .024 incidents which is one incident that ranked in this particular category. There were no property incidents, and very low in the drug/public order incidents reporting only one. Reported suspensions were 7.8 per 100 students as compared to the state range of 72.3. The overall culture of the school is based on building a culture of mutual respect from staff, students and parents. The school spends a majority of its time at the beginning of the year of building a culture of respect by using the 55 Essentials. These 55 Essentials are the basic premises of treating people as you would like to be treated, with common courtesy. These lessons are not just for school, but will prove the students well throughout the remainder of their lives.

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.

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

Part V: Budget

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

Total: \$0.00

Last Modified: 4/10/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 18 of 18