Language & Literacy Academy For Learning

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Language & Literacy Academy For Learning

330 AVE C SE, Winter Haven, FL 33880

www.weexcelinreading.org

Demographics

Principal: Tandria Callins

Start Date for this Principal: 8/20/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: No Grade 2020-21: No Grade 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CSI
* 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

Language & Literacy Academy For Learning

330 AVE C SE, Winter Haven, FL 33880

www.weexcelinreading.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-12	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	Yes	75%

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To accelerate growth in language, literacy, and social skills for students with special needs while engaging parents as partners in education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create the most effective school for children with special needs through therapeutic, educational, behavioral, and mental health interventions that systematically reduce barriers that have historically prevented students with disabilities from reaching their highest potential. The vision is to increase the graduation rate of students with disabilities and close the achievement gap between their non-disabled peers.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Callins, Tandria	Principal	Perform the business of the school to ensure that the finances and overall operations of the school are financially stable. Oversees the teachers and curriculum to ensure academic growth and improvement in student performance. Manages the therapy department to ensure compliance with IEPs and that therapeutic services are being provided to the students. The principal also manages the safety of the school and the procedures of testing for the school.
Adams, Sheenah	Assistant Principal	Manages the support staff to ensure the other departments of the school are running smoothly: transportations, PTO, fundraising, school nutrition, custodians, and Special Olympics.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 8/20/2022, Tandria Callins

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
20

Total number of students enrolled at the school

290

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

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	35	14	16	11	18	27	29	23	22	15	13	9	0	232
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	0	3	2	0	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	11	1	11	26	16	11	13	7	7	0	103
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	4	14	26	19	13	14	4	0	0	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	35	14	16	11	8	21	29	23	21	14	13	9	0	214

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	0	11	4	11	26	18	11	14	9	7	0	113

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Saturday 8/20/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 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	
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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement		51%	55%					61%	61%
ELA Learning Gains								58%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								49%	54%
Math Achievement		37%	42%					61%	62%
Math Learning Gains								56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								52%	52%
Science Achievement		48%	54%					52%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		53%	59%					79%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	6%	48%	-42%	58%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019	0%	47%	-47%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
06	2022					
	2019	4%	48%	-44%	54%	-50%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
07	2022					
	2019	10%	42%	-32%	52%	-42%
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	48%	-48%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	0%	56%	-56%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	0%	56%	-56%	64%	-64%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019	0%	51%	-51%	60%	-60%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	47%	-47%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	39%	-39%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	10%	35%	-25%	46%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	0%	45%	-45%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	10%	41%	-31%	48%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	18%	70%	-52%	71%	-53%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	16	32	46	10	26	34	12	37			
ELL	8	28	27	11	30						
BLK	7	23		6	27	30	6				

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
HSP	19	24	33	11	23	27	11				
WHT	21	50		14	32		22				
FRL	16	31	43	11	26	34	13	37			
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	18	31	31	22	44	57	42	19			
ELL	15	10		33							
BLK	23	35		22	50						
HSP	19	32		27	44						
WHT	12	25		7							
FRL	18	31	31	22	44	57	42	19			
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	8	30		3	15		10	21			
ELL	7			7							
BLK	3										
HSP	11			5							
WHT	10			5			7				
FRL	9				18						

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	25
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	197
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27

Students With Disabilities	
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	17
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	2

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	17
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	21
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	28
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	26
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Data suggests that the gap between ELA and Math performance is narrowing and continue to see progress. The learning gains are inconsistent across content and due to low numbers of students being tested in the higher grades, learning gains were not reported across content areas other than ELA and Mathematics. All subgroups are performing equally low across grade and content levels.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Performance in ELA, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, and EOCs need to improve.

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

Contributing factors include turn over in teachers in general. Additionally, changes in teacher positions each year. For example, we may have a teacher in a position in one year, but will need to move them to a different position to fill a need in a subsequent year. The learning curve needed to learn curriculum and curriculum changes. Additionally, the school has to learn not only curriculum for the content areas, but also, they have to be well versed in behavior strategies, prevention of behaviors, safety maneuvers and procedures, collaborate with therapy professionals, and learn social & emotional/mental health strategies.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The overall scaled score increased by 0.79 points from 2021-2022. The percentage of students tested increased from 79% to 98% from 2021-2022. In 2021, we only had one student to achieve a Level 3 and 6 students to achieve a Level 2. In 2022, we had 3 students achieve a Level 4, 3 students achieve a Level 3, and 9 students to achieve a Level 2.

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

The pandemic was the main contributing factor for this improvement. More students were returning to school in 2022.

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

Administration and teachers will need to more intentional with lesson planning, reviewing the data from benchmarks, modifying instructional strategies, and collaborating with therapists more to include therapeutic strategies within the classroom.

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.

The teachers are enrolled in the Principal and teacher academy through the Florida Consortium for Public Charter Schools. They also have access to FDLRS and will be encouraged to access the professional development courses through those platforms. Additionally, on our Staff Development days and Early Release days, administration and teachers will work in PLCs to analyze data and set goals for themselves and the students.

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

Administration will be creative in recruiting and retaining staff. Administration will continue to be deliberate with team building and developing a culture of comradery. We will also continue to work with each teacher individually and collectively to provide administrative support and resources.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. 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.**	After reviewing the student performance from the state testing data, 85% of our students achieved a Level 1, 9% Level 2, 3% Level 3, and 3% Level 4 in ELA (15% of students tested).
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The students at Language & Literacy Academy will receive a 20% proficiency rating during the 2022-2023 academic year.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	K-2 students will be measured using the STAR testing during 3 measurements throughout the year. It is expected to see at minimum at 20% growth from pretest to posttest. 3-12 grade will demonstrate at minimum a 20% improvement from pretest to posttest using the progress monitoring (FAST).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sheenah Adams (sheenah.adams@weexcelinreading.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	1. Focus on Marzano's 9 instructional strategies for effective teaching and learning. 2. Monitor teachers' use of McTighe's Understanding by Design lesson plans.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	A substantive positive relationship between evaluation scores and student achievement would suggest that helping teachers improve their practice in accordance with the teaching standards has the potential to contribute to improvements in student learning on mathematics and reading.

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.

Strategy 1: Marzano's 9 instructional strategies
Step 1. Schedule a calendar for walkthroughs and formal observations.

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

Strategy 1:Marzano's 9 instructional strategies
Step 2. Conduct a performance evaluation and develop plan for personal teaching goals by October.

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

Strategy 1: Marzano's 9 instructional strategies
Step 3. Review quarterly PMRN data to set student goals for the school year.

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

Strategy 2: McTighe's Understanding by Design (UbD)
Step 1: Review lesson plans weekly/unit plans monthly

Person Responsible	Sheenah Adams (sheenah.adams@weexcelinreading.org)

Strategy 2: McTighe's Understanding by Design (UbD)
Step 2: Assign time to work in PLCs to collaborate with other professionals

Person Responsible   Sheenah Adams (sheenah.adams@weexcelinreading.org)

Strategy 2: McTighe's Understanding by Design (UbD)
Step 3: Assign professional development opportunities that address the areas of focus

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on STAR Early Literacy and STAR Reading data, more than 50% of students are performing below grade level. This is identified as a critical need and requires interventions. We hired a reading coach to assist the teachers in utilizing the data to inform their instruction in order to improve student achievement.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

85% of the students performed at a Level 1 on the statewide, standardizes ELA assessment which is more than 50% scoring below the criteria for achievement. 15% of the students performed at a Level 2 or higher.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Each grade K-2, using the new coordinated screening and progressing monitoring system by Renaissance, will have at least 10% of students to be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Each grade 3-12th, using the new coordinated screening and progressing monitoring system by PMRN, will have at least 5% of students to be on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Ongoing monitoring will be conducted quarterly using assessments that are directly aligned with the Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T. Standards). The teachers use curriculum that is directly aligned with the Florida standards. The teachers will analyze the data quarterly to determine the need for re-teaching on any standard that is not achieved by more than 50% of the students in each grade level.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Callins, Tandria, tandria.callins@polk-fl.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Grades K-2 will focus on foundational skills. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (HMH) Curriculum uses lively, animated characters ignite students' imaginations and boost motivation and engagement. Students will love the highly engaging, age-appropriate lessons with customizable avatars, badges, and rewards. Social and emotional learning and hints are infused into each lesson. Explicit, systematic phonics and phonemic awareness lessons build fluency. Grades 3-5th will use games to motivate and challenge learners. HMH helps students develop a positive, "can-do" attitude. Innovative multilingual learner support and Spanish instructional lessons. Lessons begin with engaging, instructional videos with real-world applications. Grades 6th-8th will use an adaptive practice that moves students toward standards and skills proficiency so that they're ready for High School and beyond. Supports long-term mastery of knowledge and skills by intermixing activities. HMH addresses key 21st-century skills and builds critical thinking. Precise personalization keeps students in their zones of proximal development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The teachers use HMH curriculum that puts core instruction, supplemental practice, assessment, and professional learning in one place for a streamlined experience. HMH bolsters students' confidence and prepare them for standardized tests with a full suite of ELA assignments on foundational skills, fluency, vocabulary, reading comprehension, language conventions, and writing. HMH provides the right assessment to provide a deep understanding of each student to make planning decisions. HMH Growth Measure for ELA and math supports instructional decisions for individual, small-group, and whole-class environments. This assessment delivers valid and reliable achievement scores, including Student Growth Index, Grade Level Equivalence, our innovative HMH Scaled Score, and Lexile® (reading) or Quantile® (math) measures.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
1. Coaching and Professional Development with the HMH curriculum to ensure the teachers know how to use the curriculum.	Adams, Sheenah, sheenah.adams@polk-fl.net
Step 2: Complete Growth Measure Assessments using the curriculum quarterly.	Adams, Sheenah, sheenah.adams@polk-fl.net
Step 3: Analyze the data from the Growth Measures within the curriculum.	Adams, Sheenah, sheenah.adams@polk-fl.net
Step 4: Differentiate the instruction to ensure continued student growth during the quarterly assessments through the end of the year.	Callins, Tandria, tandria.callins@polk-fl.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The school builds positive school culture and environment by promoting unity and inclusion. We strive to build a world of inclusion and acceptance. We battle against the isolation and injustices faced by people with intellectual disabilities. We encourage all students and staff to respect diversity and embrace differences.

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

Our primary stakeholder is Special Olympics. Special Olympics Florida provides year-round sports training and competition in a variety of Olympic-type sports for people with intellectual disabilities who wish to participate, giving them continuing opportunities to develop physical fitness, demonstrate courage, experience joy and participate in the sharing of gifts, skills, and friendship with their families, other Special Olympics athletes, and the community. Every year, Special Olympics sponsors Unity Day and provides the school with anti-bullying paraphernalia. Special Olympics Florida is committed to promoting unity and creating a community of belonging, inclusion, respect, growth and development by valuing, encouraging, celebrating and supporting our diverse athletes, staff, coaches, family members and volunteers. We embrace non-discriminatory practices and policies and provide equal access to opportunities athletic participation.