

Polk County Public Schools

# Jean O'Dell Learning Center



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>20</b> |

## 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: 7/1/2013

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

### 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>20</b> |

# 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<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School<br>PK-12                      | No                     | %  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.<br>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 | Instructional Coach | Classroom teacher   |
| Brown, Kerry      | School Counselor    |   |
| Elsinger, Erika   | Other               | Speech and language teacher   |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Monday 7/1/2013, April Sumner

**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**

16

**Demographic Data**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>PK-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Special Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 96%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*  |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: No Grade<br>2017-18: No Grade<br>2016-17: No Grade<br>2015-16: No Grade |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southwest  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   |  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | CS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> . |      |

## 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           | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 5  | 9  | 16 | 63    |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2  | 4  | 6  | 27    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 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  | 0     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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     |

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/8/2020

### 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     | 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    |

**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  |       |

**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     | 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    |

**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  |       |

## 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 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 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 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 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 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 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.

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |      |
|---|------|
| 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%  |

| <b>Subgroup Data</b> |  |
|----------------------|--|
|----------------------|--|

| <b>Students With Disabilities</b> |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
|-----------------------------------|--|

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 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% | 2   |

| <b>English Language Learners</b> |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
|----------------------------------|--|

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 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% | 0   |

| <b>Native American Students</b> |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
|---------------------------------|--|

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 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   |

| <b>Asian Students</b> |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|-----------------------|--|

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 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   |

| <b>Black/African American Students</b> |  |
|--|--|
|--|--|

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 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% | 0   |

| 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%                   | 2   |
| 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 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   |     |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| 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% | 2   |

## 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.**

Due to Covid 19 Distance Learning, FSAA Datafolio/ Performance Task testing was not conducted or finished. For the previous school year, 2018-2019, 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. 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.**

Due to Covid 19 Distance Learning, FSAA Datafolio/FSAA Performance Task testing was not conducted or finished. Based on the 2018-2019 school year, 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 2019 (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 with the FSAA Performance Task 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, of the 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 previously or this past year due to no FSAA testing during Covid 19 Distance Learning.

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

Due to Covid 19 Distance Learning, FSAA testing was not completed or provided. In the 2018-2019 school year, we did not see improvement in any academic area due to our small sample size. 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?**

Upon reflection of the 2018-2019 FSAA Datafolio and Performance Tasks results, improvement in the area of teacher monitoring of Unique Learning's GPS data and adaptation of instruction to improve student performance with level of assistance and benchmarks is needed. Based on our discipline referral data for students, discipline and school safety continue to be an area of concern for Jean O'Dell Learning Center. Even though no suspensions were noted, 64 discipline referrals reflecting restraint and seclusion occurred.

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

1. Improve implementation of PBIPs to reduce discipline referrals.
2. Improve implementation of de-escalation strategies by paraprofessionals and teachers.
3. Improve integration of progress monitoring within instructional lessons, specifically FSAA Datafolio collection periods and Unique Learning GPS monitoring.
4. Improve Core Vocabulary development.
5. Improve students' time on task through scheduling structure and grouping.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** 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). In the 2019-2020 school year, the number of restraints decreased from 42 to 32 (10 students to 6 students) , and seclusion incidents went from 27 to 20 (11 students to 8 students). Although we saw a decrease in crisis incidents, these number reflect only a portion of the school year due to COVID 19. In the 2018-2019 school year, 33 restraint incidents and 15 seclusion incidents occurred between August and March 1st. For August 2019- March 2020, 32 restraints and 20 seclusions occurred. We saw an increase of 5 seclusion incidents and a decrease of 1 restraint in comparison to the same time frame the previous school year. As a result of our center school's population consisting of students with severe cognitive delays, we expect to see an increase in behaviors due school closures resulting in distance learning; major disruption in students' normal daily routine and school structure is a predictable precursor to increased behaviors for this population.

**Measurable Outcome:** After our students have experienced an excessive time away from face to face learning due to school closures and distance learning as a result of COVID 19, we will implement behavior strategies to decrease the number of restraints and seclusions by 25% for the 2020-2021 school year. Results will be compared to 2018-2019 full year data and data collected from August 2019-March 2020 as well. By updating and monitoring implementation of PBIPs, providing focused monthly social skill learning instruction, and providing staff development on de-escalation strategies for students, the amount of 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 should have positive behavioral impacts on the students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jami Yost (jami.yost@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Positive Behavior Intervention Strategies will be implemented through staff developed, school wide expectations (SHINE), CPI (Crisis Prevention Institute) safety and de-escalation strategies, and a school wide monthly social skill with daily lessons and integrated practice each day.

In 2019-20 school year, school wide expectations, SHINE, were developed and posted throughout the school. A behavior support coach was added to the staff to assist with individual student needs, monitor the implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention Plans, and provide Social Skills focus and lessons for each month. Staff was also trained in Crisis Intervention De-escalation strategies. As a result of COVID 19, students and staff did not return after Spring Break. Staff development review will be provided on CPI safety and de-escalation and school wide expectations. The behavior coach will continue to provide support for the updating and implementation of PBIPs, CPI strategies, social skills, and school wide expectations.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Crisis Prevention Institute strategies for de-escalation and safety training will provide staff for the skill set to assist in preventing behaviors from reaching the crisis level which can lead to restraint/ seclusion incidents. The use of school wide expectations will provide needed consistency for our students. A monthly social skill focus will equip students with the needed skills to self regulate their emotions. By providing professional development to staff for appropriate strategies for dealing with behaviors and the consistency and skill sets for students, we expect to see a decrease of high magnitude disruptions.

**Action Steps to Implement**



Behavior Coach will meet with each teacher to review and update Positive Behavior Intervention Plans for individual students during pre planning days. Documentation and tracking of progress will be discussed and monitoring checks scheduled. Administration will monitor implementation with the use of classroom walk-thrus and observations during meal times, assemblies, transitions, etc.

**Person Responsible** Laura Holland (laura.holland@polk-fl.net)

Staff will be provided a review of school wide expectations, behavioral strategies and Crisis Prevention Institute strategies, focusing on de-escalation strategies and appropriate interactions to increase safety for staff and students and reduce discipline referrals and restraint/seclusion incidents.

**Person Responsible** Laura Holland (laura.holland@polk-fl.net)

A newly furnished sensory room will be used proactively to decrease agitation and anxiety for students in order to decrease the incidences of continuous high magnitude disruptions. A classroom schedule will be developed to provide group time in the sensory room to prepare students for learning.

**Person Responsible** APRIL SUMNER (april.sumner@polk-fl.net)

Monthly social skills with daily lesson and, activities for implementation and practice will be developed and provided to teachers by the behavior coach. Documentation of implementation will be noted in daily lesson plans and reviewed by administration. Administration will monitor implementation with the use of classroom walk-thrus and observations during meal times, assemblies, transitions, etc.

**Person Responsible** Jami Yost (jami.yost@polk-fl.net)

Continue with the existence and re-certification of the Professional Crisis Management team. Conduct debriefing sessions after restraint or seclusion incidents.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** As a part of the standards based learning cycle, teachers must identify what students need to know, understand, and be able to do, then plan effective instruction to enable students to reach these learning targets. A crucial part of this cycle is progress monitoring as a means to identify what students have learned and what instructional adjustments need to be made. A focus on meaningful progress monitoring is needed to ensure every student is afforded the opportunity to reach their fullest potential through effective standards based instruction. Based on 2018-2019 results from FSAA Assessments, ELA showed a decline in learning gains from the previous school year, going from 28% learning gains in 2018 to 13% learning gains in 2019, a 15% drop. Math went from 18% to 7% learning gains. As we evaluated this data, we encouraged IEP teams to consider which format of FSAA is more appropriate for our most significant cognitive impaired students. After individual IEP team decisions, we now have 78% of our students being assessed with FSAA Datafolio and 22% evaluated with FSAA Performance Task. The results of 2018-2019 FSAA Datafolio assessments resulted in 55% unscorable entries with only 45% of the results being able to be utilized to inform instruction for our students. It is critical that teachers have a thorough understanding FSAA Datafolio to ensure we receive scorable results that can be used as progress monitoring for 78% of our population. They must also utilize GPS assessments to provide monitoring of progress and students' needs to effectively adjust instruction during daily lessons.

**Measurable Outcome:** In order for the FSAA Datafolio to be utilized as a progress monitoring tool, the assessment must be scorable and provide a leveled score for students. With the FSAA Datafolio format, we plan to have 80% of our student work opportunities to be scored as only 45% were scored in the 2019 session. Also, we expect 100% of our students to be monitored through Unique Learning Systems GPS progress monitoring tool and evidence of adjusted instruction based on this monitoring within lesson plans.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jami Yost (jami.yost@polk-fl.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers, Academic Resource Teacher and Assistant Principal will attend state FSAA Datafolio training. Teachers will engage in common planning time and Professional Learning Communities, with the guidance of our Academic Resource Teacher, to develop lesson plans and strategies to integrate Datafolio Evidence Collection opportunities into daily lessons. The use of the GPS tool within Unique Learning System will assist with monitoring the progress of the strategies employed for all students. Data will be collected and analyzed, and adjustments to teaching strategies will be made to ensure that all students benefit from the instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Our leadership team has participated in a two year Leadership Academy for sustaining systems growth. As a result of our learning, we have identified the need to focus our teachers on planning data driven effective instruction. Although FSAA tutorials are available for teachers administering Datafolio, our data reflected a need for our staff to attend FSAA Datafolio training provided by the ACCESS Project to afford them the needed skills in integrating Datafolio collections within well planned daily lessons in order to receive results that provide data driven instruction.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Hire an Academic Resource Teacher to assist with instructional planning, modeling, and guidance.

**Person Responsible** APRIL SUMNER (april.sumner@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will attend FSAA Datafolio professional development through the ACCESS Project in July 2020.

**Person Responsible** APRIL SUMNER (april.sumner@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will engage in weekly Professional Learning Communities to develop and design Datafolio standards assessments under the guidance of the Academic Resource Teacher.

**Person Responsible** Mary Ann Luciano (maryann.luciano@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will engage in collaborative planning to assess GPS data and plan effective instruction accordingly under the guidance of the Academic Resource Teacher.

**Person Responsible** Mary Ann Luciano (maryann.luciano@polk-fl.net)

Lesson plans will be monitored for evidence of progress monitoring results with specific instructional adjustments based on the data.

**Person Responsible** Jami Yost (jami.yost@polk-fl.net)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**The school leadership team will hold weekly meetings to revisit the SIP and reflect on progress towards Areas of Focus and areas of need. As a part of standards based instruction, the team will continue to provide strategies under the guidance of our SLP to strengthen Core Vocabulary development for students by deciding on specific "words of the week" and assessments to monitor student progress. The team will continue to work through the LSI framework to address classroom needs including a focus on scheduling structures and strategies for varying grouping of students. Modeling and individual planning sessions will be provided to teachers with the Academic Resource Teacher to assist teachers with this focus.**

## 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.

Jean O'Dell Learning Center recently rebranded our school to the Jean O'Dell Suns- Where All Abilities Shine. The rebranding and school wide expectations were developed and approved by all staff members

and the School Advisory Committee made up of staff, business partners, and family members. The "Sun" theme has been incorporated in school wide expectations identified by the acronym SHINE. Posters of these expectations were provided in each classroom and hung in all common areas of the school. Teachers review the expectations daily with their students. A mascot costume of a sun was purchased. Our Sun mascot appears during monthly celebrations highlighting staff and student birthdays, monthly "shining" students from each classroom, and staff who have been nominated by their peers for "shining" gestures. Our school holds an annual Fall Carnival for our students to provide an event for students to participate in games and activities they otherwise may not be able to experience in their community. This past school year, our school hosted an Agency Fair for our families including a dinner for our families. The event was well attended and is being planned as a yearly event. Families, business partners, and district staff are invited to participate in all of our school events. The results of these efforts have resulted in a positive culture of staff, students, and families who have great pride in their school. We recognize the importance stakeholders play in our school and host quarterly School Advisory Council meetings to review our school's mission, vision, goals, progress and school needs and provide input .

**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. | <b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports</b> | <b>\$0.00</b> |
| 2             | III.A. | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction</b>                  | <b>\$0.00</b> |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |   | <b>\$0.00</b> |