

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lavoy Exceptional Center



2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
R.A.I.S.E	0
Positive Culture & Environment	0

Lavoy Exceptional Center

4410 W MAIN ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: **Scottie Basham**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	ESE
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	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	94%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Unsatisfactory 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: No Rating
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

All students will develop as future citizens intellectually, physically, socially, emotionally and morally in a safe, least-restrictive environment for life, through the support of well-informed staff, parents, and community members.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Each student is valued as an individual and will be encouraged to develop life skills to his or her fullest potential. Lavoy Exceptional Center recognizes disabilities as a challenge to be surmounted, not as an insurmountable obstacle to be avoided.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

LaVoy is an exceptional education center. All of our students have an Individualized Educational Plan. Our population is very diverse. We have students from Pre-K to 22 on campus. Most of our students have cognitive disabilities. We have a portion of our students that are medically fragile and/or on the Autism Spectrum. Our students have extremely diverse needs and need individualized support. Some of our students are non-verbal. We are fortunate to have a low student to adult ratio, 3 students to every 1 adult. We service the whole child, which means we not only address academic issues, but social/emotional, independent functioning, communication, as well as their physical needs.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Basham, Scottie	Principal	Principal of the school
Klein, Lauren	SAC Member	SAC Chair, Physical Education Teacher, NCI Team and Crisis TEam
Cocchiola, Darilyn	Instructional Coach	Provide coaching and support for faculty and monitor data
Bownes, Erinn	Behavior Specialist	Provides instructional coaching for teachers and behavior support for students.
Carfore, Danielle	Teacher, ESE	Support teachers and provide feedback to SAC
McFarland, Martha	Assistant Principal	Provide PD for staff and instructional coaching
Thompson, Sherry	SAC Member	Assist with data collection and implementation of plan
Watkins, Jayme	Administrative Support	Secretary-keeps notes of meetings
Whaley, Victor	Administrative Support	Data Gathering and collection of evidence of implementation of SIP plan

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.**Demographic Information****Principal start date**

Thursday 7/1/2021, Scottie Basham

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

13

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

15

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

61

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

4

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

4

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	3	3	2	0	5	1	3	6	6	6	5	18	58
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	2	1	0	4	1	1	5	5	3	2	9	36
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 9/12/2021

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	1	2	0	5	6	2	5	8	3	7	4	4	1	48	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	2	0	0	3	1	0	2	1	4	0	6	23	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	
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 FSA ELA assessment	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		

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					57%	61%		59%	60%
ELA Learning Gains					56%	59%		56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					52%	54%		49%	52%
Math Achievement					55%	62%		57%	61%
Math Learning Gains					57%	59%		53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					49%	52%		47%	52%
Science Achievement					50%	56%		51%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					77%	78%		79%	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	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	58%	-58%
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	0%	54%	-54%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	0%	57%	-57%	64%	-64%
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					

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				5	14			9			
FRL				6	15						
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	9	19		6	17		17				
BLK	9			9							
HSP					27						
FRL	12	19		8	22		20				
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	6
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	28
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	53%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	6
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	5
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.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the Areas of Focus?

For all subgroups we worked within our PLC's and ILT to better understand the student's learning gains. Last year, the focus was mainly on communication and school culture. There was a lack of focus on student learning gains.

Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Overall the subgroups stayed consistent. SWD, Black students, Hispanic students and economically disadvantaged students have declined across all subgroups. These groups continue to challenge us to address and show forward movement. In order to better target these groups, we are working within our PLC's to disaggregate data to better target each subgroup. We also have smaller class sizes and have increased the ratio of teacher to student in order to have adults more consistently working in small groups with students.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

Economically disadvantaged subgroup showed the lowest performance. Our school is Title 1 and attendance is often an issue due to students medical needs. Students missing school often translates to low academic performance. Our Social Worker made home visits to check on every student with attendance concerns. We also sent home packets to support the student while at home.

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

Lack of planning for the teachers and using grade level Access Points Standards was not consistent in all grade levels. Teachers typically taught to the lowest level student.

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

A focus on planning using grade level Access Points Standards and using data to plan appropriate differentiated lessons for our students.

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.

Professional development will be targeted for the teachers. Non-evaluate walk throughs will help the ILT build PD that is targeted on instructions. PLC's will focus on instruction and movement of students academically, data chats at report card time for teachers to discuss with each other and leadership team what student needs are and what areas need targeting. Teachers will have time dedicated to planning with colleagues in order to better support each other. Admin and ESE will provide Coaching Cycles and modeling to assist the teacher in specific skill building.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Instructional practice aligned with grade level standards is needed to plan more rigorous age appropriate lessons.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

FASA data comparison from previous year to this year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

During PLC's, and ILT data will be used from grading rubrics to assess student learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Klein (lauren.klein@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Grade level, standards based instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Teachers are not using grade level standards to plan lessons. They teach to the lowest ability level.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Learning walks with staff

Person Responsible

Martha McFarland (martha.mcfarland@hcps.net)

Coaching cycles in order to Plan, Do, Act and Check

Person Responsible

Darilyn Cocchiola (darilyn.cocchiola@hcps.net)

PLC Facilitator Training

Person Responsible

Lauren Klein (lauren.klein@hcps.net)

Working with PLC's to disaggregate data and plan lesson based on grade level standards

Person Responsible

Scottie Basham (scottie.basham@hcps.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

ESE specialists are conducting walk throughs, modeling strategies and workshops assisting teachers understand what grade level instruction looks like. This strategy will specifically assist our SWD ESSA Subgroup and assist teachers with grade level instruction.

Our APC will conduct coaching cycles with teachers to assist them with identifying inequities within classrooms. She also will work with our PLC's and ILT to target areas for growth across the school. This will assist our Black and Hispanic student ESSA Subgroups.

Lastly, our Economically Disadvantaged ESSA Subgroup, do not always have the same access to

needed items than others. Our Social Worker will provide support to the families, delivering supplies and hooking them up with services to help them with what they need.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Students struggle with grade level reading. Several of our students are non-readers and working on recognizing letters, sounds, etc. Students need reinforcement in reading every day in every class.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our FSSA scores in ELA will show growth for this school year, compared to last school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Data chats for teachers to discuss individual student data, especially in ELA. Discussing student work in ELA during PLC to identify literacy strategies to build on student learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erinn Bownes (erinn.bownes@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Data based PLC discussions using student work in ELA

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Teachers need assistance with strategies that are evidenced based and data driven. PLC discussions focused on this area will allow us to continue to support teachers while meeting the needs of individual students.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

PLC training/workshops for teachers

Person Responsible

Martha McFarland (martha.mcfarland@hcps.net)

Workshop on using data to plan and make data based decisions

Person Responsible

Martha McFarland (martha.mcfarland@hcps.net)

Data dives with individual teachers to discuss individual students

Person Responsible

Martha McFarland (martha.mcfarland@hcps.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

All ESSA subgroups will be addressed through PLC discussions. We will focus on students within each subgroup that are not making gains in order to plan and use specific strategies for each student to address individual needs.

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.

Since last year, the schools Culture and Environment has improved dramatically. Staff is beginning to function as a team, and work together. Staff is beginning to support each other and the admin/ESE team deal with most extreme behaviors that would disrupt classrooms for extended periods of time. The use of Triage and Mini-BIT meetings to effectively target student behavior and teach replacement behavior is consistent and allows teachers to focus on instruction.

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

Administration- responsible for whole school policies and procedures. Responsible for creating a culture of communication and working together, along with upholding expectations consistently across the school. Sets the tone of the manner in which the school is going to function.

ESE- Provides teachers support within classrooms, acts as coaches and problem solvers with the staff, monitors IEP compliance and works with families.

Social Worker-reaches out to provide support to families, teachers, staff so each stakeholder is supported. Works one on one with students providing emotional support and skill building.

Teachers- support each other within their teams and assist each other with planning and support. Works for what is in the best interests for students.

All staff members, students and parents all have a role to play with creating a positive culture. When one area is out of synch, it creates havoc in another area. We all must assume best intentions, and work to support each other in the most productive manner we can.