Alachua Learning Academy Elementary

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
students
mission
school improvement
ambitious
family and community involvement
striving
achievement
teaching
learning
relationships
success
areas of focus
needs assessment
resources
instruction
supportive environment
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
growth

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Alachua Learning Academy Elementary

11100 W STATE ROAD 235, Alachua, FL 32615

http://alachualearningcenter.com/

Demographics

Principal: Krishna Rivera

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	36%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (77%) 2017-18: A (78%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: A (66%) 2014-15: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

N/A

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

Alachua Learning Academy Elementary

11100 W STATE ROAD 235, Alachua, FL 32615

http://alachualearningcenter.com/

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)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	53%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	31%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

We are committed to the success of every student.
ALA is a H.E.A.R.T.-based family that fosters our students' eagerness for lifelong learning, and their development of moral character and practical life skills, while preparing them to contribute as valuable members of the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educating students to become exemplary citizens of the world with H.E.A.R.T..
We will graduate students who have the knowledge, skills, and personal characteristics to be lifelong learners and independent thinkers. Our graduates will excel in their chosen careers and be productive and contributing members of the global community.

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
Rivera, Krishna	Principal	
Kaseder, Jaya	Administrative Support	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

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

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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)

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 9/20/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	80%	59%	57%	85%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	57%	58%	72%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	53%	0%	48%	52%
Math Achievement	73%	60%	63%	78%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	61%	62%	85%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	51%	0%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	95%	57%	53%	65%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	9 (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	82%	57%	25%	58%	24%
	2018	67%	56%	11%	57%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	55%	4%	58%	1%
	2018	88%	54%	34%	56%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-29%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	100%	55%	45%	56%	44%
	2018	86%	55%	31%	55%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	58%	1%	62%	-3%
	2018	61%	60%	1%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	60%	13%	64%	9%
	2018	100%	60%	40%	62%	38%
Same Grade Comparison		-27%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	80%	57%	23%	60%	20%
	2018	91%	61%	30%	61%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	95%	55%	40%	53%	42%
	2018	77%	55%	22%	55%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison						

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
WHT	83	62		78	85		93				
FRL	76	53		62	68						
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
WHT	89	56		92	85		100				
FRL	76	69		72	63						
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
WHT	93	81		83	85		67				
FRL	73	63		67	74						

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	386
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	80
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	65
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

The data component showing the lowest performance was 3rd grade math and 4th grade ELA. Both 3rd and 4th grade data were in line with state averages. ALA is a small school with only one class per grade. This small sample size can cause a large variance in test scores from year to year.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline was 4th grade math. Even with the decline, 4th grade data was 9% above the state average. ALA is a small school with only one class per grade. This small sample size can cause a large variance in test scores from year to year.

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.

The data component showing the greatest gap was 5th grade ELA. 5th grade ELA data was 44% above the state average. ALA is a small school with only one class per grade. This small sample size can cause a large variance in test scores from year to year.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was 5th grade science. 5th grade science data increased 18% from last year and was 42% above the state average. ALA is a small school with only one class per grade. This small sample size can cause a large variance in test scores from year to year.

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

Potential areas of concern are 3rd grade math and 4th grade ELA. Statewide assessments indicated early warnings in these two areas.

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

1. 3rd grade Math
2. 4th grade ELA
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	3rd grade math
Rationale	A potential area of concern is 3rd-grade math. Statewide assessments indicated early warnings in this area.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our outcome is to reach a 3rd grade math achievement of 65% from the current 59% on statewide math assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Krishna Rivera (rivera@ourala.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Identify the lowest quartile and provide additional instructional time in math.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By providing additional instructional time in math, students will have more opportunities to master key concepts.
Action Step	
Description	1. Schedule additional instructional math time 2. Provide additional staff support 3. Review AIMS data 4. Reevaluate strategy based on data 5.
Person Responsible	Krishna Rivera (rivera@ourala.org)

#2	
Title	4th grade ELA
Rationale	A potential area of concern is 4th-grade ELA. Statewide assessments indicated early warnings in this area.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our outcome is to reach a 4th-grade ELA achievement of 75% from the current 71% on statewide math assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Krishna Rivera (rivera@ourala.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Identify the lowest quartile and provide additional instructional time in ELA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By providing additional instructional time in ELA, students will have more opportunities to master key concepts.
Action Step	
Description	1. Schedule additional instructional ELA time 2. Provide additional staff support 3. Review AIMS data 4. Reevaluate strategy based on data 5.
Person Responsible	Krishna Rivera (rivera@ourala.org)

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).

ESE Communication and Collaboration
Continue to improve our team decision-making process to ensure students with disabilities(SWD) transition from grade to grade, school to school and district to district to ensure placement in the least restrictive environment.
Providing opportunities to learn and practice skills associated with self-determination; coordinating orientation for students moving from elementary to middle school, including giving tours of the buildings, reviewing important information in the student handbook and orienting students to school procedures and ensuring that annual IEP participants page is signed will improve ESE communication and collaboration to ensure smooth transitions for SWDs..

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.

ALA builds positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by providing timely information about school programs and activities through conducting an Annual Meeting. Scheduled mailers, school newsletters and handouts are generated each semester and sent to parents to inform them of all programs and the assessment methods used. Another way is by maintaining a Parent & Family Resource Area consisting of information related to the school and other programs as well as academic resources available for home use. The school also provides Making the Parents Make a Difference newsletter available through the school website. The school website also provides parent involvement documents and materials.

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' social-emotional needs are met by having a home-school liaison at our school who provides extra support to students in need. Due to its small size, the classroom teachers are able to easily identify students and get them the resources needed.

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

In order to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another, teachers convene a meeting at the beginning of the school year to discuss student transitions. Cross-grade level teachers meet weekly to discuss any issues that may arise in this respect. The school holds school-wide activities such as regular whole school assemblies to help students with these transitions as well.

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.

School leadership identifies and aligns all available resources by meeting with staff on a weekly basis. The leadership team meets quarterly to discuss areas of concern and modify any issues that arise. Coordination of federal, state and local funds, services and programs is done with district support.

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

Students learn about different advance college or career opportunities through classroom activities directed to these aims. The school partners with community organizations and businesses at its annual schoolwide expo events.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: 3rd grade math				$20,625.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	100-Salaries	0957 - Alachua Learning Academy Elementary	General Fund		$20,625.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: 4th grade ELA				$20,625.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	100-Salaries	0957 - Alachua Learning Academy Elementary	General Fund		$20,625.00
					Total:	$41,250.00