

Polk County Public Schools

Jean O'Dell Learning Center School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	20

Jean O'Dell Learning Center

1310 FLORAL AVE S, Bartow, FL 33830

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/pllc>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
SUMNER, APRIL	Principal	<p>Instructional leadership, focusing on all operations and effectiveness of the Exceptional Education Center. Develop collaborative relationships with parents, district and state level staff, and community agencies to ensure that our students receive FAPE and that IDEA regulations are implemented with fidelity.</p> <p>Focus on appropriate academic instructional strategies to elicit the best data from our students. Conduct walkthroughs and evaluations with feedback to assist teachers in improving achievement of the students.</p> <p>Provides a servant leadership role to assist the staff with the skills and materials necessary to inform and improve instruction.</p>
Yost, Jami	Assistant Principal	<p>Provides teachers with professional learning communities where teachers work collaboratively to share strategies for academic achievement. Collects and reviews data from academic, attendance, and disciplinary areas. Develops action plans to develop FSAA assessments for use with our students with significant cognitive disabilities and limited expressive language to assist with accurately assessing the student's abilities.</p>
Lehmkuhle, Alyssa	Instructional Coach	<p>Coordinates the Campus Induction Program to assist new teachers with acclimation to our dynamic school setting. Mentors new teachers and coaches veteran teachers in appropriate teaching strategies. Assist teachers with accessing and implementation of the IEP process, online curriculum awareness, and our school informational services, ie) Focus. This role is very important in terms of retention of teachers in this critical needs area.</p>
Holland, Laura	Behavior Specialist	<p>Develops teachers in their understanding of positive behavioral implementation plans to include assisting in writing plans directed towards improving specific behavior. Assists students with regulating their own behavior to decrease time off task. Participates in IEP meetings to provide support and insight to the stakeholders. Work with district, state, and community stakeholders to help obtain services necessary for our students with severe behavior.</p>

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The draft SIP is developed during the summer months with input from the administration, lead teachers, SAC members. Prior to final submission of the plan, the SAC committee reviews the plan, completes editing, and then approves the working SIP.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP is used to guide school programming and instruction. It will be reviewed monthly with the staff during professional learning sessions to ensure that the school is on-track to meet the goals of the plan. Review of IEP progress monitoring reports, discipline and attendance reports, and school walk through data will be conducted by the leadership team initially, then shared with stakeholders. The SAC committee meets bi-monthly, where they are provided data to support the progress of the SIP and provided an opportunity to seek clarification on the progress of the school instruction. The SAC committee will include school staff, parents, and community partners.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	63%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	96%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: COMMENDABLE 2018-19: UNSATISFACTORY 2017-18: UNSATISFACTORY
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	1	1	2	0	4	0	6	3	4	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	4
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	1	0	1	0	5	9	4	2	24
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	15	48	53	20	51	55			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	17	49	55	10	37	42			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		47	52		48	54			
Social Studies Achievement*		68	68		53	59			
Middle School Acceleration		61	70		43	51			
Graduation Rate		54	74		46	50			
College and Career Acceleration		39	53		71	70			
ELP Progress		50	55		55	70			

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	16
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	32
Total Components for the Federal Index	2

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	15
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	30
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	91
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	16	Yes	4	4
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	20	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

Accountability Components by Subgroup
 Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	15			17								
SWD	15			17							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	20			10								
SWD	20											
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
 The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The FAA reading scores showed a slight decrease in the Scale Score growth average for our 11 students that were tested using the Performance Task test. Our overall decrease in Scale Score growth was -3.6 scale points compared to 2022 scores. (The previous year (2022) we saw a significant increase in Scale Score growth for reading of 10.1 scale points). This decrease was due to two students dropping one achievement level. A factor could include the classroom teacher was on medical leave for 2 months during the course of the school year for one student. The other student may have been impacted by behavior issues of classmates.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The FAA reading scores showed a slight decrease in the Scale Score growth average for our 11 students that were tested using the Performance Task test. Our overall decrease in Scale Score growth was -3.6 scale points compared to 2022 scores. (The previous year (2022) we saw a significant increase in Scale Score growth for reading of 10.1 scale points). This decrease was due to two students dropping one achievement level. A factor could include the classroom teacher was on medical leave for 2 months during the course of the school year for one student. The other student may have been impacted by behavior issues of classmates.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Data to compare to State Averages for the FAA are not available.

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

Using data uploaded in Focus for 2023, the FAA Performance Task Math Scale Score Average Growth showed an increase of .62. We had the same number of students included in the test data for growth as the previous year, however, we still had under 10 tested students to compare math data. Two of the tested students increased from a level 2 to a passing score of a level 3. These students were most likely impacted by the focus of standards-based instruction and exposure to more rigorous content. The focus on improving instructional strategies and aligning curriculum to the Access Standards through the assistance of a dedicated part-time math coach also impacted the student's achievement levels.

Note: the sample size in both ELA and Math were extremely small, with nine students tested in math and eleven in ELA. Using data from FOCUS, we had 82% of students tested make gains in ELA, and 78% in math (although the small number tested in math eliminates the points earned for math on the school rating) (updated data from 2022 in Focus shows ELA and Math both at 100% with growth. Based on this data we would show a slight decrease in ELA and Math, again one should consider the small sample size as a factor)

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

We continue to have students with high absenteeism. Additionally, we have several students whose behavior frequently disrupts instruction which impacts student achievement negatively.

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

1. Improve attendance. (6 of the students in our sample size of 9 and 11 had greater than 10 days absence)
2. Decrease behavior. (2 of the sample size had significant behavioral incidents)
3. Continue to build on alignment of standards to curriculum, raising the rigor of the lessons.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Analysis of our attendance data compared to our students tested on FAA Performance Task showed six of the eleven tested students were identified as having excessive absenteeism. All of our tested students fall under the SWD subgroup.

Measurable Outcome:

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

JOLC will establish and sustain a positive culture to support student achievement outcomes through improving the attendance of all students identified as having excessive absence.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will review attendance data at each meeting in order to identify students who will need support in improving attendance. Environmental structures/systems will be created to support positive behavior (attendance).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will use Positive Behavior Supports (PBIS) as our evidenced based intervention to improve student attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Thirty percent of the total student population exhibited excessive absenteeism. Of those 30 only ten have documentation regarding medical complexities that could require frequent absenteeism. This indicates that twenty students had extreme absenteeism that is not excusable. We must focus on developing awareness for the parents of these students of the importance of improved attendance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

1. The leadership team will monitor student attendance (revise monitoring system)
2. Create and monitor problem solving protocols for parental awareness and responsibilities.
3. Include attendance recognition in PBIS celebrations.
4. Parental conferences with habitual offenders of attendance

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year, ending on the last day of school.

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Given the introduction of the new Best Standards for Access Point in 2023-24 we will need to become familiar with the much more rigorous Access Points standards for ELA, Math, Civics, History, and Science. Aligning standards with our online curriculum, adopting/adapting a curriculum map that includes Unique Learning System curriculum and supplementary materials is necessary to ensure that we provide a challenging academic program for our most cognitively impaired population.

Measurable Outcome:

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

To improve instructional design, lesson planning, and assessment where it is evident during classroom observations that lesson design is structured, aligned to standards, and that student engagement is specified within the lesson plan. Data collected via the Standards Walk Through (Qualtrics) observational evidence indicate that at least 80% of lesson activities observed will show that our students are engaged in activities aligned to the Access Point Standards.

Monitoring:

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

Standards Based Walk-throughs will be utilized to monitor fidelity of our educational program. Qualtrics data will be analyzed during the Leadership Team meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Multi Tiered Systems of Support framework can be considered the umbrella for other support systems, such as data-based individualization (IEP), response to intervention (RTI), and positive behavior intervention and supports (PBIS). MTSS encompasses academic, behavioral, and mental health supports for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

MTSS is a framework that helps educators provide academic and behavioral strategies for students with various needs. MTSS grew out of the integration of two intervention-based frameworks: Response to Intervention (RTI) and PBIS.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

1. Monitor students engaged in equivalent experiences aligned to the State expectations for students on Access Point standards using Qualtrics Trend Data.
2. Engage teachers in standards based planning protocol, aligning standards and instruction through the use of Learning Arcs
3. Professional learning communities where teachers will collaborate to develop lessons and activities that embrace the new level of intensity for our students with significant cognitive disabilities in all subject levels.
4. Development of differentiated instruction.

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

By When: ON-going throughout the school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The following are utilized to ensure that funding allocations are based on needs.

1. Data com
2. Summer Leadership Academy
3. School Improvement Plan Meetings
4. PURE Process
5. Regional review of SIP Plan

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes