

Polk County Public Schools

Roosevelt Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Roosevelt Academy

115 E ST, Lake Wales, FL 33853

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/rooseveltacademy>

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.

Roosevelt Academy will strive to provide a supportive and caring environment to equip students for success in college and career.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Roosevelt Academy is a learning community that fosters a culture of high-quality educational practice to challenge all students to achieve at their greatest potential.

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
Wiggs, Carla	Principal	School supervision and daily school operations
Donhauser, Heather	Assistant Principal	School supervision, master scheduling, school safety, maintains facilities, student discipline
Woodford, Tamara	Behavior Specialist	Implements and monitors schoolwide behavior management system
Bagby, Amy	Other	ESE facilitator - ensures ESE students are properly placed to receive ESE services and make sure that IEPs are in compliance.
Gifford, Michelle	School Counselor	Scheduling, making sure that students are meeting graduation requirements, attendance management.
Barrett, Virginia	Teacher, K-12	ELA department chair and instructor of corrective reading
Middlebrook, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Science department chair and instructor of Biology, Earth Space Science and Physical Science
Bartos, David	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair and instructor of world history, government and economics
Sharpless, Daniel	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Elective Department Chair and instructor of cabinetmaking
Selwood, Tracie	Teacher, K-12	Math Department chair and instructor of 7th, 8th grade math and foundations.
Hicklin, Precious	Reading Coach	Reviews student data and provides assistance and resources for teachers to implement and improve Reading instruction in the classroom setting.
Jones, Carlressian	Dean	Monitors, manages, and reports school discipline.

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.

Roosevelt Academy meets regularly with the School Advisory Council. This committee consists of parents, students, school staff, and community leaders. The school information will be shared at the SAC meeting and the input gleaned will be reflected in the SIP.

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))

We will review the SIP quarterly at leadership and SAC meetings. This will allow us an opportunity to review quarterly data to check progress and make any necessary adjustments.

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)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	60%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: MAINTAINING
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	18	18	53	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	11	15	43	
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	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	14	22	64	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	19	25	79

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		
The number of students identified retained:		
Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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 school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	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*	14	38	50	12	41	51	16		
ELA Learning Gains				27			31		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			30		
Math Achievement*	19	24	38	10	35	38	9		
Math Learning Gains				39			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			55		
Science Achievement*	15	50	64	20	26	40	11		
Social Studies Achievement*	23	50	66	48	39	48	24		
Middle School Acceleration					41	44	18		
Graduation Rate	83	84	89	74	52	61	96		
College and Career Acceleration	31	54	65	18	55	67	33		
ELP Progress		40	45						

* 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	31
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	185
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	83

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	33

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	332
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	74

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	27	Yes	4	4
ELL	20	Yes	4	3
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	18	Yes	4	4
HSP	36	Yes	4	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	24	Yes	4	1
FRL	33	Yes	4	

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	30	Yes	3	3
ELL	25	Yes	3	2
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	15	Yes	3	3
HSP	32	Yes	3	

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	32	Yes	3	
FRL	34	Yes	3	

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	14			19			15	23		83	31	
SWD	9			14			10	17		31	6	
ELL	13			23			7	36			4	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			8			25	14			4	
HSP	14			25			12	30		47	6	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	11			15			15	17		10	6	
FRL	14			21			15	27		41	6	

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	12	27	34	10	39	50	20	48		74	18	
SWD	7	25	30	9	38	46	13	42		73	19	
ELL	9	28		5	39		20	46				
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	0	5		13	38		21					
HSP	15	30	44	8	41	47	18	53				
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	12	30	36	13	35	50	22			57		
FRL	15	28	36	11	44	50	18	56		68	15	

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	16	31	30	9	22	55	11	24	18	96	33	
SWD	10	27	28	6	21	52	10	17		96	32	
ELL	12	31		5	15		0	27				
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	8	25	10	5	36			15				
HSP	16	28	31	7	16	56	6	19		90		
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	17	35	41	13	26	55	19	32		100	38	
FRL	16	31	41	10	21	63	5	10		94	25	

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
10	2023 - Spring	9%	40%	-31%	50%	-41%
07	2023 - Spring	19%	36%	-17%	47%	-28%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	11%	39%	-28%	47%	-36%
09	2023 - Spring	13%	39%	-26%	48%	-35%
06	2023 - Spring	12%	35%	-23%	47%	-35%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	24%	38%	-14%	54%	-30%
07	2023 - Spring	38%	35%	3%	48%	-10%
08	2023 - Spring	20%	42%	-22%	55%	-35%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	11%	33%	-22%	44%	-33%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	4%	37%	-33%	50%	-46%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	6%	37%	-31%	48%	-42%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	16%	50%	-34%	63%	-47%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	26%	65%	-39%	66%	-40%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	14%	49%	-35%	63%	-49%

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.

Civics showed the lowest performance. The contributing factor was not having a certified teacher in the class for instruction for a full year along with poor attendance.

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

Algebra and Geometry show the greatest decline. Lack of student engagement and instructional fidelity are contributing factors to the decline.

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.

Roosevelt Academy showed scores well below the state average in all areas. This is due to low attendance rates and a 73% exceptional student population.

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

Math showed the greatest improvement. Increased fidelity helped to improve this area.

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

1. Attendance

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

1. Attendance
2. ELA/Reading
3. Collaborative Planning/Instructional Support

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**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.

Roosevelt Academy will focus on collaborative planning and instructional support for all teachers in order to increase teacher efficacy. The learning gains and schoolwide achievement for Roosevelt Academy falls short in ELA/Reading, Math, and Science. The most significant deficiencies remain in ELA/Reading among all subgroups. As teacher instructional practices improve in aligning student tasks to benchmarks, so will student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By participating in collaborative planning bi-weekly, teachers will use data gleaned from appropriate summative assessments to plan using the Learning Arc to drive instruction in the classroom. During this planning, the teachers will review the benchmark to ensure that the tasks are aligned. Administrative standards-based walks will measure growth.

Monitoring:

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

1. Track the frequency of planning sessions and collect planning documents.
2. Standards Walk Tool to monitor classroom instructional practices.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carla Wiggs (carla.wiggs@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.)

Use of the Learning Arc framework for planning.

Standards based walk tool to monitor teacher instructional practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Ensure that collaborative planning is taking place effectively.

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. Track the frequency of planning sessions and collect planning documents. Each administrator will be in collaborative planning meetings with their assigned content area.
2. Standards Walk Tool to monitor classroom instructional practices. Each administrator will conduct six SBI walks a week. The administrative team will review the trend data to identify areas of improvement.

Person Responsible: Carla Wiggs (carla.wiggs@polk-fl.net)

By When: 2023-2024 school year.

#2. 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.

Due to poor student attendance, (38% missed 20 or more days of school), it was determined that excessive absences negatively impact student performance. 61% of the students that missed 20 or more days of school were middle school students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the school year, Roosevelt Academy will improve its attendance rate by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

The attendance manager/school counselor will monitor student attendance weekly. She will provide the administration with a list of students with excessive absenteeism each week. The students that reach 5 unexcused absences in a 30-day period will receive an attendance letter. Once the student reaches 10 unexcused absences in 30 days, an attendance meeting will be scheduled for the student, parents, attendance manager, and school administration. If there are 15 absences in a 90-day period, the community liaison will be contacted. The school will monitor student attendance and make phone contact with the parents after each fifth day of absenteeism.

The school-wide behavior management system also helps us to identify those students that continue to be at risk. At the end of each week, the student point sheets are tallied, and students are rewarded for earning 75% or greater for the week. This behavior management system goes hand in hand with attendance as students need to be present to earn. Data is tracked in order to identify students that are not earning and allows for implementation of resources to improve attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Gifford (michelle.gifford@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.)

Parent communication and attendance meetings.

Use of point sheets/monitoring of behavior management system.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of point sheets to assist with behavior management plays a key role in monitoring attendance. Students will self monitor and be accountable for their attendance. The point sheets also serve as a motivational tool for students to receive recognition and participate in school incentives.

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.

The attendance manager/school counselor will monitor student attendance weekly. She will provide the administration with a list of students with excessive absenteeism each week. The students that reach 5 unexcused absences in a 30 day period will receive an attendance letter. Once the student reaches 10 unexcused absences in 30 days, an attendance meeting will be scheduled for the student, parents, attendance manager, and school administration. If there are 15 absences in a 90 day period, the community liaison will be contacted.

The school will monitor student attendance and make phone contact with the parents at each 5 day increment.

Person Responsible: Michelle Gifford (michelle.gifford@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly

Behavior interventionist will:

Collect and tally the student point sheets. Create the list of students that will be able to participate in the incentive program for earning 75% or greater for the week.

Track data to identify students that are not earning. Collaborate with school counselor to implement resources to improve attendance.

Person Responsible: Tamara Woodford (tamara.woodford@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**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.

Roosevelt's area of focus will be to improve instructional practices in the areas of ELA/Reading and Math. The learning gains and school wide achievement for Roosevelt Academy falls significantly short in the above-mentioned content areas. As intervention strategies and instructional practice improve, so will student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Roosevelt students will demonstrate a 5% increase in learning gains in the areas of ELA/Reading and Math.

Monitoring:

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

1. Students in Corrective Reading will be monitored daily by tracking workbook lesson points earned and fluency tests (Levels B2 and C). They will also be monitored at different intervals (based on levels) with a mastery test. If 25% of the students did not pass the mastery test, the teacher must re-teach the lesson. Scores are graphed to show how many words they read per minute and how many errors they make.
2. Student performance (including data chats) will be reviews for the FAST PM 1 and 2.
3. Students in Math 180 will be monitored weekly using the growth measure test. This computer test adjusts to the student's ability levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Precious Hicklin (precious.hicklin@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.)

Corrective Reading
Math 180

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These Foundational courses are used to enhance student areas of weakness in primary content areas of Reading and Math. They provide strategies that will assist students in grasping/understanding the concepts presented in instruction.

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.

Collect student reading data from Corrective Reading teachers.

Teachers will submit workbook lesson points earned, fluency tests (Levels B2 and C), and mastery test scores.

Person Responsible: Precious Hicklin (precious.hicklin@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly

Teachers will conduct data chats with students to review their scores on the FAST PM 1 and 2. They will also complete the data chat forms for each student and turn them in to their content area administrator.

Person Responsible: Heather Donhauser (heather.donhauser@polk-fl.net)

By When: Quarterly

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

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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based 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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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)).

Title 1 funds are allocated and reviewed at the beginning of each fiscal year. As FSA scores are reviewed, Administration along with the Title 1 Coordinator and the Department Chairpersons are able to decipher and determine what areas need to be improved upon and decide what resources may be helpful in assisting with instruction. As the year progresses, the administrative team and Title 1 Coordinator continue to monitor needs and spending to meet the needs of instructional delivery.

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 shared at Roosevelt Academy's annual Open House during the Parent Involvement Meeting held September 14th. This information will also be provided during the initial SAC meeting for the 23-24 school year.

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))

Roosevelt will provide opportunities for parents and families to receive assistance and resources during it's Parent Academic Night and Academy Showcase events. Informational call outs, and notices will be given to keep parents, families, and other community stakeholders informed of student and school progress.

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)

Roosevelt Academy will strengthen its academic program by providing continuous professional development for its teachers that will enhance the rigor of content presented. By focusing on the Learning Arc and improving teacher efficacy, students will become more fully engaged with instruction and productivity.

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))

This plan is developed by incorporating time and resources for planning quality lessons that are aligned with the BEST standards. Professional Development will be provided to ensure teachers have understanding of materials/resources and how to effectively present instruction. Planning and student progression will monitored monthly and instruction will be adjusted as needed.

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))

Each month students are identified and discussed as at risk by the Mental Health and Threat Management Team meetings. The teams meet to discuss the needs of the students and the resource options that may be available to address the students' needs.

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))

Roosevelt Academy participates in the District's Great American Teach-In event as well as the Commitment Day Celebrations. Students are enrolled in the Math for ACT/SAT course that is offered by the school, dual enrollment classes in connection with Ridge Technical College, and students are also able to obtain CTE certification. Participation in the school's academies that are offered prepare students for careers in the areas of Agriculture, Culinary Arts, Welding, and Building & Construction.

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).

Roosevelt Academy implements a schoolwide behavior management program based on employability skills. All students are given a point sheet that is completed by the teacher for each class period. Students that meet the criteria will participate in Leisure Activity Time (LAT) every Friday. Those students that do not meet the criteria are addressed and must participate in Eagle Reserve to review and work on areas in need of improvement.

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))

Continuous professional development and faculty meetings are held throughout the year to keep staff abreast of student needs based upon behavior and academic performance on assessments. Examples of such courses include Schoology, Youth Mental Health Training, and ARC Framework.

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))

n/a

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning				\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				\$68,716.09
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	130	1381 - Roosevelt Academy	UniSIG	0.7	\$45,214.51
	Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - School based Behavior Interventionist who work with small groups of students in need of remediation					
	5100	210	1381 - Roosevelt Academy	UniSIG		\$9,580.95
	Notes: Retirement - 13.57% - Behavior Interventionist					
	5100	220	1381 - Roosevelt Academy	UniSIG		\$3,458.91
	Notes: Social Security y -7.65% -Behavior Interventionist					
	5100	231	1381 - Roosevelt Academy	UniSIG		\$7,719.60
	Notes: Health and Hospitalization - Behavior Interventionist					
	5100	232	1381 - Roosevelt Academy	UniSIG		\$15.12
	Notes: Life Insurance - Behavior Interventionist					
	5100	240	1381 - Roosevelt Academy	UniSIG		\$253.20
	Notes: Workers Compensation - .56% - Behavior Interventionist					
	6400	160	1381 - Roosevelt Academy	UniSIG	0.03	\$1,683.60
	Notes: Cost Sharing - Senior Coordinator of Instruction					
	6400	210	1381 - Roosevelt Academy	UniSIG		\$285.80
	Notes: Retirement - 13.57%					
	6400	220	1381 - Roosevelt Academy	UniSIG		\$161.12
	Notes: Social Security - 7.65%					
	6400	231	1381 - Roosevelt Academy	UniSIG		\$330.84
	Notes: Health and Hospitalization					
	6400	232	1381 - Roosevelt Academy	UniSIG		\$0.65
	Notes: Life Insurance					
	6400	240	1381 - Roosevelt Academy	UniSIG		\$11.79
	Notes: Workers Compensation .56%					

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$68,716.09

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes