Lake Alfred Polytech Academy

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Alfred Polytech Academy

925 BUENA VISTA DR N, Lake Alfred, FL 33850

http://lapolytech.polk-fl.net

Demographics

Principal: Britt Gross

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: D (34%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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

Lake Alfred Polytech Academy

925 BUENA VISTA DR N, Lake Alfred, FL 33850

http://lapolytech.polk-fl.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	95%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

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.

It is the mission of Lake Alfred Polytech Academy to provide a safe and structured environment, foster motivation, and guide all students to reach their social, academic, college, and career potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Believe. Achieve. Succeed. Everyone. Everyday.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gross, Britt	Principal	Provides leadership for and management of programs and processes related to instruction, school operations, personnel management, business management, student support services, student activities and community involvement.
Sweet, Lacey	Assistant Principal	Assists the school principal by providing leadership for and management of programs and processes related to instruction, school operations, personnel management, business management, student support services, student activities and community involvement.
Williams, Tony	Assistant Principal	Assists the school principal by providing leadership for and management of programs and processes related to instruction, school operations, personnel management, business management, student support services, student activities and community involvement.
Gaymont, Katherine	Reading Coach	The School-based Coaches are responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. They are also be responsible for coaching teachers about: data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools.
Smelser, Belinda	Math Coach	The School-based Coaches are responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. They are also be responsible for coaching teachers about: data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools.
Lane, Brandon	Teacher, K-12	Works with school administration with the development and implementation of the school's local testing program. Provides data and technical assistance to school as necessary for the development of the school improvement plan. Responds to questions in relation to test administration and interpretation and utilization of results for school improvement. Complies with best practices and procedures and shares them with school staff as appropriate. Identifies and shares national and state reports with school staff. Assists in coordinating workshops and activities on school accountability and data issues. Conducts training with school personnel on state testing requirements, environment, security, and procedures and the implementation and use of progress monitoring systems.
Jenkins, Mario	Dean	Provides articulation between the Office of Discipline and school administration related to discipline. Interprets and applies School Board Code

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		of Conduct and discipline policies related to student discipline within the school site. Remains current on the latest pedagogical studies relating to MTSS, PBIS, discipline, restorative justice, and alternative education. Works with administrators and school personnel in solving school-wide problems related to the Code of Student Conduct.
Canon, Lana	Teacher, K-12	Duties include identifying students who are at-risk in not meeting grade level proficiency by analyzing data from identified state and district formative and summative assessments, classroom grades, Measures of Academic Progress (MAP), and other identified curricula-based learning objectives, collaborating with teachers to plan, implement, and evaluate interventions for identified students; identifying appropriate supplemental resources to meet students' individual needs; working with administration to implement and document activities related to the Title I Plan; monitoring students' response and communicating with administration, teachers, and parents regarding students' progress in tutoring activities. Implementation of intervention strategies with students may be accomplished through "pull out" or "push in" with small groups or on a one-to-one basis when necessary. Tutoring may occur before, during, and after school.
McGill, Idiana	Teacher, ESE	SAC Chair, PTO Member, and Self-Contained ESE classroom teacher.
Peabody, Brooke	Instructional Technology	Coordinates the maintenance, operation and management of existing instructional and non-instructional school microcomputer networks. Develops and maintains network procedures to ensure regular system backups on a timely basis for administrative, media, foodservice and instructional networks. Maintains software/hardware inventory to include locations within school and a school data-wiring diagram. Establishes environment encouraging creative and independent use of instructional technology. Coordinates and/or provides training to school staff in network and software use. Facilitates the use of existing and emerging technology by staff and students. Some examples are Internet usage, interactive video, media center search tools, instructional television and computer based instructional materials.
Hearn, Anne-Marie	Instructional Media	Provides leadership and expertise in the development, implementation and evaluation of the school library media program and instructional materials to promote student learning and teacher effectiveness for the benefit of the system's total educational program. Coordinates all aspects of the school library media program, library media services, and management, oversight, and instructional materials adoptions, purchases, and implementation of inventory.
Warren, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	Coordinates the referral, staffing, placement, and re-evaluation process for exceptional student education at the school level. Serves as a member of individual educational plan (IEP)

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		meetings as the LEA representative. Provides the level and frequency of direct support to students and teachers based upon general educators' and students' need for assistance. Implements a program of study designed to meet individual needs of students with disabilities as outlined in the student's IEP. Provide support for ESE student achievement in the general education classroom through cooperative consultation and support facilitation. Will assist with progress monitoring, data collection, analysis and necessary changes in the instructional program for students with disabilities based on assessed results.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/28/2020, Britt Gross

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.*
2

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
37

Total number of students enrolled at the school
635

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
0

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
0

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	168	245	222	0	0	0	0	635
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	49	65	0	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	22	20	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	33	0	0	0	0	56
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	23	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	48	44	0	0	0	0	106
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	44	39	0	0	0	0	106
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	89	75	0	0	0	0	252
Level 1 on 2021 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2021 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	58	64	0	0	0	0	136

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	3	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/12/2021

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	238	203	183	0	0	0	0	624
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	24	21	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	28	31	0	0	0	0	82
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	40	70	0	0	0	0	156
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	46	47	0	0	0	0	135
December 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	50	53	0	0	0	0	149
December 2019 STAR Math Level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	28	19	0	0	0	0	95

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	59	63	67	0	0	0	0	189

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	4	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	231	212	201	0	0	0	0	644
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	50	51	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	18	29	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	21	35	0	0	0	0	66
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	19	12	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	40	70	0	0	0	0	156
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	46	47	0	0	0	0	135
December 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	50	53	0	0	0	0	149
December 2019 STAR Math Level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	28	19	0	0	0	0	95

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	102	101	102	0	0	0	0	305

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	1	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				44%	48%	54%	34%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				43%	52%	54%	47%	47%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	48%	47%	43%	42%	47%
Math Achievement				47%	50%	58%	35%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains				48%	50%	57%	51%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	48%	51%	48%	51%	51%
Science Achievement				32%	44%	51%	33%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				67%	72%	72%	92%	86%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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
06	2021					
	2019	53%	48%	5%	54%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	39%	42%	-3%	52%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
08	2021					
	2019	33%	48%	-15%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	47%	47%	0%	55%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	47%	39%	8%	54%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
08	2021					
	2019	19%	35%	-16%	46%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	32%	41%	-9%	48%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	68%	70%	-2%	71%	-3%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	80%	50%	30%	61%	19%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	53%	-53%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

STAR Reading
STAR Math
District Quarterly Assessments in Civics and Science

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49%	44%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43%	42%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	17%	17%	23%
	English Language Learners	27%	27%	42%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	53%	55%	36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46%	46%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	22%	28%	25%
	English Language Learners	46%	43%	34%

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42%	46%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38%	38%	39%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	21%	30%
	English Language Learners	17%	13%	22%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28%	52%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22%	45%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	37%	35%
	English Language Learners	27%	41%	41%
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58%	34%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58%	29%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	43%	31%	43%
	English Language Learners	59%	33%	53%

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52%	57%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43%	51%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	29%	57%	27%
	English Language Learners	23%	23%	9%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33%	71%	57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	59%	49%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	57%	36%
	English Language Learners	29%	52%	38%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68%	44%	49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	63%	39%	43%
	Students With Disabilities	48%	16%	16%
	English Language Learners	69%	45%	51%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	29	42	41	27	31	29	25	69			
ELL	29	41	35	29	27	28	20	54			
BLK	34	37	24	27	24	30	20	47	43		
HSP	43	45	32	41	35	43	39	64	64		
MUL	50	38		43	14						
WHT	48	43	33	48	34	36	53	70	47		
FRL	36	36	26	35	29	33	35	60	39		
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	21	37	32	31	47	46	16	45			
ELL	18	30	29	16	42	53	11	56			
BLK	26	34	31	34	41	32	23	58	82		

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
HSP	38	38	33	37	47	55	24	57	70		
MUL	73	73		82	64						
WHT	58	54	59	63	52	47	60	82	85		
FRL	39	41	34	42	48	47	26	62	81		
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
SWD	18	41	39	27	48	50	11				
ELL	11	40	38	16	51	49	4				
BLK	22	46	49	28	51	43	23				
HSP	30	45	39	26	50	47	27	89	73		
MUL	55	60		36	45						
WHT	50	49	47	53	51	50	51	89	80		
FRL	30	46	40	30	51	50	28	94	75		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	30
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
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	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	36
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	46
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Although limited growth has been experienced in Learning Gains in Reading and Math and Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% in Reading and Math over the past three years, performance in these areas has been maintained. The consistently lowest performing area for the school has been 8th Grade Science Achievement. The trends across grade levels and subgroups remains that our ELL and SWD students are not preforming on grade level.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based off our progress monitoring data we have three areas that have great need for improvement: SWD across all contents, ELA and Science. Although limited growth has been experienced in Learning Gains in Reading and Math and Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% in Reading and Math over the past three years, performance in these areas has been maintained.
Although gains have been made in 8th Grade Science, this has been a consistently low performing area for the school and continues to be an area in need of substantial growth. For the past four years 8th Grade Science Achievement has fluctuated between 25% and 28%. Although, an increase in Science Achievement did occur from 25% in 2017-18 to 32% in 2018-19 we are still 16% below the state average for 8th Grade Science Achievement. 8th Grade Science Achievement had the biggest gap when compared to the state average.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

One of the major contributing factors to this need for improvement we encountered last year was that we had a large number of SWD students who were in eSchool last year. We also had several students who switched back in forth between eSchool and Campus Learning multiple times. When the students were in eSchool they did not have access to the support and resources like they would on campus. We were also not able to provide tutoring in person like we have in the past.
For the 2021 – 2022 school year several changes have been made to help facilitate reaching our instructional goals:
• ESE Inclusion teachers will be assigned to a grade-level. They will have a grade-level specific caseload and will be the primary service provider to their assigned students in Science, Math, ELA and Social Studies classes.
• We have also adjusted our schedule back to a seven-period day from an alternating block schedule. This change in our scheduling model will provide students with access to all core and remediation courses daily.
• All core teachers will be teamed by grade-level.
• All core teachers will have common planning by grade-level.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The progress monitoring shows that 7th grade math shows the most improvement. The Mathematics Achievement data component has shown the greatest improvement over previous years with a 19% increase from 2016-17 to 2017-18 and an additional 12% increase from 2017-18 to 2018-19 for a total increase over from 2016-17 to 2018-19 of 31%. This improvement can be attributed to many factors, including the scheduling of students struggling in Algebra 1 and Geometry into Intensive Math to provide additional support for those students in need of greater assistance.
Although the Leadership Team monitors student performance during the three progress-monitoring windows, the team also closely monitors student performance in all mathematics courses to ensure all students were receiving the appropriate support and interventions based upon their individual needs.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

There are several contributing factors to our improvement in mathematics:
• Our Math Coach, Math Interventionist, and math teachers collaboratively developed Module Assessments to assist in monitoring student progress toward proficiency and guide intervention strategies between progress-monitoring assessments.
• Our Math Interventionist also worked closely with our Math Coach and teachers to provide push-in and pull-out services to our students with the greatest identified need by standard.
Additionally, the majority of the students in 7th grade were taught by one teacher. Students who started the school year in eSchool were with him and when they came back to campus, they remained with him. (it was not like that for other content and grade levels) This teacher utilizes personalized learning based off data and hold data chats regularly with his students. He builds relationship with his students and parents and has engaging lessons. When a student enters his class, he does an evaluation of each student's needs and creates a remediation plan for the student.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

According to Using Technology with Classroom Instruction That Works, 2nd ed. (Marzano, 2012), when purposefully planning and paring the seven categories of technology (word processing applications, spreadsheet software, organizing and brainstorming software, data collection tools, multimedia, web resources, and communication software) with the nine categories of instructional strategies that affect student achievement (identifying similarities and differences, summarizing and note-taking, reinforcing effort and providing recognition, homework and practice, nonlinguistic representation, cooperative learning, setting objectives and providing feedback, regenerating and testing hypotheses, and cues, questions, and advanced organizers) an effect size of ranging from 1.61 to .59 can be achieved with all learner sub-groups.
During collaborative planning and classroom visits conducted by the school's Academic Leadership team, and District support personnel, focus will be placed on ensuring the student targets and tasks meet the complexity level of the standards being taught and are aligned to the student success criteria. During classroom visits by administration, evidence of differentiated, standards-based instruction will be collected, and data chats will be conducted with the staff to review the effectiveness of instruction in the classroom. School administration will review and monitor lesson plans, team meeting documentation, coaching logs, and documentation from coaching cycles to determine effectiveness of implementation and that the needs of all student subgroups, especially our ESE and ESOL students, are being addressed.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Monthly during PLCs, Common Planning, or virtually through Microsoft Teams or Google Classroom, the Literacy Coach, Math Coach, and Math Interventionist will work with all teachers on researching, gathering, and developing engaging resources. Professional development for teachers will focus on different areas of need including but not limited to:
• Personalized learning in the classroom
• Providing small group instruction
• Using data to drive instruction
• Conducting student data chats
• Planning for lessons 50 mins vs 90 mins
• Developing engaging lessons with technology integration
• Resources for ELL and SWD
• Accessing Enrich
• Using ClassDojo
Professional development Supplies, Instructional Technology supplies, and instructional materials (laptop batteries, Fab Lab supplies) for these sessions will be purchased through the school's 2021 - 2022 Title I Part A allocation.
Monthly the Literacy Coach, Math Coach, and Math Interventionist will work with the ESE and ESOL departments to provide increased supports and improved interventions for the school's ESE and ESOL students. The integration and effectiveness of these supports will be monitored by the administration, Coaches, and Interventionists by reviewing Achieve 3000, Imagine Math, and STAR Reading data monthly.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Some of the additional professional development, schoolwide initiatives, and services that will be implemented and funded through the school's 2021 - 2022 Title I Part A allocation during the 2021 – 2022 school year include CHAMPS, a comprehensive PBIS and MTSS initiative throughout the school, and training teachers on accessing IEP and 504 information for students through Erich.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based upon the school's historical performance data and progress monitoring data from the 2020 - 2021 school year, the subgroup that has struggled the most and has shown limited growth in achievement and learning gains has been our SWD. In previous years, structures, interventions, and supports have been in place to service our SWD population; however, those structures, interventions, and supports were not always coordinated or implemented with fidelity. Although our trend data shows that our SWD subgroup has struggled the most with demonstrating growth in achievement and learning gains, due to the COVID-19 pandemic the gaps in learning were magnified during the 2020 - 2021 school year. One of the contributing factors to the limited growth experienced by our SWD population we encountered during the 2020 - 2021 school year was that a large number of our SWD remained in eSchool for the duration of the school year or they switched back in forth between eSchool and Campus Learning multiple times; deepening the learning gaps experienced by SWD population because students who were in eSchool did not consistently have access to the level of supports and resources they would have had access to had they been Campus Learning students.
Measurable Outcome:	Through a systematic and differentiated campus-wide ESE program the needs of our SWD population, the achievement and learning gains for our SWD population will be increased by 5% in all core areas by the end of the 2021 - 2022 school year. ELA Achievement will increase from 21% to 26% ELA Learning Gains will increase from 37% to 42% ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25% will increase from 32% to 37% Math Achievement will increase from 31% to 36% Math Learning Gains will increase from 47% to 52% Math Learning Gains Lowest 25% will increase from 46% to 51% Science Achievement will increase from 16% to 21% Social Studies Achievement will increase from 45% to 50%
Monitoring:	Weekly the school's administration will review and monitor lesson plans, team meeting documentation, coaching logs, documentation from coaching cycles, and data from classroom visits to determine effectiveness of implementation and that the needs of all student subgroups, especially our SWD students, are being addressed. Additionally, the school's administration, academic coaches, and Interventionist will review data from Achieve 3000, Imagine Math, STAR Reading and Math, and quarterly assessments monthly.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Britt Gross (britt.gross@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Comprehensive interventions for learning disabled students (0.77) Individualized instruction (0.23) Personalized Learning (0.53)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students come to us with a variety of strengths, weaknesses and backgrounds. By providing personalized learning options we can meet the individual needs of our students in order to advance their academic progress. The redesign of the ESE program on the campus will include developing individualized and comprehensive interventions for our SWD population. Students are able to work with teachers, ESE support facilitators, interventionists, academic coaches, and other members of the leadership team to focus on areas of need as identified through course work, class grades, and progress monitoring

data. A combination of hands-on activities, computer programs and one-on-one coaching will be utilized to differentiate learning based upon each student's identified needs.

Action Steps to Implement

The school's administration will build a master schedule to provide for common planning time for grade-level content areas and grade-level teams. Students will be assigned to a core grade-level teaching team to provide for individualized support and monitoring.

Person Responsible Lacey Sweet (lacey.sweet@polk-fl.net)

ESE Inclusion teachers will be assigned to a grade-level. They will have a grade-level specific caseload and will be the primary service provider to their assigned students in Science, Math, ELA and Social Studies classes.

Person Responsible Jennifer Warren (jennifer.warren@polk-fl.net)

The school's master schedule will be adjusted back to a seven-period day from an alternating block schedule. This change in our scheduling model will provide students with access to all core and remediation courses daily.

Person Responsible Britt Gross (britt.gross@polk-fl.net)

Monthly the Literacy Coach, Math Coach, and Math Interventionist will work with the ESE departments to provide increased supports and improved interventions for the school's ESE students. The integration and effectiveness of these supports will be monitored by the administration, Coaches, and Interventionist by reviewing Achieve 3000, Imagine Math, and STAR Reading data monthly.

Person Responsible Katherine Gaymont (katherine.gaymont@polk-fl.net)

ESE Inclusion teachers will conduct data chats with all students included in their grade-level specific caseload.

Person Responsible Jennifer Warren (jennifer.warren@polk-fl.net)

The Learning Strategies classes will provided students with early access to upcoming core content and academic vocabulary through accelerated previewing.

Person Responsible Lacey Sweet (lacey.sweet@polk-fl.net)

The leadership team will meet weekly throughout the year to evaluate instructional alignment with our students' needs. Teachers will monitor student growth by analyzing the data from state, district, school, and formative pre/post assessments. Progress monitoring will occur periodically throughout the year. The leadership team will meet with teachers to discuss their data. Teachers will also be monitored and coached weekly to ensure our SIP goals are being implemented with fidelity within the classroom setting.

Person Responsible Britt Gross (britt.gross@polk-fl.net)

Monthly during PLCs, Common Planning, or virtually through Microsoft Teams or Google Classroom, the Literacy Coach, Math Coach, and Math Interventionist will work with all teachers on developing effective instructional strategies. Professional development for teachers will focus on different areas of need including but not limited to:
• Personalized learning in the classroom
• Providing small group instruction
• Using data to drive instruction
• Conducting student data chats

- Planning for lessons 50 mins vs 90 mins
- Developing engaging lessons with technology integration
- Resources for ELL and SWD
- Accessing Enrich
- Using ClassDojo
- Data analysis and application to student learning
- Differentiating instruction
- Using rubrics and providing feedback

The data provided through progress monitoring and formative assessments set clear expectations and facilitate the development of a systemic approach to teaching with rigor, relevance, and building relationships as the focus. Professional development Supplies, Instructional Technology supplies, and instructional materials (laptop batteries, Fab Lab supplies) for these sessions will be purchased through the school's 2021 - 2022 Title I Part A allocation.

Person Responsible Britt Gross (britt.gross@polk-fl.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	All students will be monitored using the Early Warning System (EWS) indicators and provided with interventions and supports to help decrease the number of students exhibiting two or more Early Warning System indicators. In reviewing our data, the number of students exhibiting Early Warning System indicators has increased over the last two years. This is a change from the previous two years when the number of students exhibiting Early Warning System Indicators was decreasing. Therefore, it is important that we monitor our students more closely to ensure they are receiving the supports necessary to be successful in all subject areas.
Measurable Outcome:	We will decrease the number of students having 2 or more indicators on the Early Warning System by 50% by the end of the 2021 - 2022 school year. The PBIS and MTSS plan will apply to all students in the school; however, a greater focus will be placed meeting the needs of our ESE and ESOL student populations.
Monitoring:	The school administration will use EWS Indicator data collected from STAR, Achieve 3000, Imagine Math, FOCUS, and the school's Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) program to monitor progress toward achieving the Measurable Outcome for this Area of Focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tony Williams (tony.williams@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Pairing a PBIS plan with an MTSS plan provides an integrated three-tiered intervention framework that improves data, systems, and practices monitoring and affords teachers and Interventionists the ability to specifically focus and identify interventions to meet each student's individual needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementing a Positive Behavior Intervention and Support plan creates a school environment where all students succeed. Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is a framework that helps educators provide academic and behavioral strategies for all learners. According to Visible Learning for Teachers (Hattie, 2011), Response to intervention has an effect size of 1.29 and the use of pre-referral intervention teams has an effect size of 1.10.

Action Steps to Implement

By the end of September 2021 the PBIS and MTSS committee, which is comprised of the LEA, Literacy Coach, Math Coach, Math Interventionist, Dean, Assistant Principal, and classroom teachers, will review and modify the school's PBIS and MTSS plan based upon the previous year's implementation data.

Person Responsible	Tony Williams (tony.williams@polk-fl.net)

The LEA, Literacy Coach, Math Coach, Math Interventionist, Dean, Assistant Principal, and Teachers will meet and review student data twice a month to identify students in need of intervention and determine the necessary interventions for each identified student.

Person Responsible	Katherine Gaymont (katherine.gaymont@polk-fl.net)

Quarterly we will survey students regarding PBIS and MTSS incentives and reward ideas. Incentives and awards offerings will be provided to the students quarterly and in accordance with PBIS and MTSS plan developed by the PBIS and MTSS committee.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Warren (jennifer.warren@polk-fl.net)

Provide students identified for PBIS and MTSS interventions with extended learning opportunities based upon tiered intervention placement with a greater focus being placed on meeting the needs of our ESE and ESOL student populations. Extended Learning supplies and materials will be purchased through the school's 2021 - 2022 Title I Part A allocation.

Person Responsible Mario Jenkins (mario.jenkins@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

In looking at our discipline data from the 2019 - 2020 school year, we identified that there were consistently errors occurring when a discipline code was assigned to office discipline referrals. Of the 22 SESIR defined discipline incidents in the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org report, 12 have been identified as not meeting the criteria of a SESIR defined incident and should have been coded with a local code instead of a SESIR code. For the 2021- 2022 school year administrators and the dean will be retrained on assigning the proper codes to office discipline referrals.

Additionally, the PBIS/ MTSS program will be fully implemented schoolwide and the PBIS/MTSS team will review academic and discipline data monthly. The full implementation of the PBIS/MTSS program for the 2021 - 2022 should aid in significantly reducing the number SESIR incidents occurring on the campus. Grade-level teams will be given the discipline data monthly to review and develop interventions appropriate for each student.

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.

There have been great changes that have occurred over the last five years at Lake Alfred Polytech Academy. We have had an overhaul of our school culture, climate, and the education we provide our students.
Our greatest success in the last five years has been the improvement of our school image and reputation, which has led to increased enrollment, greater community and family involvement, and lower student and teacher attrition rates.

Despite the challenges Lake Alfred Polytech Academy has faced in the past, in the 2020– 2021 school year the school recruited over 350 new students. This increased interest in the school and the school's continued increase in enrollment is related to the marketing and recruitment efforts of the school's administration, teachers, staff, parents, community members, and students. As the enrollment and interest in the school and attendance of campus events continues to grow, additional parent, family, and community engagement events are added each year that are well attended by members of the community, volunteers, and current and prospective students and parents.

Five years ago our SAC committee was basically nonexistent. Over the course of the last five years, we have been able to grow the group. Teachers, parents, community member and students make up the SAC committee and we have 19 voting members that reflect the racial make-up of our school. We also are proud to say that some of the SAC officers are parents. Having parent support is very important to the culture of a school. We worked very hard to encourage parents to have a voice on our campus, with this in mind we restarted our PTO. Although it took some time, we are happy to report that as of the 2020 – 2021 school year all the officers for PTO are parents. Prior to the grant, parent involvement on campus was rare but even with our Covid restrictions the PTO parents found ways help support our students and staff through outside of school fundraisers and spirt nights at restaurants.

Due to COVID we have had to restrict access to our campus for visitors. However, we have continued our partnership with the Lions Club of Lake Alfred who continues to support out students through weekly food donations. The partnership with Winter Haven High School's Technobots Academy is still providing equipment for our robotics class that focuses on the Vex robots. It is our plan as soon as we can to invite all our Community Partners back on campus and continue the programs we have had in the past.

As a school community have experienced a positive change in our school culture amongst all stakeholders. There has been an increase in parent participation, student engagement, teacher retention and we have programs that are now self-sustaining. All of these have increased student interest in learning and have played a major part in the improved culture. As we reflect and plan, the goal is to maintain and improve on these positive changes.

> **Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.**

At the beginning of the 2016 – 2017 school year, Lake Alfred Polytech Academy, at that time known as Lake Alfred-Addair Middle School, did not have any community or business partners. Since that time, we have built relationships within the community through our participation in local events. The Lions Club of Lake Alfred provides support to our students and teachers through weekly food donations, donations of school supplies, sponsorship of our LEO Club, and sponsorship of our Student of the Month.

We developed a relationship with Lowe's Home Improvement that resulted in the school receiving a grant from their 'Voice Team' to remodel our greenhouse and farm area and make it ready for our students to begin growing and learning about organic gardening and hydroponic systems through their science classes.

Our partnership with Winter Haven High School's Technobots Career Academy, which began during the 2016 – 2017 school year, continues to grow through their active involvement with our robotics program. Students from the Technobots Academy aid and mentor our students during school-sponsored events and parent nights.

Lake Alfred Polytech Academy has established an active School Advisory Council (SAC) and Parent and Teacher Organization (PTO). Meetings occur monthly for both committees and are attended by community members, parents, students, and staff. We have also seen significant growth in our school volunteer programs. Volunteers annually take part in the Great American Teach-In, help in our media center, teach lessons in our classes related to their fields of specialization, and supply instructional materials for our classes.

With grant funds, we have been able to purchase equipment and supplies to enhance the Fabrication Lab. The Fabrication Lab has developed into one of our biggest recruitment draws for incoming students. This program has created an online catalog of items that the students make and market. Each year the teachers and students solicit new ideas from the community to add to the catalog. This has allowed the Fabrication Lab to become self-sustaining.

In addition to the Fabrication Lab, we have been able to develop our Hydroponics system, which was built within our existing greenhouse. This system will allow us to incorporate hands on opportunities within our science classes while growing crops to share with our cafeteria staff for them to make food for students to enjoy. We have also developed a relationship with a local farm to table restaurant and we will be selling part of the crops to help this program become self-sustaining as well.