

Orange County Public Schools

# Blankner K 8



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Blankner K 8

2500 S MILLS AVE, Orlando, FL 32806

<https://blanknerk8.ocps.net/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Junella Kreil**

Start Date for this Principal: 1/20/2016

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: A (71%) 2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (68%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A

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

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Blankner K 8

2500 S MILLS AVE, Orlando, FL 32806

<https://blanknerk8.ocps.net/>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-8</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>38%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>42%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>
<b>Grade</b>	A	A	A	A

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

## 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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

### 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
Kreil, Junella	Principal	
Conti, Stephen	Assistant Principal	
Adams, Kyle	Dean	
Hines, Michelle	Instructional Coach	
Hinson, Aimee	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Schneeberger, Carol	School Counselor	
Whitman, Ashley	Instructional Technology	
Lafferty, Cristen	Teacher, ESE	
Cason, Amanda	Instructional Media	
Markham, Trevor	Staffing Specialist	
Wyatt, Danyetta	School Counselor	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 1/20/2016, Junella Kreil

**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.*

5

**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.*

20

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

65

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

774

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

8

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

11

**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	76	78	76	90	89	76	92	86	111	0	0	0	0	774
Attendance below 90 percent	0	18	8	13	16	13	15	15	20	0	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	2	0	2	1	7	7	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	6	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	7	8	15	18	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	8	13	15	16	0	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	18	13	19	28	38	0	0	0	0	116

**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	0	1	0	2	10	80	10	15	16	0	0	0	0	134

**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	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	2	2	0	0	0	0	4

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/4/2022



**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	70	81	83	91	83	83	96	104	101	0	0	0	0	792
Attendance below 90 percent	1	13	17	8	11	9	15	18	14	0	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4	2	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	12	11	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	11	14	0	0	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	10	12	10	5	7	8	6	0	0	0	0	68

**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	3	5	13	15	13	0	0	0	0	49

**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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**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	70	81	83	91	83	83	96	104	101	0	0	0	0	792
Attendance below 90 percent	1	13	17	8	11	9	15	18	14	0	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4	2	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	12	11	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	11	14	0	0	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	10	12	10	5	7	8	6	0	0	0	0	68

**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	3	5	13	15	13	0	0	0	0	49

**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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	72%	57%	55%				70%	62%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	64%						61%	60%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						44%	55%	54%
Math Achievement	77%	41%	42%				75%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	78%						75%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%						54%	54%	52%
Science Achievement	75%	57%	54%				68%	56%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	75%	63%	59%				82%	74%	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	69%	55%	14%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	57%	14%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					
	2019	73%	54%	19%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
06	2022					
	2019	66%	52%	14%	54%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
07	2022					
	2019	69%	48%	21%	52%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
08	2022					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	56%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

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%	62%	-5%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	76%	63%	13%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2022					

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
	2019	73%	57%	16%	60%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
06	2022					
	2019	58%	43%	15%	55%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
07	2022					
	2019	78%	49%	29%	54%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
08	2022					
	2019	43%	36%	7%	46%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2022					
	2019	66%	54%	12%	53%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	68%	49%	19%	48%	20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2022					
2019					

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2022					
2019	81%	66%	15%	71%	10%

<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	98%	63%	35%	61%	37%
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	28	45	42	39	57	46	31	39			
ELL	30	50	46	44	62	64					
ASN	89	79		89	100						
BLK	49	45	50	51	71	65	40	50			
HSP	58	59	53	63	75	68	59	67	83		
MUL	73	75		67	67		80				
WHT	80	67	50	86	79	54	84	83	89		
FRL	56	59	52	58	69	61	56	56	79		
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	25	38	33	23	42	43	22	17			
ELL	43	40	33	54	47		40				
ASN	88	70		82	40						
BLK	45	41	17	29	41	46	21				
HSP	54	48	40	54	46	38	52	28	56		
MUL	57	27		57	45						
WHT	77	55	18	78	62	51	77	70	79		
FRL	53	39	22	48	44	38	52	33	60		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	14	26	27	24	48	40	24	35			
ELL	40	50	29	43	62	38	42				
ASN	91	76		91	89						

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
BLK	46	50	52	54	71	63	36	56			
HSP	56	59	35	61	70	51	43	78	90		
MUL	61	45		74	82						
WHT	79	64	47	82	76	48	83	87	97		
FRL	49	48	36	56	67	59	39	67	77		

**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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	640
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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

<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	89
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	65
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	75
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	61
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?**

Data shows that in all grades and subject areas assessed (3rd-8th grades ELA, Math, Science and Civics), proficiency rates at Blankner were 15-30% higher than district and state proficiency rates. In 2022, Grades 3-5 performance in Reading and Math maintained or increased as compared to 2021. Blankner Middle School grades showed a slight decrease in ELA, Algebra 1, Civics and 7th grade Math.

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

The areas in greatest need of improvement are in our middle school grades. Blankner Middle School grades showed a slight decrease in ELA, Algebra 1, Civics and 7th grade Math. According to subgroup data, the Student with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup continues to be an area in need and met the minimum required Federal Index (ESSA) threshold of 41% proficiency.

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

A contributing factor for the decrease in middle school results is teacher turnover. The teachers who left were veteran, high performing teachers who had been the only teacher in their course for more than 15 years at Blankner. The lowest scoring areas were in these high-turnover courses.

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

The areas that showed the greatest growth from 2021 to 2022 were 3rd (10% increase), 4th (13% increase) and 5th grade (11% increase) ELA, 5th grade Science (14% increase) as well as 3rd grade Math (21% increase). Learning gains for our lowest 25% showed an increase in both ELA and Math (increase of 3% ELA, 4% Math).

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

A contributing factor to this improvement is teacher retainment and expertise. Third, 4th and 5th grade teachers have had the same teachers as part of their Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) for at least 3 years. Part of our lowest 25% includes our Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH) students. One of the contributing factors to the learning gains increase for our lowest 25% included matching specific programs and strategies for DHH students so they could access the curriculum.

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

In order to accelerate learning, the following strategies will need to be implemented: monthly middle school subject-area PLC's to increase performance progress monitoring in grades 6-8; focused PLC conversations with Grades K-8 about the new BEST Standards for ELA and Math; targeted interventions and small group instruction in all grades; and quarterly data meetings focused on subgroup and individual student progress, with all grade levels.

**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.**



Professional development that will be provided include: differentiation in the classroom and data-informed instructional decision making. Differentiated and optional professional development will also be provided for Orton Gillingham, classroom management, accelerated learning strategies and student support services.

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

Specific to deaf or hard of hearing students (DHH), an additional Teacher of the Deaf has been hired to provide support and instruction to DHH students. It is our intent to continue to build this specific expertise within our instructional team in order to provide comprehensive and accurate support to students whose primary language is American Sign Language (ASL).

**Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. 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.**

According to the 2022 data, Students with Disabilities (SWD) had low performance across all subject areas. In addition, the Federal Index (ESSA) for SWD was at the minimum required 41% threshold.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

In the 2022-2023 school year, at least 43% of Students with Disabilities (SWD) will make a learning gain in ELA and Math.

**Monitoring:**

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

Data meetings will be conducted quarterly with all grade levels and will focus on subgroup and individual student progress.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Junella Kreil (junella.kreil@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Blankner will utilize Professional Learning Communities (PLC's), differentiated professional development and specific research-based curriculum/strategies for instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

The work of our Professional Learning Community is based around continuous improvement and determining how to adjust instructional practices to obtain better learning outcomes. Teachers will be given new, different and differentiated training, and will work together to shift their instruction based on student need.

**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.

1. Blankner's School-based Leadership Team (SBLT) will provide details of all Individual Education Plans (IEPs), 504 Plans, Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Plans, Health Plans, Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs) to teachers during pre-planning.

**Person Responsible**

Cristen Lafferty (cristen.lafferty@ocps.net)

2. The SBLT will train teachers on accommodations, interventions and documentation as related to those plans.

**Person Responsible**

Cristen Lafferty (cristen.lafferty@ocps.net)

3. Professional development will be provided to train ESE teachers on best practices for Support Facilitation and Quality Individual Education Plan (IEP) writing.

**Person Responsible**

Cristen Lafferty (cristen.lafferty@ocps.net)

4. Professional development will be provided to train Teachers of the Deaf and Interpreters in Fairview Reading curriculum and the IXL Program.

**Person Responsible**

Cristen Lafferty (cristen.lafferty@ocps.net)

5. Professional development will be provided to train and support primary grades teachers on Orton Gillingham principles and practices.

**Person Responsible**                      Cristen Lafferty (cristen.lafferty@ocps.net)

6. A Professional Learning Community (PLC) will meet regularly to discuss assessment, curriculum, learning strategies and progress of the middle school Deaf and Hard of Hearing (D/HH) students at Blankner.

**Person Responsible**                      Junella Kreil (junella.kreil@ocps.net)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

According to prior years data, Blankner ELA scores met or exceeded goals in all three school domains: proficiency, learning gains, and lowest 25% learning gains. Proficiency in grades 6-8 still show needs for improvement.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2022-2023 school year, at least 67% of students across all assessed grade levels will make learning gains in the areas of ELA.

### Monitoring:

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

ELA progress monitoring data in Fall, Winter and Spring will be analyzed and discussed in data meetings. Adjustments in instruction based on progress monitoring data will be monitored through PLC's and classroom observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Junella Kreil (junella.kreil@ocps.net)

### Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Blankner will utilize Professional Learning Communities (PLC's), differentiated professional development and specific research-based curriculum/strategies for instruction.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The work of our Professional Learning Community is based around continuous improvement and determining how to adjust instructional practices to obtain better learning outcomes. Teachers will be given new, different and differentiated training and will work together to shift their instruction based on student need.

### 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.

1. All ELA teachers will meet to analyze student progress monitoring data at least quarterly. The School-based Leadership Team (SBLT) will support intervention and acceleration discussions as instruction is adjusted in response to data.

**Person Responsible**

Junella Kreil (junella.kreil@ocps.net)

2. The School-based Leadership Team (SBLT) will lead a series of refresher professional development opportunities to all teachers on how to plan for and assess writing across subject areas.

**Person Responsible**

Michelle Hines (michelle.hines@ocps.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**

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

According to 2022 data, areas in need of improvement were found in multiple and varied subject areas and grade levels, making it difficult to establish one specific focus for instructional practice improvement. Analysis of data pointed toward specific courses taught in isolation by individual teachers and specific subgroups of students in need of differentiation and intervention (SWD in all grade levels). Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) will allow each area of need to be addressed and improved through course-specific and student-specific strategies.

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

In the 2022-2023 school year, at least 67% of students across all assessed grade levels will make learning gains in the areas of ELA and 80% of Math.

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

Progress monitoring data in Fall, Winter and Spring will be analyzed and discussed in data meetings. Adjustments in instruction based on progress monitoring data will be monitored through PLC's and classroom observations.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Junella Kreil (junella.kreil@ocps.net)

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

Blankner will utilize Professional Learning Communities (PLC's), differentiated professional development and specific research-based curriculum/strategies for instruction.

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

The work of our Professional Learning Community is based around continuous improvement and determining how to adjust instructional practices to obtain better learning outcomes. Teachers will be given new, different and differentiated training and will work together to shift their instruction based on student need.

**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.

1. The School-based Leadership Team (SBLT) will lead a series of professional development opportunities to all teachers on how to plan for and assess writing across subject areas.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Hines (michelle.hines@ocps.net)

2. Elementary grade level teachers will meet for lesson planning PLC's once per week. The School-based Leadership Team (SBLT) will support standards-based discussions as learning activities are planned.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Hines (michelle.hines@ocps.net)

3. All grade level teachers will meet to analyze student progress monitoring data at least quarterly. The School-based Leadership Team (SBLT) will support intervention and acceleration discussions as instruction is adjusted in response to data.

**Person Responsible** Junella Kreil (junella.kreil@ocps.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.**

Communication is essential in working towards increasing parental involvement. Blankner focuses on ways to provide timely and accurate information to the parents and community by utilizing a bi-weekly electronic newsletter and social media outlets such as Facebook and Twitter. Blankner increases the speed and frequency of the dissemination of information. Traditional methods of a parent calendar, student planners and voice messages to homes ensure all families are being reached. Events at the beginning of the year such as the BooHoo/Yahoo Breakfast, Play Date at the Park for kindergarten parents, new parent orientation, parent information nights on specific topics and Volunteers/Business Partners' Thank You breakfast, give parents and partners a way to connect to the school. Report card conference night during the year provides parents detailed information regarding their child's progress.

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

All stakeholders within our school have a role in promoting a positive culture and environment, including faculty/staff, students, parents and community guests and partners. Faculty/staff promote positive culture by modeling and teaching. Students promote positive culture by practicing the strategies taught and modeling

for peers. Parents and guests are expected to adhere to Blankner's high standard for positive culture and environment; this is encouraged within our campus as well as in our community.