
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Blankner K 8

2500 S MILLS AVE, Orlando, FL 32806

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kreil, Junella	Principal	The principal oversees all instructional leaders on campus, as well as monitors classroom instruction and provide feedback to teachers accordingly, facilitate and participate in weekly PLCs and data meetings, analyze school-wide and grade-level data, and review lesson plans.
Conti, Stephen	Assistant Principal	Assistant principals monitor classroom instruction and provide feedback to teachers accordingly, facilitate and participate in data meetings, analyze school-wide and grade-level data, and review lesson plans.
Hinson, Aimee	Assistant Principal	Assistant principals monitor classroom instruction and provide feedback to teachers accordingly, facilitate and participate in data meetings, analyze school-wide and grade-level data, and review lesson plans.
Adams, Kyle	Dean	The Dean implements and oversees school-wide behavior plan to ensure students are only removed from the instructional environment when necessary.
Hines, Michelle	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach facilitates and attends weekly PLC meetings, guides teachers on lesson planning, provides professional development, assists teachers in the creation of formative assessments, and assists teachers in the development and implementation of their deliberate practice plans.
Rimmer, Liz	School Counselor	The Middle School Counselor develops and monitors student schedules, and addresses social-emotional needs of students in grades six through eight identified by teachers. Counselors review student cumulative records to assist with intervention design and progress monitoring.
Whitman, Ashley	Instructional Technology	The Instructional Technology Teacher assists and coaches teachers with blended learning strategies and proper implementation of instructional technology. She leads professional development on related best practices for teaching with technology.
Lafferty, Cristen	Other	The MTSS/ESE Teacher assists teachers in identifying and trialling appropriate academic and behavioral interventions/accommodations for students, and participates in meetings to discuss possible further evaluation and or identification of more levels of support or services.
Cason, Amanda	Other	The Media Specialist supports digital technology needs for both students and teachers, ensuring devices are in student hands and working well. She also leads the Literacy Leadership Team.
Markham, Trevor	Staffing Specialist	The Staffing Specialist assists teachers in identifying appropriate academic and behavioral interventions/accommodations for students, and schedules

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		and leads meetings to discuss possible further evaluation and or identification of more levels of support or services.

Wyatt, School Counselor
 Danyetta, School Counselor
 The Elementary School Counselor addresses social-emotional needs of students in grades pre-kindergarten through five as identified by teachers. Counselors review student cumulative records to assist with intervention design and progress monitoring.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Blankner's School Improvement Plan (SIP) is developed through collaboration with our School Advisory Council (SAC), Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA), and all faculty and staff. SAC is comprised of parents, teachers, non-instructional personnel, and community business partners. PTSA is comprised of parents, extended family members, teachers/staff, and students. All stakeholders provide input and feedback through annual student, staff, and family surveys. School performance, progress monitoring data, and stakeholder survey responses are shared at joint SAC/PTSA meetings, as well as at faculty/staff meetings throughout the year. Students have an additional opportunity to share thoughts and input at Principal Advisory Council Meetings (PAC). At these meetings, stakeholders discuss current areas of focus, analyze trends in data, problem solve next steps for instructional strategies, celebrate growth, and determine shifts in areas of focus (at least annually).

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The School Improvement Plan will be monitored through progress monitoring (FAST) three times per year, standards-based unit assessments, course grades, and classroom observations. Data meetings will be held quarterly with teachers to analyze student progress individually as well as by subgroup and academic performance level clusters. Actions and strategies will be adjusted as needed if a student, subgroup, or performance cluster is not showing adequate growth.

Demographic Data
 Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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

2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	38%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	1	10	12	7	14	14	18	11	9	96
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	2	0	0	6	11	11	32
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	8	13	18	25	73
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	12	15	11	12	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	8	8	7	9	0	0	0	0	33

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	4	3	4	13	9	15	14	14	77

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	18	8	13	16	13	15	15	20	118
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	2	0	2	1	7	7	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	6	2	2	1	2	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	5	1	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	7	8	15	18	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	8	13	15	16	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	18	13	19	28	38	116

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	2	10	80	10	15	16	134

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	18	8	13	16	13	15	15	20	118
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	2	0	2	1	7	7	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	6	2	2	1	2	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	5	1	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	7	8	15	18	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	8	13	15	16	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	18	13	19	28	38	116

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	2	10	80	10	15	16	134

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	69	56	53	72	57	55	68		
ELA Learning Gains				64			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			30		
Math Achievement*	75	59	55	77	41	42	68		
Math Learning Gains				78			55		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61			45		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	78	56	52	75	57	54	64		
Social Studies Achievement*	71	68	68	75	63	59	57		
Middle School Acceleration	88	74	70	88	52	51	73		
Graduation Rate		82	74		52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		46	53		71	70			
ELP Progress	85	55	55		73	70	79		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	545
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	640
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	42			
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	48			
HSP	64			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	63			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	41			
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	53			
HSP	65			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	61			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	69			75			78	71	88			85
SWD	32			40			36	42			5	
ELL	42			63							3	85
AMI												
ASN	92			92							2	
BLK	39			50			56				3	
HSP	55			62			59	56	82		6	
MUL	75			71			60				3	
PAC												
WHT	77			82			86	81	91		6	
FRL	53			54			52	58	73		7	82

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	72	64	50	77	78	61	75	75	88			
SWD	28	45	42	39	57	46	31	39				
ELL	30	50	46	44	62	64						
AMI												
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					
PAC												
WHT	80	67	50	86	79	54	84	83	89			
FRL	56	59	52	58	69	61	56	56	79			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	68	52	30	68	55	45	64	57	73			79
SWD	25	38	33	23	42	43	22	17				
ELL	43	40	33	54	47		40					79

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	88	70		82	40							
BLK	45	41	17	29	41	46	21					
HSP	54	48	40	54	46	38	52	28	56			75
MUL	57	27		57	45							
PAC												
WHT	77	55	18	78	62	51	77	70	79			
FRL	53	39	22	48	44	38	52	33	60			73

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	76%	54%	22%	54%	22%
07	2023 - Spring	58%	45%	13%	47%	11%
08	2023 - Spring	60%	46%	14%	47%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	60%	16%	58%	18%
06	2023 - Spring	62%	44%	18%	47%	15%
03	2023 - Spring	76%	52%	24%	50%	26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	65%	53%	12%	54%	11%
07	2023 - Spring	48%	38%	10%	48%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	82%	59%	23%	59%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	62%	8%	61%	9%
08	2023 - Spring	67%	58%	9%	55%	12%
05	2023 - Spring	80%	55%	25%	55%	25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	69%	50%	19%	44%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	86%	59%	27%	51%	35%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	47%	48%	50%	45%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	45%	55%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	61%	7%	66%	2%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Blankner's lowest performing data component was 7th Grade English Language Arts (ELA) with 58% of students scoring proficient. Middle school ELA scores have been a focus for improvement for several years. Lower scores in this area have been a trend since 2017 at Blankner, as well as across district data. Blankner ranked in the top quartile of middle schools in our district in 2023, though still 20% points lower than 2018. Additionally, ELA scores in grades 3-5 showed slight decline, while also ranking in the top quartile when compared to elementary schools. It is important to note that new ELA standards and curriculum were recently introduced.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data component with the greatest decline was 4th grade math, which declined 15% from 2022 to 2023. When comparing the like group of students across grade levels, the decline was less (7%) for 4th grade students. A possible contributing factor was all new curriculum in math.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Blankner scored above in all district and state data components. The greatest gap compared to the state average was in Science. Fifth grade science exceeded the state proficiency level by 35%. Eighth grade Science exceeded the state proficiency level by 25%. Contributing factors include a school-wide focus on Science through structured science, technology, engineering, arts and math (STEAM) activities; and veteran, high performing teachers teaching science courses over several years.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Most improvement was shown in 3rd and 5th grade Math. Both grades exceeded scores from the past seven years (3rd showed 82% students proficient; 5th grade showed 80% students proficient) in Math. For the past three years, these grades have been staffed with veteran, high-performing teachers and no teacher turnover. In addition, the teams have structured lesson planning collaborations with departmentalized focus.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Reflecting on early warning indicators, one area of concern is students who are missing 10% or more school days in the year. Another area of concern are students who fall into two or more warning indicator areas.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Blankner's highest priorities for school improvement are English Language Arts (ELA), Students with Disabilities (SWD), English Language Learners (ELL), and student attendance.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to Early Warning Indicators, 96 students (12%) were absent 10% or more days in 2022-2023. In addition, 77 students (9%) were shown to have two or more early warning indicators. When analyzing data at the student level, there is a correlation between absent students and students with multiple warning indicators.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The number of students absent for 10% or more days in the school year will decrease to 9% of enrolled students or less.

Monitoring:

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

School-based Leadership team (SBLT) will meet weekly to discuss interventions for behavior, attendance and other early warning indicators. Truancy will be closely tracked and addressed each week.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aimee Hinson (aimee.hinson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Intervention will include close home-school connections with students and families through our school registrar, school counselors, and school social worker.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Positive relationships and ongoing connection between home and school will encourage better attendance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. School-based Leadership Team (SBLT) will identify students who fall in the early warning system components. Create a tracking system to be used to monitor these students at the weekly Multi-tier System of Supports - Behavior (MTSS-B) meetings.

Person Responsible: Aimee Hinson (aimee.hinson@ocps.net)

By When: Preplanning

2. Teachers will collaborate with the SBLT to establish consistent home-school communication regarding attendance, and will connect families to school or community resources as needed.

Person Responsible: Aimee Hinson (aimee.hinson@ocps.net)

By When: ongoing

3. SBLT will monitor identified students for achievement as well as attendance and take action intervene if needed.

Person Responsible: Aimee Hinson (aimee.hinson@ocps.net)

By When: weekly at MTSS-B meetings

4. School leadership will communicate the school-wide positive behavior system (our Blankner Standard) clearly and often to teachers/staff, students, parents, and families.

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

By When: August 2, 2023 and ongoing

#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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Historical data shows that Students with Disabilities have had lower performance across all subject areas as compared to other subgroups. In addition, in 2022, the Federal Index (ESSA) for SWD was at the minimum required 41% threshold. This will continue as an area of need and to closely watch for progress.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2023-2024 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 Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The work of our Professional Learning Community is based around continuous improvement, data 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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)

By When: August 3, 2023

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

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

By When: August 3, 2023 and ongoing

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

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

By When: Ongoing

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

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

By When: ongoing

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

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

By When: ongoing

6. Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will meet regularly to discuss assessment, curriculum, learning strategies and progress of Students with Disabilities at Blankner.

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

By When: monthly

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Middle school ELA scores have been a focus for improvement for several years. 7th grade ELA was the lowest performing component in 2023. Lower scores in this area have been a trend across district data as well. Blankner ranked in the top quartile of middle schools in our district. Additionally, ELA scores in grades 3-5 showed slight decline, while also ranking in the top quartile when compared to elementary schools.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2023-2024 school year, at least 70% 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 Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The work of our Professional Learning Community is based around continuous improvement, data 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 and will meet weekly for collaborative lesson planning. 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)

By When: weekly

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)

By When: ongoing

3. All Kindergarten through fifth grade teachers will be trained in the Orton Gillingham approach to reading instruction.

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

By When: ongoing