Rosabelle W. Blake Academy

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Rosabelle W. Blake Academy

510 HARTSELL AVE, Lakeland, FL 33815

http://www.blakeacademy.com/

Demographics

Principal: Ava Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI
* 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

Rosabelle W. Blake Academy

510 HARTSELL AVE, Lakeland, FL 33815

http://www.blakeacademy.com/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 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	73%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brown, Ava	Principal	
Kieffer, Rayna	Assistant Principal	
Cox, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	
Pion, Debra	Math Coach	
Wiersema, Brett	Science Coach	
Denney, Elizabeth	Reading Coach	
Hammond, Clarence	Dean	
Towles, Vernisa	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/1/2022, Ava Brown

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*
8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
52

Total number of students enrolled at the school
625

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	65	50	72	59	51	63	77	98	66	0	0	0	0	601
Attendance below 90 percent	17	15	20	15	17	11	10	19	8	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	13	5	14	14	19	23	29	37	21	0	0	0	0	175
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	6	20	29	25	22	0	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	13	20	34	38	30	0	0	0	0	144
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	47	33	41	15	13	8	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	165

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	9	10	18	9	24	29	37	42	23	0	0	0	0	201

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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
Tuesday 7/12/2022

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	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

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	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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	45%	51%	55%				53%	61%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	54%						52%	58%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						47%	49%	54%
Math Achievement	38%	37%	42%				55%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	36%						52%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						49%	52%	52%
Science Achievement	35%	48%	54%				43%	52%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	85%	53%	59%				76%	79%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	52%	52%	0%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	46%	48%	-2%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	55%	47%	8%	56%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
06	2022					
	2019	54%	48%	6%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
07	2022					
	2019	56%	42%	14%	52%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2022					
	2019	49%	48%	1%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	57%	56%	1%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	29%	56%	-27%	64%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	51%	-5%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
06	2022					
	2019	46%	47%	-1%	55%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
07	2022					
	2019	58%	39%	19%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
08	2022					
	2019	63%	35%	28%	46%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	45%	45%	0%	53%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	42%	41%	1%	48%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	75%	70%	5%	71%	4%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	89%	50%	39%	61%	28%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	15	35	36	15	26	30					
ELL	26	50	53	13	24	27	18				
BLK	34	47	39	28	33	31	20	76	43		
HSP	46	51	62	36	41	38	34	76			
MUL	69	64		46	55						
WHT	61	65	76	53	34	50	56	97	77		
FRL	40	52	52	32	34	36	25	81	52		

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		
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	517
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Language Arts scores improved across all grade levels in overall proficiency, overall learning gains, and learning gains for the bottom quartile. Science proficiency increased by 7%. Math learning gains for the bottom quartile increased slightly. Math overall proficiency and overall learning gains saw a decrease.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math overall proficiency was low in all grade levels, including Algebra. Math Learning Gains were also low in all grade levels.

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 high level of teacher absenteeism for and teacher vacancies in the math department. In order to address these learning deficiencies, students in Algebra will be be scheduled into a double math block to include foundational skills and algebra content. Students in grades 6 and 7 who were high level 2s will also be placed in a foundational math skills course in order to boost their scores to passing. Small groups will also be pulled for interventions for level 1 students in 7th grade.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Language Arts showed the greatest level of improvement in overall proficiency, overall learning gains, and learning gains for the bottom quartile.

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

The Language Arts schedule allowed for each core Language Arts teacher to provide instruction in foundational reading skills, rather than have one teacher teach all sections of foundational reading. This change had an enormous impact on overall learning gains and learning gains for the bottom quartile.

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

Rather than have one reading coach for all grades K-8, Blake will now employ two reading coaches. One coach will focus on grades K-5 and the other will focus on grades 6-8 in order to ensure that teachers are equally supported.

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.

Teachers will complete a book study using Doug Lemov's Teach Like a Champion 3.0. Teachers will also complete professional development using the Learning Arc to create alignment between learning targets and instructional tasks.

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

To ensure sustainability of improvement, a dean has been added to the staff so that Administrators can focus on instruction. After school tutoring will have more structure that will allow for tutoring to be more consistent across all tested grade levels.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to PBIS	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The number of office referrals is just over 800, indicating that student behavior needs improvement.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The goal is to reduce the number of referrals by 25%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The area of focus will be monitored through the RtI:B system and the monthly discipline reports.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Clarence Hammond (clarence.hammond@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The PBIS system is being revamped and streamlined. Students will earn daily points that will accumulate toward a monthly (for elementary) or quarterly (for middle school) reward. Discipline infractions will also be monitored through the RtI:B systems when students do not meet the school-wide expectations. Parents will be notified of these infractions using an infraction card that goes home daily as well as through the Class Dojo app. The Class Dojo app will also be utilized to inform parents of positive choices that students are making throughout the day. Teachers will report to Administration the number of students from their homeroom class that have earned the reward.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this strategy is that students need to clearly understand school-wide expectations and be rewarded for meeting them so that they remain motivated behaviorally. By streamlining the PBIS system, consistency across campus can be monitored and therefore behavior will improve and referrals will be reduced.

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will need to be trained on how to enter major and minor infractions into the RtI:B system as well as how to utilize the infraction care with parents. All teachers will also need to have a Class Dojo account set up and active for the year.

Person Responsible   Clarence Hammond (clarence.hammond@polk-fl.net)

The Rti:B system will need to be monitored to determine if the number of referrals and discipline incidents is being reduced.

Person Responsible   Clarence Hammond (clarence.hammond@polk-fl.net)

The number of students who are earning the monthly and quarterly rewards will need to be monitored by Administration to determine if the point system and rewards are effective with students.

Person Responsible   Elizabeth Cox (elizabeth.cox@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	In previous years, students with disabilities, have had a lower level of proficiency according to ESSA analysis (28%).
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	We will increase the level of proficiency for students with disabilities by 15% using the ESSA index.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	This area will be monitored through regular data analysis of current ESE students as well as data analysis of all other student demographics in order to identify students who need to be a part of the MTSS process.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Following each progress monitoring window, data (both of ESE and the general population) will be analyzed in order to determine which students would benefit from the MTSS process. The Leadership Team will assist teachers in developing intervention plans that address the gaps identified by the data analysis and guidance counselors will regularly monitor the data collected to help determine the next steps that need to be taken during the MTSS process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Regular data analysis allows for gaps in student learning to be identified early on in the year so that appropriate interventions can be put in place. Furthermore, regularly monitoring data throughout the intervention process allows the effectiveness of interventions to be determined so that adjustments can be made. Finally, students who have IEPs should not be eliminated from the MTSS process if they are not making academic progress.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Using STAR and other progress monitoring data, conduct data analysis for ESE students and the general population to determine which students are not making adequate academic progress.

Person Responsible   Debra Pion (debra.pion@polk-fl.net)

Develop MTSS intervention plans for students, both ESE and general population, who need extra support in order to demonstrate progress.

Person Responsible Vernisa Towles (vernisa.towles@polk-fl.net)

Monitor MTSS plans to determine effectiveness of interventions and adjust interventions as needed as students move through the MTSS process.

Person Responsible Vernisa Towles (vernisa.towles@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	When reviewing data, overall proficiency levels are low across all grade levels in the area of Math. Teachers need professional learning in order to understand and effectively utilize high-yield instructional strategies.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The overall Math proficiency for all grades combined will be 40%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Proficiency Levels will be monitored using the FAST ELA and Math assessments for all grades following each progress monitoring assessment. In addition, weekly reading assessments and module assessments in Math will be monitored to ensure that students are making progress between progress monitoring windows. Classroom observations will provide evidence of teachers' use of the high-yield strategies they are learning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will complete a book study using Doug Lemov's Teach Like a Champion 3.0 so that they can both learn and implement high-yield strategies that will benefit the entire school population. Data will also be monitored to track the effectiveness of the strategy implementation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Using high-yield strategies for whole group instruction allows all students to benefit and aids in increasing overall proficiency levels. Regular progress monitoring of data allows for student progress to be tracked before state assessments are given so that scaffolds can be put in place to aid students in becoming successful prior to administering state assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Conduct book study on Doug Lemov's Teach Like a Champion 3.0.

Person Responsible   Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

Observe classroom teachers and provide feedback on their use of the strategies from the book study.

Person Responsible	Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

Monitor data from progress monitoring assessments to track overall proficiency levels.

Person Responsible	Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

Monitor data from math module assessments to determine needed scaffolds and interventions.

Person Responsible	Debra Pion (debra.pion@polk-fl.net)

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

When reviewing data, overall proficiency levels are low across all grade levels in the area of Language Arts. Teachers need professional learning in order to understand and effectively utilize high-yield instructional strategies during whole group instruction so that all students benefit and show progress.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

When reviewing data, overall proficiency levels are low across all grade levels in the area of Language Arts. Teachers need professional learning in order to understand and effectively utilize high-yield instructional strategies during whole group instruction so that all students benefit and show progress.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

The overall Language Arts proficiency for grades K-2 combined will be 50%

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The overall Language Arts proficiency for grades 3-5 combined will be 50%

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Proficiency Levels will be monitored using the FAST ELA assessments for all grades following each progress monitoring assessment. In addition, weekly reading assessments in elementary grades and periodic assessments in middle school will be monitored to ensure that students are growing academically between progress monitoring windows. Classroom observations will provide evidence of teachers' use of the high-yield strategies they are learning through the book study.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brown, Ava, ava.brown@polk-fl.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Teachers will complete a book study using Doug Lemov's Teach Like a Champion 3.0 so that they can both learn and implement high-yield strategies that will benefit the entire school population. The strategies in the book align to all content areas as they pertain to whole group instruction and include elements such as No Opt Out, proper planning, engaging students in lessons, etc. Data will also be monitored to track the effectiveness of the strategy implementation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Using high-yield strategies for whole group instruction allows all students to benefit and aids in increasing overall proficiency levels. Regular progress monitoring of data allows for student progress to be tracked before state assessments are given so that scaffolds can be put in place to aid students in becoming successful prior to administering state assessments.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Conduct book study on Doug Lemov's Teach Like a Champion 3.0. Teachers will engage in the book study during Professional Learning Communities where they will discuss various ways to implement the strategies during literacy instruction.	Brown, Ava, ava.brown@polk-fl.net
Observe classroom teachers and provide feedback on their use of the strategies from the book study. As observations are conducted coaching cycles on how to implement the study during Language Arts instruction will take place.	Brown, Ava, ava.brown@polk-fl.net
Monitor data from weekly reading assessments in elementary grades and periodic reading assessments in middle school to determine needed scaffolds and interventions. Monitoring data will also allow the Leadership Team to assess the effectiveness of the strategies and action steps and plan the next steps of implementation.	Brown, Ava, ava.brown@polk-fl.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

1. Parents and community partners will be invited to our campus each quarter 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 school culture and environment.

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