

Polk County Public Schools

Language & Literacy Academy For Learning



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 15 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 16 |

Language & Literacy Academy For Learning

330 AVE C SE, Winter Haven, FL 33880

www.weexcelinreading.org

Demographics

Principal: Tandria Callins

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 15 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 16 |

Language & Literacy Academy For Learning

330 AVE C SE, Winter Haven, FL 33880

www.weexcelinreading.org

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 | Yes | % |

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.

To accelerate growth in language, literacy, and social skills for students with special needs while engaging parents as partners in education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create the most effective school for children with special needs through therapeutic, educational, behavioral, and mental health interventions that systematically reduce barriers that have historically prevented students with disabilities from reaching their highest potential.

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Callins, Tandria | Principal | |
| Brown, Dexter | Assistant Principal | |

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 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 14 | 11 | 19 | 16 | 18 | 19 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 135 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 16 | 20 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

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 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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

17

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/18/2019

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 | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 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 | 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 | 0 |

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 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 6 (0) | 10 (0) | 9 (0) | 14 (0) | 11 (0) | 19 (0) | 16 (0) | 18 (0) | 19 (0) | 9 (0) | 1 (0) | 2 (0) | 1 (0) | 135 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 3 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (0) | 3 (0) | 2 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 8 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 9 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 9 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 9 (0) | 16 (0) | 16 (0) | 20 (0) | 11 (0) | 6 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 78 (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 | 0% | 52% | -52% | 58% | -58% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 6% | 48% | -42% | 58% | -52% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 0% | 47% | -47% | 56% | -56% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 4% | 48% | -44% | 54% | -50% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 10% | 42% | -32% | 52% | -42% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 0% | 48% | -48% | 56% | -56% |
| | 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 | 0% | 56% | -56% | 62% | -62% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 0% | 56% | -56% | 64% | -64% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 0% | 51% | -51% | 60% | -60% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 0% | 47% | -47% | 55% | -55% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 0% | 39% | -39% | 54% | -54% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 10% | 35% | -25% | 46% | -36% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 0% | 45% | -45% | 53% | -53% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 10% | 41% | -31% | 48% | -38% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |

| 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 | 18% | 70% | -52% | 71% | -53% |
| 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 | 8 | 30 | | 3 | 15 | | 10 | 21 | | | |
| ELL | 7 | | | 7 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 11 | | | 5 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 10 | | | 5 | | | 7 | | | | |

| 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 |
| FRL | 9 | | | | 18 | | | | | | |
| 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 | 13 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 76 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 91% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 15 |
| 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 | 7 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 |

| Native American Students | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 2 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 8 |
| 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 | 7 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 9 |
| 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.

The performance data was low across all data components. 2019 was our initial year and served as our baseline data. We will be able to track and trend 2020 performance data and have comparative data for 2020 testing results.

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

There was not a decline in the data from the previous year. 2019 was our initial year and served as our baseline data. We will be able to track and trend 2020 performance data and have comparative data for 2020 testing results.

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 Social Studies component reflected the greatest gap when compared to the state average. We have no comparative data from prior year and it is undetermined at this time what could be considered as a contributing factor for this gap other than our school serving students with disabilities.

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

We did not have any areas that showed improvement from the previous year. 2019 was our initial year and served as our baseline data. We will be able to track and trend 2020 performance data and have comparative data for 2020 testing results.

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

Reflecting on the EWS, the greatest area of concern is the number of Level 1's on the state assessments.

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

1. Teacher development and training
2. Increase the number of Level 2's and 3's
3. Decrease 3rd grade retentions
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| | |
|------------------|--|
| #1 | |
| Title | Teacher Development and Training |
| Rationale | If we provide the teachers with necessary resources including current curriculum specifically designed for students with disabilities and technology, our improvement rating will improve from unsatisfactory to satisfactory. |

| | |
|---|---|
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Language & Literacy Academy for Learning will improve their school rating from unsatisfactory to maintaining. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Tandria Callins (tandria.callins@polk-fl.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | <p>According to research, focusing on teacher development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *an integral part of all of a school and district’s strategies for improving student outcomes; *a way to focus on challenging education standards in an equitable and inclusive model that meets students’ academic, social-emotional, and physical development needs; *a sustained effort in a continuous cycle with the familiar steps of learn, plan, do, assess, modify, repeat; data-driven. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | We will follow Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) guidelines and ensure that we our teachers are highly effective. I have scheduled curriculum training for September 4-6 so that the teachers will use the curriculum as it is designed for, to accelerate reading growth across content (social studies, math, and science). The curriculum has progress monitoring built into the online platform along with baseline and year end assessments. This curriculum will also allow teachers to drive their instruction on students', individual needs based on data collected by using the curriculum. |

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teacher training and professional development 2. Teacher quarterly performance reviews 3. Review of Unit Lesson Plans to ensure teachers are including standards 4. Grade Level meetings and Professional Learning Communities 5. Collaboration with teachers and therapists to assist with IEP goals |
| Person Responsible | Tandria Callins (tandria.callins@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).

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.

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Teacher Development and Training | | | | \$210,700.00 |
|---|----------|--|--|----------------|-------|--------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 5200 | 510-Supplies | 8008 - Language & Literacy Academy For Learning | Other Federal | 200.0 | \$16,046.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Exceptional--Supplies: The following items that will be purchased for the (where)classroom use (why) to help support instruction: (what) pencil sharpeners for the classrooms, PECS materials , microscopes, dissection material, and headphones for (who) students. (What) Toner will be purchased for the printer for (who) teacher use. PECS materials are used for communication with nonverbal students. PECS is a unique alternative/ augmentative communication system used for learning with various cognitive, physical and communication challenges. (how) Our educational and therapeutic model addresses the</i> | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|------|---|---|--|-------|-------------|--|
| | | | <i>functional limitations of each child thus reducing their barriers or health conditions that impede access to educational curriculum and social development thus producing successful student outcomes. The cost is \$136.64 per set x 60 students. (when) Items will be purchased Fall 2019.</i> | | | |
| 5200 | 520-Textbooks | 8008 - Language & Literacy Academy For Learning | Other Federal | 200.0 | \$11,269.00 | |
| | | | <i>Notes: Exceptional--Textbooks: (what) Social Studies curriculum provides unique assessments for individual students and (How/Why) conceptualizes each student's educational pathway where learning is a dynamic process of functioning and disability which is attained through the interaction between a person's health condition, environmental factors, personal factors, and academic indicators. The curriculum will be used by the (who) students and kept at the (where) school. Cost is estimated at \$720.20 for grades K-1st grade + \$365.50 for 2nd grade + \$383.50 for 3rd grade + \$426.50 for 4th grade + 501.40 for 5th grade + \$7,801.25 for 6-8 grade + \$1,070.83 for shipping. The curriculum will be purchased in the (when) Fall of 2019.</i> | | | |
| 5200 | 649-Technology-Related Noncapitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment | 8008 - Language & Literacy Academy For Learning | Other Federal | 200.0 | \$26,385.00 | |
| | | | <i>Notes: Exceptional--Technology-Related Non capitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment: (Who) Items and equipment will be used by ESE students and staff. (What) The following items will be purchased: Augmentative communication devices, Charging carts for tablets, 3D printers, Defender cases for tablets. (When) The items will be purchased during the 2019-2020 school year. (Where) The items will be kept at the school. (Why/How) Language and Literacy is a special education school and many of the students are nonverbal and requires assistive devices to communicate, and need to be instructed in the use of such devices. Augmentative Communication Devices are speech/communication solution for our students who have difficulty communicating as a result of autism, aphasia, Down Syndrome, stroke, laryngectomy or any other condition that affects a person's ability to communicate effectively. The cost is \$300 per device x 30 devices. Other technology devices will be used to implement into instructional learning.</i> | | | |
| 5200 | 644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized | 8008 - Language & Literacy Academy For Learning | Other Federal | 200.0 | \$95,368.00 | |
| | | | <i>Notes: Exceptional--Non capitalized Computer Hardware: The following items will be purchased for the (who) students and teachers to use in the (where) classroom: (what) Tablet, desktop computers, laptop computers, HDMI adapters, sync adapters, document cameras, and student response systems. We will purchase 100 (50Y1/50Y2) Tablet computers at \$390 each to aid in student instruction. We will purchase 35 Desktop computers (15Y1/10Y2) at \$390 each, 30 Laptop computers at \$690 each, and other equipment (why) to help improve instruction with technology. The items will be purchased Fall 2019 and Spring 2020. (how) Our vision is to create the most effective ESE school for children with special needs in the nation.</i> | | | |
| 5200 | 360-Rentals | 8008 - Language & Literacy Academy For Learning | Other Federal | 200.0 | \$13,932.00 | |
| | | | <i>Notes: Exceptional--Rentals: (what/who)Curriculum software provides unique assessments for individual students and (how) conceptualizes each student's educational pathway where learning is a dynamic process of functioning and disability which is attained through the interaction between a person's health condition, environmental factors, personal factors, and academic indicators. Cost is estimated at \$528.10 per site x 18 site licenses. Only including the first year of the subscription. (why) Due to the fact that Language and Literacy works with children who have significant special needs, the school provides a large number of therapy services. We are able to bill (what) Medicaid for these services and are looking to purchase a software package which will streamline and improve this process. The cost is based on a quote which lists the cost for the annual subscription at \$744, plus an additional \$372 per user. (who) Users include two of the school's administration and 15 therapists who provide services to students. Each therapist must have their own subscription tied to their own individual license to log each time increment with students. We are only including the first year of the subscription. There software subscriptions will be (where) used at the school and purchased (when) July 2019.</i> | | | |
| 5200 | 643-Capitalized Hardware and Technology-Related Infrastructure | 8008 - Language & Literacy Academy For Learning | Other Federal | 200.0 | \$47,700.00 | |
| | | | <i>Notes: Exceptional--Capitalized Computer Hardware: (Who) Hardware will be used by ESE students and their teachers. (What) We will purchase Interactive Whiteboards. (When) We</i> | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <i>will purchase the hardware during the 2019-2020 school year. (Where) The hardware will be kept in the classrooms at the school. (Why) We will need purchase technology equipment to help support and improve instruction. (How)Our vision is to create the most effective ESE school for children with special needs in the nation.</i> |
| | Total: \$210,700.00 |