Jean O'Dell Learning Center

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Jean O'Dell Learning Center

1310 FLORAL AVE S, Bartow, FL 33830

http://schools.polk-fl.net/pllc

Demographics

Principal: April Sumner

Start Date for this Principal: 6/20/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Jean O'Dell Learning Center

1310 FLORAL AVE S, Bartow, FL 33830

http://schools.polk-fl.net/pllc

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-12	No	%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Helping our students achieve their full potential by teaching independence and self-confidence in a safe, respectful environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In partnership with our parents and the community, Jean O'Dell Learning Center will meet the academic, physical, health, and behavioral needs of its students, ensuring that the individual educational needs of all students are met with robust and rigorous instructional strategies.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
SUMNER, APRIL	Principal	The Leadership Team meets bi-weekly to discuss academic, behavioral/ discipline, and attendance concerns (MTSS). During our meetings we will collaborate, problem solve, share effective practices and strategies, evaluate implementation and fidelity of current initiatives (ULS/GPS systems; Datafolio), and make data based decisions. Team members responsibilities include developing leading grade band PLC groups to ensure fidelity of expectations, addressing curricular and behavioral concerns, reviewing lesson plan development, monitoring student portfolio development, and assisting with parental involvement activities.
Holland, Laura	Other	
Taft, Laura	Teacher, ESE	
Yost, Jami	Assistant Principal	
Lehmkuhle, Alyssa	Teacher, ESE	
Luciano, Mary Ann	Teacher, ESE	Classroom teacher

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	1	2	4	4	6	3	6	6	7	5	9	20	73
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	0	3	4	1	2	5	2	6	3	6	3	37
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	1	2	1	3	0	13
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	7

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

11

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/23/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	2	3	4	3	3	5	2	4	3	4	10	46
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	4	1	2	6	4	2	2	3	0	26

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	3	1	1	3	2	1	0	1	0	14

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	2	3	4	3	3	5	2	4	3	4	10	46
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	4	1	2	6	4	2	2	3	0	26

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	3	1	1	3	2	1	0	1	0	14

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	61%	61%	0%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	54%	0%	44%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	61%	62%	0%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	56%	59%	0%	50%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	52%	0%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	52%	56%	0%	49%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	79%	78%	0%	68%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	6 (0)	3 (0)	6 (0)	6 (0)	7 (0)	5 (0)	9 (0)	20 (0)	73 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (1)	2 (2)	0 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	1 (3)	2 (3)	5 (5)	2 (2)	6 (4)	3 (3)	6 (4)	3 (10)	37 (46)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	3 (1)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (4)	7 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (4)	4 (1)	0 (2)	2 (6)	1 (4)	2 (2)	1 (2)	3 (3)	0 (0)	13 (26)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

				MATH		
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	12	7		6	8						
HSP	9										
FRL	17	10		10							
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	8
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	33
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	8
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	9
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	12
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Both ELA and Math data indicate that our school struggles with proficiency and growth for the students tested with the Performance Task format of the FSAA. As we became more familiar with the FSAA Datafolio and Performance Task assessments we began to consider which test would be a better measurement of student achievement for our most severely cognitive impaired students. As a result of this study the total number of students tested with PT decreased from 33 to 19 in ELA and 25 to 13 in Math. Additionally, the subgroups reduced from five being identified to three, SWD, hispanic, and economically disadvantaged. Therefore, the impact of each student scoring below proficient drastically decreased our percent scoring proficient in both areas.

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

ELA showed the greatest decline, going from 28% learning gains in 2018 to 13% learning gains in 2019 (a 15% drop in percentage of students with gains). Math went from 18% learning gains in 2018 to 7% learning gains in 2018 (an 11% drop in learning gains). The main factor that contributed to both areas with decline was the decrease in the total number of students tested in ELA and Math. in 2019 there were 18 students tested on the Performance task format for ELA, down from 25 tested the previous year. For math there were 12 tested down from 20 tested the previous year. With such small population sets an individual score has a significant impact on the percentages/. Additionally, students tested in ELA 8 of the 18 tested are completely non-verbal; in Math 5 of the 12 tested are non-verbal.

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.

State averages for FSAA not made available.

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

Due to our small sample size, we did not see improvement in any academic area. In fact, our sample size was so small that we lost a subgroup (White) for calculation of growth. In 2018 White, Hispanic, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged were the four subgroups rated. in 2019 only HIspanic, SWD, and Economically Disadvantaged were identified.
We did see improvement in the number of students with less than 90% attendance, 37 students were identified with poor attendance, down from 46 students the previous year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Discipline and school safety continues to be a concern for our school. A facet of that concern included the implementation of a Social Skills curriculum, the need for a dedicated position to assist teachers with classroom management of behaviors, improved use and tracking of Behavior Intervention Plans, and more certified team members for the CARE team.

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

1. Improve implementation of PBIP.
2. Improve staff awareness of behavior strategies to de-escalate situtations.
3. Implement Social Skills curriculum.
4. Improve instruction using Unique Learning Systems - along with GPS monitoring of achievement.
5. Improve teacher understanding of Datafolio to ensure more student's work is scored in 2020.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Disruptions to instruction
Rationale	After seeing a significant decrease in high magnitude disruption and aggression during the 2016-2017 school year we have seen the number of students and events steadily rise over the past three school years. We have seen the number of restraints go from 12 in 2017 to 42 in 2019 (5 students to 10 students), and seclusion incidents going from 10 in 2017 to 27 in 2019 (7 students to 11 students).

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	After seeing our data points nearly triple in events for restraint and seclusion incidents over the past two years we will plan to have those numbers decrease by 25% for the 2019-2020 school year. By implementing Social Emotional Learning instruction positive and proactive approaches to students in need will be enhanced. Integrating positive interventions and social emotional learning through the use of Social Skills curriculum time out of the classroom environment should be reduced allowing for more instructional time for the students. The use of PBIS and consistent school wide expectations we should see positive behavioral impacts on the students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	APRIL SUMNER (april.sumner@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Positive Behavior Intervention Strategies will be implemented in a more formal formal, school wide expectations developed and posted throughout the school. A behavior support coach has been added to the staff to assist with individual student needs. Staff development with a well known behavior analyst to increase capacity will also be provided. Crisis Prevention and Implementation will be provided to all para-educators to increase the staff member's de-escalation skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By providing professional development to staff for appropriate strategies for dealing with behaviors, we expect to see a decrease of high magnitude disruptions.

Action Step	
Description	1. Hire a behavior specialist in a full time position to assist with PBIP, modeling, intervention development, and training. 2. Provide staff training to include behavioral strategies and CPI, in order to increase the safety in the classrooms. 3. Continue with the existence and re-certification of the PCM team, include debrief sessions after events. 4. Include social skills training in the daily routine in all classrooms. 5. Utilize the sensory room when necessary to decrease the incidences of continuous high magnitude disruptions. 6. Created school-wide expectations with staff to ensure buy in of all involved.
Person Responsible	Laura Holland (laura.holland@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Standards Access
Rationale	It is important that each of our students reach the maximum benefit of standards based instruction. Our curriculum is an on-line curriculum (Unique Learning System) which has the Florida Access Standards embedded in the lessons. We need to ensure that we are challenging our students with rigorous lessons and high expectations for achievement. Included in that we will need to practice the use of Core Vocabulary in the students' daily routine.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	For those students assessed using the Performance Task format for the FSAA we plan to see growth in achievement either by moving up within the level or to the next achievement level. Provided we have enough students tested in the SWD, Economically Disadvantaged, and Hispanic subgroups we should also see improvement in these students scores. With the Datafolio format we plan to have all of our student work samples be scored as only 45% were scored in the 2019 session. .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jami Yost (jami.yost@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Staff will participate in common planning time, Professional Learning Communities, to develop lesson plans and strategies that target specific areas of need for each student. The use of the GPS within Unique Learning System will assist with monitoring the progress of the strategies employed. Data will be collected and analyzed, adjustments to teaching strategies will be made to ensure that all students benefit from the instruction. Differentiated lessons will be utilized to maximize student learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	As our sample size of Performance Task FSAA students decreases the impact of each student's scores will influence our school ratings. We must ensure that those students who are tested with PT have every opportunity to improve their academic skills and that they are challenged in the content. Those students who will be assessed using Datafolio also need rigorous instruction, with the focus being on moving the students along the continuum of Levels of Assistance.

Action Step	
Description	1. Provide staff development for teachers on the Unique Learning System curriculum to ensure that it is utilized to the fullest extent possible. 2. Provide teachers with a calendar of activities to complete to improve skills with regard to navigating ULS. Coupled with the expectation that these skills will be practiced / included in small group instruction. 3. Using the GPS system within ULS to accurately analyze data from standards based instruction during PLCs to determine student's growth or needs. 4. Identify assistive technology needs and implement the use of such technology with those students who need AT to demonstrate knowledge learned. 5. Using Marzano's depth of knowledge to ensure that students are being challenged in the Center environment. 6. Develop a data point on Unify in order to more easily track data. 7. Implement a Word of the Week to provide an emphasis on use of Core Vocabulary. 8. Provide planning days for teachers to develop the test bank for Datafolio. 9. Provide a dedicated testing environment with practice for students.
Person Responsible	APRIL SUMNER (april.sumner@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Continue to monitor lesson plans, instruction, IEP goal progress, GPS data, Levels of Assistance needed for students.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Communication between home and school is essential. We utilize a daily agenda in which teachers and parents communicate to each other about the day to day activities in the classroom. Since nearly 80% of our students are non-verbal it is important that we have open lines of communication. Additionally, parents are welcomed at the school; we have nearly 95% of parents attend IEP meetings to discuss their child's educational needs. We have several activities throughout the year in which parents are welcome to attend, which include: Orientation, Open House, School dances, Prom, Field day, Walk-a-thon, Water play day, Theatrical performances, Awards ceremony, and Graduation. Parents also serve on the SAC committee.

PFEP Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Students may attend our school from age 5-22. Classrooms are made up of mixed grade levels, and transition from one level to the next is minimized by this set up. When students are placed at JOLC, a staffing committee convenes to discuss the needs of the students. The parents and staff of the school then meet to discuss specific needs of the student. Due to our ratio of 3 students to 1 staff person, a great deal of attention is provided to students, easing the transition into our environment.
For students transitioning out of school at age 22, JOLC has informed and assisted the parents of the student regarding services available to the family post education. Beginning at age 13 transition IEPs are developed, where the focus shifts from academics to functional life and work readiness skills. Parents are teamed with State Agencies to develop plans for the students. In addition, a district Agency Fair is provided annually, bringing multiple vendors in to advise parents of possible resources at their disposal.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

The school leadership works with District supervisors, other Principal colleagues, school leaders, and support staff to plan for curriculum, scheduling, personnel, instructional strategies, behavioral strategies, and parent involvement activities. Personnel and budget levels are set by the District office. Once those items are identified and communicated to the school, the Principal in collaboration with the Leadership team develops staff and student assignments. The Operating budget worksheets are completed

following the Leadership team discussion regarding school needs. Professional development needs for staff are determined via a needs assessment review and based on staff evaluations.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Students at JOLC work towards a standard diploma through Access Point Standards. Our secondary focus is employability and life skills for our students in order to assist them in performing skills that most of us take for granted. After the age of 18 and upon graduation, student's education focuses on rudimentary job skills that are taught both on and off campus. JOLC partners with the Polk Education Foundation, the Polk County School Board, and with local charities to provide employability skills training. We work with students on job skills such as reporting to work on time, following directions, asking for help, taking breaks appropriately, appropriate social interactions, money skills, and access to transportation. Students participate in learning about daily living skills, such as, cleaning, cooking, laundry, grocery shopping, and hygiene skills. Students also experience Community Based Instruction through frequent trips off campus to local businesses and service agencies. In order for our students to reach their fullest potential in all areas, therapy services (occupational therapy, physical therapy, and speech/language therapy) are provided as needed.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Beginning in middle grades at JOLC students complete an interest inventory regarding careers. Each year the inventory is provided to the students and addressed on the student's IEP. Career planning is provided in both the classroom and in elective classes for Career Education and Career Preparation. Planning for post education also happens during the IEP process.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Disruptions to instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Standards Access	$0.00
		Total:	**$10,591.00**