

Polk County Public Schools

Jean O'Dell Learning Center



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	24
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	27

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

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities*
School Grades History	2020-21: No Grade 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	24
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	27

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 (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
SUMNER, APRIL	Principal	The Leadership Team meets twice a month 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 (benchmark assessments, FSAA Datafolio), and make data based decisions. Team members responsibilities include leading PLC groups to ensure fidelity of expectations, addressing curricular and behavioral concerns, monitoring student portfolio development, and assisting in parental involvement activities.
Yost, Jami	Assistant Principal	Master scheduling, schedule development, discipline, testing coordinator, staff evaluations.
Lehmkuhle, Alyssa		Monitors IEP compliance, assists teachers in writing IEPs, counsels parents on services, new teacher resource for writing IEPs, parent involvement.
Holland, Laura	Behavior Specialist	Assists with developing /implementation/ monitoring behavior intervention plans, assists with student behavior, works with teachers with implementing classroom management strategies.
Luciano, Mary Ann	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Works with teachers to improve instructional strategies for our students, Supports and trains teachers on our online curriculum, develops lessons and supplemental materials for teacher use. Assists with behaviors as needed.

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

17

Total number of students enrolled at the school

68

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

3

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

5

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	1	1	0	3	1	7	8	4	3	4	7	4	25	68
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	1	0	6	3	15	30
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	1	0	3	1	7	8	4	3	4	7	4	25	68

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/24/2021

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	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	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	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	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	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	

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	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		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	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		

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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	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 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					61%	61%		54%	60%
ELA Learning Gains					58%	59%		52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					49%	54%		46%	52%
Math Achievement					61%	62%		55%	61%
Math Learning Gains					56%	59%		54%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					52%	52%		51%	52%
Science Achievement					52%	56%		48%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					79%	78%		85%	77%

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
03	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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					
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					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Teachers began piloting the Unique Learning System's Benchmark Assessments to become more familiar with the tool and how best to utilize the benchmark assessing for progress monitoring; however, due to transitioning of students to e-learning and high absenteeism as a result of the pandemic, the Progress Monitoring Assessments were not completed with consistency and the data is not reliable. The implementation of ULS Benchmark Assessments with fidelity as well as developing a deeper understanding of the need for progress monitoring to drive instruction is the number one focus for the 2021-2022 school year.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

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
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						

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	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

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	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%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
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
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
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 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?

Due to small sample size of students tested per grade level our data can be misleading. Of the students tested with the FSAA Performance Task version we saw declines in both ELA and Math achievement levels for the subgroups that had enough students to be counted.

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

We need to continue to focus on our students and their ability to communicate using Core Vocabulary skills. With over 80% of our students being non-verbal we see the need to focus on the instruction of Core Vocabulary skills to increase the student's abilities to participate in expressive language.

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

As a result of our students significant cognitive disabilities and their lack of expressive language skills we see the need to continue our focus on the implementation of Core Vocabulary lessons to improve the use of picture representation for communication for our students. Expressive and receptive language skills are a foundational skill necessary to increase academic achievement for our students and as such will have a significant impact on academic success. Most of our student's IEP goals focus on communication needs first.

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

Improvement gains were not demonstrated based on FSAA and progress monitoring due to small sample size in tested groups and as a result of most of our students tested by means of Datafolio instead of Performance Task versions of the FSAA. Less than ten students were tested via Performance Task for 2021. As mentioned before, our progress monitoring tool was piloted in 2020-21 and there are issues with the fidelity of implementation which will be a focus for correction during the 2021-22 school year.

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

We did see improvement in the use of Core Vocabulary by our non-verbal students. We conducted weekly assessments on the instruction of 7 high frequency Core words throughout the school year. Lessons for instruction on the core words were provided to the teachers, data was collected weekly to demonstrate student growth. This program will continue for the upcoming school year with an addition of more words for student use.

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

Our common progress monitoring tool, ULS Benchmark Assessment tool, will be utilized by all teachers on all students for the 2021-22 term. Following each progress monitoring window, Administration will meet with each teacher individually to review the data and to assist with analyzing the data to inform teacher instructional strategies. Additionally, the leadership team will work with district staff and ULS to determine the evaluation criteria to determine what growth looks like within the Benchmark Assessments.

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.

Our curriculum support teacher will work with new staff and staff who are struggling with ULs to improve understanding of the online curriculum. Additionally, staff will be provided common planning time to work in teams to make lesson plans and common assessments. Revising our Datafolio Assessment upon feedback from the testing center will be conducted during professional development planning days to improve teacher understanding of the Access Points standards. Revisions will be made to our teacher created Datafolio Assessment to ensure that student work output is scorable in order to provide more accurate progress monitoring for our SWCD.

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

Continued progress monitoring and Administrative/teacher review of the student data following each scheduled progress monitoring period to ensure fidelity of the program.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Implementation of progress monitoring with fidelity with all students. Minimal progress was made in the 2020-2021 school year related to the use of progress monitoring for driving instruction and the importance of progress monitoring for ongoing assessment of students' needs. In 2020-21 Teachers began piloting Unique Learning System's Benchmark Assessments but did not implement the tool with fidelity in part due to pandemic effects (absenteeism of both staff and students, transitioning between e-learning and campus learning) and a lack of understanding for the need for progress monitoring and how to use the data to drive instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	Benchmark Assessments will be provided to all students 3 times during the 2021-2022 school year. Data will be obtained to analyze student growth and areas of need throughout the school year as well as cumulatively at the end of the school year. This data will be a valuable resource for planning during the school year and recognizing areas of need for the following school year.
Monitoring:	Benchmark Assessment windows/dates will be provided for progress monitoring 3 times a year. The administration will provide ongoing monitoring of the fidelity of progress monitoring, tying data to teachers' SAOs, and looking for evidence of progress monitoring in lesson plans and use of grouping during instruction. Both the curriculum coach and the behavior coach will be asked to make this a primary focus when working with teachers throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	APRIL SUMNER (april.sumner@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Unique Learning System Benchmark Assessment will be administered 3 times a year. Data will be used in planning for instruction and for students' IEPs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The benchmark assessments will provide quality student data to be used in planning instruction for students including information for writing appropriate IEP goals, grouping during instruction, and any additional specialized instruction a student may need.

Action Steps to Implement

The administration and the curriculum coach will meet individually with teachers during the first 9 weeks to review students' data.

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

The curriculum coach and the behavior coach will provide ongoing professional development for ULS Benchmark Assessments, using data for planning instruction, and the MTSS process during monthly PLCs.

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

The administration will monitor for evidence of the use of progress monitoring when reviewing lesson plans, SAOs, and during classroom visits.

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

The curriculum and behavior coach will meet weekly with new teachers to provide ongoing support and assistance.

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

Continue Covid protocol to reduce absenteeism among staff and students

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Jean O'Dell Learning Center was not listed on the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org site. We did have four students with at least one referral for discipline, totaling 19 referrals for the year. Three of those students had one (1) incident and the fourth student had 16 incidences throughout the 2020-21 school year. These numbers were down from the 2019-2020 year: 10 students with referrals totaling 58 incidences . The decrease was surprising to us especially given that the school year was two months shorter than 2020-21. When reviewing our data we concluded that the significant decrease was a result of having fewer students on campus and a lower teacher to student ratio, and the offering of virtual or face to face school settings.

The leadership team reviews behavioral data monthly, sharing data with staff as appropriate. We have an ABST on staff who works with other staff on developing behavior intervention plans to assist with decreasing outbursts resulting in referrals. Additionally, the ABST works with staff as a coach to ensure that staff utilize appropriate behavior strategies to de-escalate situations.

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.

JOLC has established school wide expectations that are identified by the acronym, SHINE. Posters of these expectations are provided in each classroom and displayed in all common areas of the school. Teachers

review the expectations daily with their students as part of the morning routine. We have a school mascot, Sunny, that appears during special occasions and during monthly school Sunny Celebrations, where students are recognized for following the school expectations. During these celebrations we recognize a student of the month from each classroom, monthly birthdays, and staff accolades.

Additionally, we partner with our neighboring schools and local businesses throughout the year. We host several school events, such as school dances, field day, water play day in which we invite students from the nearby schools to participate with our students and staff. This provides an opportunity for both sets of students to learn from each other and to grow socially. We partner with our local food pantry where we send a crew of post graduates weekly to work in their stock room, assisting with organization and distribution. This partnership allows our students to be visible in the community and to learn valuable job skills.

The results of these efforts have provided a positive culture for our staff, students, and families. Our stakeholders have pride in our school as evidenced by the multitude of referrals we receive each year from our current families of new families.

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

Feeder schools have ESE staff who are familiar with our programming and who support our efforts often refer families to our school for future options for educating special needs students. Their understanding of our services assists families with determining the most appropriate school environment for their child. Administrators utilize the school's Social Media page (Facebook) to share school activities, shining students and staff, and promote fundraisers to families and the community.

Students participate in district and state FFA events, Polk County Youthfair, Prom, Special Olympics, and community-based field trips.

Quarterly SAC meetings provide opportunities for SAC members to learn about school initiatives and activities as well as provide valued input.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning				\$2,800.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0962 - Jean O'Dell Learning Center	Other		\$2,800.00
			<i>Notes: Cover cost of substitutes for teacher planning days to develop progress monitoring understanding and datafolio samples, total of 22 days. est. \$2800.00</i>			
Total:						\$2,800.00