

Polk County Public Schools

Language & Literacy Academy For Learning



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

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: 6/25/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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
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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 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. The vision is to increase the graduation rate of students with disabilities and close the achievement gap between their non-disabled peers.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Callins, Tandria	Principal	HR Coordinator, Therapy Coordinator, ESE Coordinator, Title I Coordinator, Oversee Business/Office Manager, Oversee National School Lunch Program, Oversee Network Manager, and Assistant Principals
Brown, Dexter	Assistant Principal	Oversee Facilities & Maintenance, Director of Secondary Education, & Testing Coordinator
Adams, Sheenah	Assistant Principal	Oversees Pre-K & Elementary, Transportation, Behavior, and Special Olympics.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/25/2020, Tandria Callins

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

20

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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
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 .	

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	12	11	14	20	14	20	21	17	27	9	3	2	0	170
Attendance below 90 percent	9	3	5	6	11	11	15	15	15	6	0	1	1	98
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	2	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	10	16	21	16	12	4	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	8	17	24	29	16	5	0	0	0	104

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	1	4	5	2	0	0	0	12

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/25/2020

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	
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

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
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

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		
	(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.

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					
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%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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						
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				
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%	1
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%	1
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%	0
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%	0
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%	1
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%	1
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%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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%	0
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%	1
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%	1

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 continue to track and trend 2020 performance data and have comparative data for 2020 testing results. Unfortunately due to Covid-19, we will have to use 2021 data.

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

There was no decline in the data from the previous year. 2019 was our initial year and served as our baseline data. We will continue to track and trend 2020 performance data and have comparative data for 2020 testing results. Unfortunately due to Covid-19, we will have to use 2021 data.

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 continue to track and trend 2020 performance data and have comparative data for 2020 testing results. Unfortunately due to Covid-19, we will have to use 2021 data.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

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. Instructional practice.
2. Increase the number of Level 2's and 3's
3. Parental involvement and engagement.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 47% of students performed at a Level 1 on the FSA ELA and Math assessments, an area of critical need is instructional practice and instructional coaching. LLAL employed two teachers who had a professional certificate in education. The remaining teachers were either permanent substitute teachers, out of field teachers who had a statement of eligibility, or out of field teachers who were working under their temporary teacher certification. Based on observations from leadership, performance evaluations, and parent feedback, teacher mentorship and instructional practice was an area identified as requiring focus.

Measurable Outcome: Language & Literacy Academy for Learning will use FEAPs as a standardized way to assess instructional practice and have 70% of teachers to be rated as highly effective.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tandria Callins (tandria.callins@polk-fl.net)

According to research, focusing on teacher development:

Evidence-based Strategy: *is 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: Instructional practice and coaching will be supported through the Professional Educational Competency (PEC) teacher mentorship program that provides specific areas of focus directly aligned with the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs). We will support beginning teachers in this structured format that will give leadership data on teacher performance.

Action Steps to Implement

PEC Program
 FEAPs for performance evaluation of instructional practice
 Instructional Coach provided through Title I

Person Responsible Tandria Callins (tandria.callins@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Teacher recruitment and retention will be additional areas of focus. We will recruit teachers who have at a minimum a statement of eligibility and/or a temporary teaching certificates. We will eliminate permanent substitute teachers. Once we support teachers and guide them through the PEC program and they obtain their professional educator certificate, we will strive to retain them to continue to be mentors and highly effective teachers to improve graduation rates of students with disabilities and narrow the achievement gap between their non-disabled peers.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Staff will focus on building trusting collaborative relationships among teachers, families, and community members. Staff will recognize, respect, and address families' needs, as well as class and cultural differences. Staff will embrace a philosophy of partnership where power and responsibility are shared. School leadership will train staff on mental health awareness and risk factors to respond appropriately to escalations and behaviors.

Parents & Families will be positive about their child's progress and the involvement of the school in creating this success. Parents will be encouraged to actively participate in parent teacher organization meetings, board meetings, and IEP meetings. Families will be encouraged to support extracurricular and fundraising activities and focus on parent volunteers.

Students will be encouraged to recognize the awesome in themselves and others. We will encourage students in being positive role models around campus instead of participating in bullying. We will encourage them to use FortifyFL and prevent bullying and be watchful of mental health risk factors (suicidal talk, ideations among friends).

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching				\$49,121.25
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5200	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	8008 - Language & Literacy Academy For Learning	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$45,000.00
			<i>Notes: Reading/Instructional Coach</i>			
	5200	529-Technology-Related Textbooks	8008 - Language & Literacy Academy For Learning	Title, I Part A		\$4,121.25
			<i>Notes: Renaissance STAR 360</i>			
					Total:	\$49,121.25