Rosabelle W. Blake Academy School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Rosabelle W. Blake Academy

510 HARTSELL AVE, Lakeland, FL 33815

http://www.blakeacademy.com/

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.

Blake Cambridge Academy enables students to realize their full potential in a multicultural, caring, and positive learning environment. Through our broad and balanced curriculum, we will endeavor to develop responsible, globally conscious citizens. We will support all our students to develop their skills as lifelong learners with a strong sense of self-worth.
We understand that helping develop global citizens who can achieve what they dare to dream requires strong and effective partnerships with parents. We recognize that education and learning are ongoing?shared responsibilities between home and school, and we provide a full program of parental consultation
evenings and parental engagement workshops.
Together we can provide the best support for children throughout all stages of their education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Blake Cambridge Academy is to be a premier learning organization that provides all scholars with an academic foundation for success.

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
Brown, Ava	Principal	
Kieffer, Rayna	Assistant Principal	
Pion, Debra	Instructional Coach	
Denney, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	
Towles, Vernisa	School Counselor	
Barber, Craig	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Bossman, Carrie	Reading Coach	
Pienkowski, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	
Trzcinski, Denise	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Chauncey, Tanya	Dean	

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.

At our first summer meeting, the school leadership team was invited to participate in the initial draft writing of our SIP. This included the principal, assistant principal, math instructional coach, and literacy instructional coach.

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 SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing achievement through weekly school leadership meetings where classroom walkthrough observations and data, formative assessment data, quarterly assessments, and state assessment data (three times a year) are analyzed by all demographics. If needed, the SIP will be revised to ensure there is continuous improvement.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	73%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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)* 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: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	20	13	11	9	10	5	15	9	5	97
One or more suspensions	4	3	4	3	10	5	27	18	15	89
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	13	26	31	24	19	132
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	28	13	32	27	20	28	148
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	28	35	20	11	3	8	1	1	113
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	6	4	10	5	12	24	58	39	41	199

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	0	4	3	11	0	0	0	2	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	17	15	20	15	17	11	10	19	8	132
One or more suspensions	13	5	14	14	19	23	29	37	21	175
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	6	20	29	25	22	113
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	13	20	34	38	30	144
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	47	33	41	15	13	8	4	4	0	165

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	9	10	18	9	24	29	37	42	23	201

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	17	15	20	15	17	11	10	19	8	132
One or more suspensions	13	5	14	14	19	23	29	37	21	175
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	6	20	29	25	22	113
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	13	20	34	38	30	144
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	47	33	41	15	13	8	4	4	0	165

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	9	10	18	9	24	29	37	42	23	201

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	45	48	53	45	51	55	40		
ELA Learning Gains				54			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			25		
Math Achievement*	35	49	55	38	37	42	43		
Math Learning Gains				36			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36			43		
Science Achievement*	27	47	52	35	48	54	27		
Social Studies Achievement*	75	68	68	85	53	59	73		
Middle School Acceleration	51	61	70	66	43	51	77		
Graduation Rate		54	74		46	50			
College and Career Acceleration		39	53		71	70			
ELP Progress	33	50	55	70	55	70			

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	312
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	517
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	19	Yes	4	4
ELL	24	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	2	
HSP	36	Yes	1	
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	62			

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%
FRL	39	Yes	1	

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	26	Yes	3	3
ELL	35	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	48			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	45			

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	45			35			27	75	51			33
SWD	7			12			6	50			4	
ELL	25			14							3	33
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			28			16	65	38		6	
HSP	40			31			14	70	17		7	29
MUL	64			43							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	59			47			54	89	72		6	
FRL	40			28			20	68	41		7	33

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	45	54	52	38	36	36	35	85	66			70
SWD	15	35	36	15	26	30						
ELL	26	50	53	13	24	27	18					70
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	47	39	28	33	31	20	76	43			
HSP	46	51	62	36	41	38	34	76				
MUL	69	64		46	55							
PAC												
WHT	61	65	76	53	34	50	56	97	77			
FRL	40	52	52	32	34	36	25	81	52			

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	40	38	25	43	43	43	27	73	77			
SWD	12	19	20	9	12	18	0					
ELL	27	33	18	21	37		18					
AMI												
ASN												
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							
PAC												
WHT	51	42	35	61	51	84	32	79	90			
FRL	32	32	23	36	38	33	18	65	70			

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	38%	43%	-5%	54%	-16%
07	2023 - Spring	42%	36%	6%	47%	-5%
08	2023 - Spring	53%	39%	14%	47%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	53%	4%	58%	-1%
06	2023 - Spring	39%	35%	4%	47%	-8%
03	2023 - Spring	43%	42%	1%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	31%	38%	-7%	54%	-23%
07	2023 - Spring	24%	35%	-11%	48%	-24%
03	2023 - Spring	40%	51%	-11%	59%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	56%	-1%	61%	-6%
08	2023 - Spring	25%	42%	-17%	55%	-30%
05	2023 - Spring	29%	44%	-15%	55%	-26%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	29%	33%	-4%	44%	-15%
05	2023 - Spring	24%	39%	-15%	51%	-27%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	51%	37%	14%	50%	1%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	37%	63%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	65%	10%	66%	9%

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.

Language Arts overall proficiency increased by .1%. Science proficiency decreased by 8%. Math overall proficiency saw a decrease of 4%.

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

Science proficiency showed the greatest decline. In 5th grade, there were 2 long-term substitutes. In 8th grade, there was a cultural and relationship barrier between the teacher and student.

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.

5th grade science (24%) had the greatest gap when compared to the state average (51%). This is a gap of 27%. There were 2 long-term substitutes which did not allow for rigorous instruction.

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

3rd and 4th grade math showed the most improvement. These teachers incorporated project based learning which allowed the students to make real world connections.

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

Students with 2 or more indicators and students with significant reading deficiencies are two areas of concern.

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

1. Math
2. Science
3. School Culture

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.

Positive culture and environment relates to early warning system data. Even though student absenteeism decreased, we still want to improve attendance by increasing student engagement. If students find their time at school as engaging and applicable to their lives, they will want to attend. We also want to increase parental involvement which will lead to a school-home partnership where all stakeholders are working together to ensure student success.

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

We plan to decrease student absenteeism by 25% and increase parent involvement through participation in parent university, PTA, and Title One nights by 25%.

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

Student absenteeism - We will require parents to attend quarterly portfolio conferences where student attendance will be monitored. Each homeroom teacher will contact and document parental contact after 2 or more absences in a row. The school's registrar will check the teacher's log weekly for proof of parent contact. The teacher's log will also be turned in each quarter to administration.
Parent Involvement - Each time a parent volunteers throughout the school day, they will sign in at the front office. Parents attending after school activities will sign-in when admitted.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.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.)

Creating a positive school climate and culture through increased parent involvement by attending monthly parent university activities centered on concerns of all stakeholders.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Academic achievement seems to be impacted by a school climate and culture that addresses not only academic needs, but also fosters students' feelings of safety, addresses health and mental health issues, and establishes high expectations for academic success. It is important to develop strong partnerships with parents and families, businesses, faith-based organizations, and youth development agencies to address these priorities beyond the school day. In addition, teacher effectiveness tends to improve more over time when teachers are working in supportive professional environments as opposed to when they are working in less supportive contexts.

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.

Create monthly parent university activities which address parent and community concerns and advertise to parents, staff, and stakeholders.

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

By When: August 1, 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

When reviewing data, overall proficiency levels are low across all grade levels in the areas of math and science. Student math and science proficiency levels will increase through targeted standards-based instruction.

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

We will increase student math and science proficiency levels by 10%.

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

We will monitor this area using the standards-based instructional tool during walkthroughs, then conferencing with teachers during PLCs, tiering teachers for instructional coaching support, and monitoring computer-adaptive intervention reports and formative assessments weekly.
Weekly formative assessments will be created and assessed using performance matters to be able to disaggregate data weekly and monthly. This data will also be placed on the PLC room wall for discussion during weekly meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.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.)

Teachers, admin, and instructional coaches will collaboratively plan to ensure that instruction and assessments are standards-based. We will implement with fidelity Math 180, Number Worlds, and RTD.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research suggests that data should be analyzed at the school, classroom, and student level in order to identiy areas of strengths and weaknesses and to determine how best to improve the quality of instruction. Formative assessments selected for implementation must align with the standards, curriculum, and state assessment. Data should be widely distributed and teachers and administrators should be taught how to correctly interpret and use data. A study was conducted of a computerized curriculum-based instructional management system implemented as an enhancement to ongoing mathematics instruction which enable teachers to use data to modify instruction for students. This was shown to lead to an increase in student achievement in mathematics.

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.

Discussion during PLCs regarding progress-monitoring and formative assessment data to plan instruction using state standards

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

By When: weekly

Daily classroom walkthroughs using Standards-Based Instructional Tool and weekly leadership team meeting discussion to analyze data and tier teachers for coaching

Person Responsible: Rayna Kieffer (rayna.kieffer@polk-fl.net)

By When: daily and weekly

Analyze math intervention program data and formative assessment data weekly during leadership team meetings

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

By When: weekly

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

SWD subgroup is at 26% of the federal index.
ELL subgroup is at 35% of the federal index.
Black subgroup is at 39% of the federal index.

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

Each of these subgroups (SWD, ELL, and Black) will be at least 41% of the federal 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 SWD, ELL, and Black students to identify students who need to be a part of the MTSS process. There will be monthly meetings of the data with Vernisa Towles, school counselor, and Chanda Richardson, school psychologist.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rayna Kieffer (rayna.kieffer@polk-fl.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.)

After the initial progress monitoring window, data 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 school counselors will regularly monitor the data collected to help determine the next steps that need to be taken during the MTSS process. After each subsequent progress monitoring window, the process will be repeated.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

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.

Analyze FAST PM1 and STAR assessment data to determine which students are not making adequate academic progress

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

By When: one week after completion of PM1 and STAR initial test

School counselors and academic coaches will meet with teachers to develop intervention plans

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

By When: two weeks after completion of PM1 and STAR initial test

School counselors and teachers will monitor intervention plans monthly and discuss progress and needed changes to plan

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

By When: monthly

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

1. Title 1/UniSig Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)
2. Data Com
3. Summer Leadership Academy/Retreat
4. School Improvement Plan Meetings/Trainings
5. PURE Process
6. Regional and Office of School Transformation review of SIP plans

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be presented to SAC at our monthly meeting, to parents through the teacher newsletter (elementary) middle school newsletter, and to school staff during preplanning week. It will also be presented at the Annual Meeting. Furthermore, it will be posted on the school's webpage. The SIP will drive the agenda for weekly leadership team meetings and PLCs.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We will begin the inaugural class of Blake Cambridge Academy Parent University. Parent University was created to increase the capacity of parents and guardians to be actively engaged in their child's education at Blake Cambridge Academy. The goal of the program is to inform and engage parents and guardians as partners, advocates, and lifelong teachers in their child's education through a series of educational courses which will meet monthly.
We will also have quarterly portfolio nights where grades, assessment scores, attendance, behavior, etc. will be discussed between the parents, teachers, and students.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Blake Cambridge Academy will strengthen our academic program by ensuring instruction is standards-based; we will incorporate project-based learning; and we will apply Cambridge specific curriculum. We will do this through supplemental staff (academic coaches), extended learning, collaborative planning, RTD, and MTSS.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Title One Technical Assistance - Use of Funds, PFE Input, Back to School Meeting
Data Com
School Improvement Planning Trainings
Regional Area Meetings
Summer Leadership Academy
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Technical Assistance
Cambridge

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

https://polkschoolsfl.com/mentalhealth/
The school provides individual counseling, group counseling, and school consultations.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

The school provides Cambridge curriculum. The Cambridge international curriculum sets a global standard for education, and is recognized by universities and employers worldwide. The curriculum is flexible, challenging and inspiring, culturally sensitive yet international in approach. Cambridge students develop an informed curiosity and a lasting passion for learning. They also gain the essential skills they need for success at university and in their future careers.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Our school utilizes the PBIS Rewards computer program to track behavior and communicate with parents. Students earn daily points that accumulate toward a monthly (elementary) or quarterly (middle school) reward. Discipline infractions will also be monitored through the system when students do not meet the school-wide expectations. Student behavior is monitored and students may be placed on behavior probation which requires monthly parent meetings.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Professional Learning Communities take place weekly to improve instruction and student achievement. Response to Data is provided to targeted students who need extra academic assistance in core content areas. Two teachers are new teacher mentors and meet weekly with new teachers to provide assistance.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

We provide kindergarten round up each April/May.