The Learning Center School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

The Learning Center

650 ROYAL PALM BEACH BOULEVARD, Royal Palm Beach, FL 33411

www.rlc2000.com

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 10/18/2023.

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.

The Learning Center aligns with the School District of Palm Beach County's mission with efforts directed towards
improving the education and quality of life of our students. We are devoted to using proven approaches to maximize the developmental potential of each one of our students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Learning Center (TLC) aligns with the School District of Palm Beach County's vision. TLC intends to prepare its students to be as independent, self-sufficient and socially interactive as possible. The school is dedicated to ensuring that all services and supports will be designed and delivered to respect the dignity and uniqueness of each person and will be provided in the least restrictive environment in an appropriate manner. The Learning Center at the Els Center of Excellence was created to fill a need for high-quality, intense educational programming based on the educational intervention validated procedures of Applied Behavior Analysis for young children with autism spectrum disorders in Palm Beach County. The Learning Center's efforts are dedicated to improving the education and quality of lives of its students. Research has demonstrated the efficiency in using ABA in the education and treatment of individuals with autism. The Learning Center is devoted to using this approach in conjunction with other techniques to maximize the developmental potential of each one of our students. The Learning Center's major goals are to provide continuous and systematic intervention through full-day programming with a low teacher to student ratio; use the principles of ABA to provide a framework for instruction and ongoing evaluation of effectiveness of interventions; provide support and instruction in home management skills for parents, siblings and extended families; develop affiliations with community organizations to provide opportunities for inclusion; prepare students for public school attendance when appropriate and to support their transition; and provide a continuum of services to those students who do not meet the prerequisites for transition.

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
Routt, Stacie	Principal	The principal performs responsible administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, personnel, curriculum, and all the daily operations of the school. The principal works to maintain the integrity of the school as a place for high achieving students that incorporates multiple intelligences and a creative education.
Chin, Zayra	Assistant Principal	The school assistant principal supports the principal as educational leader of the school in all aspects of administration, including promoting safety, providing equity and access to the curriculum, and expecting academic success for all students. Assists the principal in providing school-wide leadership so as to promote the educational development of each student and to ensure the effective operation of the school.
Van Nest, Ashlie	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach is responsible for coordinating and implementing curriculum that aligns with Florida state standards. They utilize the coaching model with all teachers at the school and is responsible for assigning and mentoring staff through professional development that is aligned with the needs of the students. The Instructional Coach is responsible for PLC's where student data is analyzed to ensure students are receiving the supports needed for success and monitors student progress in the Response to Intervention (RtI) process.
Roddy, Charlene	Teacher, ESE	The Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Coordinator ensures proper implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requirements. The ESE Coordinator maintains Individual Educational Plan (IEP) documents and plans, coordinates, conducts and/or facilitates IEP Team meetings, IEP annual reviews and 3-year evaluations for a caseload of students with disabilities. The ESE Coordinator works with the ESE Instructors to assist in providing information to students, parents and General Education Instructors on how to appropriately implement a student's IEP.

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 school holds parent trainings monthly facilitated by the administrative team and instructional coaches to support families and obtain input on the needs of students and their families. The school leadership team also seeks out the input of teachers, school staff, and parents through surveys, in person team meetings, and monthly board meetings, and this input was used in the development of the 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 will be regularly monitored throughout the year for effective implementation and impact on student achievement. The administrative team will review student data and trends using teacher made assessments, teacher collected data, FAST progress monitoring that will occur three times throughout the year in ELA and Math, the FSAA administered in the spring, TeachTown, and district diagnostics as applicable. It will be updated throughout the year to ensure proper documentation of the progress made after collaborative review of student data in PLCs where teachers work collaboratively on the scope and sequence, lesson planning, and data chats.

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-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	39%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	0%
Charter School	Yes
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)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* White Students (WHT)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: MAINTAINING
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	0	2	9	3	8	3	7	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	3	10	7	10	4	4	5	10	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	1	11	7	11	6	4	6	10	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	21	9	15	14	20	20	12	119

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	8	21	9	16	16	20	20	12	122

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

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

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 school 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 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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA 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	

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	

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*	3	49	53	6	52	55	18		
ELA Learning Gains				25			33		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile							40		
Math Achievement*	7	51	55	8	45	42	16		
Math Learning Gains				45			27		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile							20		
Science Achievement*	3	46	52	8	48	54	17		
Social Studies Achievement*	0	63	68	18	57	59	19		
Middle School Acceleration		68	70		51	51			
Graduation Rate		73	74		38	50			
College and Career Acceleration		39	53		62	70			
ELP Progress		53	55		64	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	3
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	13
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	18

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	110
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
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	3	Yes	4	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	12	Yes	4	3
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	1	Yes	4	4
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	18	Yes	3	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	18	Yes	3	2

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	22	Yes	3	3
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	3			7			3	0				
SWD	3			7			3	0			5	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	11			14			10				3	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	0			4			0				4	
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	6	25		8	45		8	18				
SWD	6	25		8	45		8	18				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

						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
BLK												
HSP	4	12		12	44							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	7	29		9	57		10	20				
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	18	33	40	16	27	20	17	19				
SWD	18	33	40	16	27	20	17	19				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	24	29		28	36							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	17	42		13	26		17	18				
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.

			ELA			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	*	56%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	*	48%	*	47%	*

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	*	47%	*	47%	*
04	2023 - Spring	*	58%	*	58%	*
06	2023 - Spring	*	45%	*	47%	*
03	2023 - Spring	0%	48%	-48%	50%	-50%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	54%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	*	36%	*	48%	*
03	2023 - Spring	*	57%	*	59%	*
04	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	61%	*
08	2023 - Spring	*	65%	*	55%	*
05	2023 - Spring	*	56%	*	55%	*

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	*	46%	*	44%	*
05	2023 - Spring	*	51%	*	51%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	0%	65%	-65%	66%	-66%

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 data component showing the lowest scores were student scores on the FAST progress monitoring for ELA and Math. Student scores on the FAST progress monitoring session three for the 2022-2023 school year either held steady with lower scores/level 1 or declined from progress monitoring session

two.
The biggest contributing factor to the low performance of The Learning Center students on the FAST progress monitoring for ELA and Math is that that all of the students who participated in the FAST have an IEP in place with the primary eligibility of autism spectrum disorder and receive self-contained ESE services in all academic content areas. All of the students also have secondary eligibilities of Language Impaired and are receiving supports throughout the week from a speech/language pathologist. In grades 3 through 8 with students who participated in the FAST ELA and Math progress monitoring, there were also four new to ESE classroom teachers who were actively being supported and mentored by the school's instructional coach. This could have been a contributing factor as the teachers may not have been utilizing the most relevant specialized instructional strategies for their individual students from the start of the year.

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

Declines are seen in both ELA and Math across all assessed grade levels from the FSA in 2021-2022 school year and the FAST in 2022-2023. Overall, more students took the FAST in the 2022-2023 school year with 44 students compared to 41 students in the 2021-2022 school year. In 2021-2022, 38 of those students scores a 1, two students scored a 2, and one student scored a 3 in ELA while 40 students scored a 1 and 1 student scored a 3 in Math. In 2022-2023 on the ELA FAST, 39 students scored a level 1, three students scored a level 2, one student scored a level 3, and one student scored a level 4 while 43 students scored a level 1 and one student scored a level 4 on the Math FAST. Upon comparison of this data, an overall decline in scores were seen as more students scored within level 1 in 22-23 than in 21-22. Within the second and third progress monitoring sessions in the 22-23 school year, more students also demonstrated a decrease in their overall scores ranging from just a few points to more than 32 points which also caused some individual student decreases from a level 2 in progress monitoring session 2 to a level 1 in progress monitoring session 3.
The biggest factor in the declining scores is that all of the students at the school are receiving self-contained ESE services due to autism spectrum disorder and language impairment eligibilities. For many of the students attending The Learning Center, reading deficits are also seen in a potential correlation with their eligibilities which makes accurate participation and assessment difficult due to the difficulties with decoding, fluency, and comprehension. An increase in students participating in the FAST progress monitoring sessions instead of the FSAA has also occurred which has also had an effect on the decline of scores as more students who are requiring intensive academic supports and not performing at grade level are participating in assessments of skills expected at their age/grade.

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.

The FAST progress monitoring 3 data in both ELA and Math have the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Students at The Learning Center have an IEP in place with the primary eligibility of autism spectrum disorder and language impairment as secondary eligibilities and receive intensive academic supports in all academic content areas in self-contained classroom settings. This appears to be the primary factor that is contributing to the gap in the school's scores compared to the state average. There has also been an increase in the number of students who are participating in the FAST progress monitoring which also appears to have caused a greater gap in scores due to the number of students participating who are not performing at their grade level academically. The Learning Center continues to strive to identify the unique learning needs for each student and apply improvements to their individual educational plans to ensure the highest quality individualized education is received.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was that of teacher retention. The Learning Center did move campus locations for the 2023-2024 school year which could have contributed to a decline in this area, but the retention rates of instructional staff was 91%. The 2021-2022 school year's retention rates were around 86% which was still a strong retention rate, but the growth to 91% is a great improvement from the previous year to current.

Actions taken in teacher retention over the last year was having the support of an instructional coach; this position was created to support teachers and bring the knowledge and push for a stronger focus on academics and interventions designed to help teachers best support their students in all academic areas. The school also worked with a group of dedicated parents to reform the school's Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO) which has been brought an endless stream of support for all staff of The Learning Center. The PTO has taken on staff appreciation, brought increased funding for classroom needs and wants, and brought the parents and staff together for a strong, supported work environment. The administrative team has continued to build upon existing staff trainings to ensure all staff feel well-trained and supported in the classrooms. Staff growth is encouraged through mentorship positions where strong team members are utilized to support their co-workers regarding effective instruction, curriculum supports, lesson planning, and compartmentalizing with similar grade-level classrooms for teachers to focus on their strengths in content areas. Fidelity checks are an important aspect of this, and the trainings have grown from Google Classroom trainings to in person practice, push-in supports, modeling, and provided supports that include recorded trainings and specific manuals for staff to reference as they go.

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

Reading deficiencies and level one scores on statewide FAST ELA and Math assessments are two potential areas of concern. The demonstrated difficulties within ELA for The Learning Center's students based upon FAST progress monitoring results and teacher observations/assessments include comprehension, fluency, phonics, and phonemic awareness, and these are having the largest negative impact on students being able to attain grade level skills. The comprehension aspect is also causing negative impacts on students in the area of Math as the concepts increase across grade levels to include word problems, multi-step equations, and even for students to have the ability to read and comprehend the question to be solved. These deficiencies are having the largest impact on the increasing number of students scoring Level 1 on the FAST ELA and Math assessments, and continuing to ensure teacher academic instruction aligns with current best practices and is meaningful for individual students will be a top priority for the school.

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

1. The highest priority is to identify individual student needs and deficiencies in the area of reading in order to establish an intensive, meaningful intervention program/schedule within each classroom with the support of the instructional coach and reading intervention staff. In conjunction with the intervention program, establishing effective and ongoing data collection on the effectiveness of the intervention in place will be key to ensuring effective interventions.
2. Instructional support and coaching is the next priority for The Learning Center. Having an instructional coach who provides mentorship and coaching to new teachers and who collaborates with all teachers in professional development, curriculum training and supports, and analysis of data will ensure best practices are utilized for student success and that all instruction is meaningful and making a positive impact on student skill attainment.
3. Maintaining a positive and supportive learning environment for all staff and students is another priority for The Learning Center. This will occur through increasing Professional Learning Communities (PLC) with administration involvement to increase collaborations and maintain a strong and positive learning environment for all staff and students, increasing staff and parent communications and trainings to ensure open collaborations and clear communications with all stakeholders, and even increasing the

support of a Parent Teacher Organization to ensure staff feel supported in their roles and help families build deeper connections with the school team.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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.

The Learning Center has all students with IEP's and primary exceptionalities for autism spectrum disorder who may additionally have language and speech impairments, fine and gross motor skill deficits, and emotional and/or behavioral needs. Student behavior and communication difficulties does impede their learning and their performance in class, and this is clearly being seen on their performance on the FAST ELA and Math progress monitoring sessions. In alignment to the districts' strategic plan, The Learning Center's area of focus will be in supporting reading deficiencies of our students in the areas of decoding, fluency, and reading comprehension. Reading deficiencies were identified as an area of focus due to the data component that showed the majority of students performed within Level 1 of both the ELA and Math FAST in the 2022-2023 school year, and this can be attributed to student deficits with decoding and fluency which is negatively impacting their ability to accurately read and comprehend questions to show an accurate level of their understanding and abilities. This shows the crucial need for more intensive, individualized reading instruction for all students to ensure they can be as successful as they are individually able to be both in the classroom and on FAST progress monitoring.

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

Our instructional coach and reading intervention support staff will observe classrooms to assess teacher instruction and observe the students whose FAST data showed either limited growth or a decline in scores between progress monitoring sessions 2 and 3 in the 2022-2023 school year. The instructional coach will continue push in supports to coach the teachers on best practices for instruction and provide ongoing trainings for intensive ELA curriculums to support closing student gaps in reading.
By November of 2023, 40% of The Learning Center's teachers will be implementing a daily intensive reading-based curriculum during small group instruction in their classrooms with instructional coach support.
By March 2024, 80% of The Learning Center's teachers will be implementing a daily intensive reading-based curriculum during small group instruction in their classrooms with instructional coach support.

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

Monitoring will allow the teachers to have continuous collaboration and support while implementing new intensive curriculum in the classroom in conjunction with their IEP goal work to ensure student's are able to make progress within their individual areas of need for reading. The instructional coach will schedule weekly team meetings with classroom teachers and reading intervention teachers to build professional learning communities across the grade levels for more teacher support in lesson planning as well as data chats and analysis of student work, informal assessments, planning of classroom walks for teachers to see their colleagues working with the curriculum, and after FAST progress monitoring sessions. The Assistant Principal will also be key in monitoring student progress and ensuring teachers have support in all grade levels to provide the intensive reading instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashlie Van Nest (avannest@thelearningcenter.org)

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.)

The instructional coach will provide direct instruction and collaborate with the school's teachers to create a tutoring/mentoring program to ensure teachers are supported with curriculum, resources, and guidance for

intensive reading instruction.

Small group instruction will be provided within the classroom with intensive curriculum to support all students and allow them the additional opportunities for decreasing their individual reading deficit through additional skill instruction and practice.

Reading intervention supports will be provided by reading intervention teachers to pull students one on one who are demonstrating the need for the most intensive supports based on data analysis and progress monitoring.

Teachers will continue to increase their use of instructional programs such as iXL, DreamBox, SPIRE, and Learning Without Tears so support and enhance student's abilities in math, reading, and writing.

In addition to the tutoring/mentoring program, ongoing professional development will be used to support teachers in integrating best practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The mentoring program will enable teachers to feel supported and confident in their use of instructional strategies and curriculum to improve student instruction.

Small group instruction is the best platform for The Learning Center's student population to succeed and make individualized learning gains in a supportive environment.

Individual sessions allow for students to work most specifically on the skill deficits they may have in a quieter, more focused environment. Based upon review of data from students previously receiving additional individual reading intervention in the 22-23 school year, student achievement rates were higher on the progress monitoring sessions.

Specific supportive curriculum increase student achievement and are effective for differentiation to meet students where their individual needs are.

Professional Development will allow for collaboration, data analysis, and discussions on student progress and how to continue to increase their success.

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. Establish the teacher mentoring program/PD for support:

The instructional coach will be given information from the administrative team on who the first and second year teachers are to prioritize scheduling mentorship support for these teachers first.

The instructional coach will then schedule a meeting with all school teachers to analyze classroom schedules, determine the areas of support needed in individual classrooms, and establish strengths and weaknesses in content area instruction.

With the instructional coach, teachers will create a school-wide schedule for the instructional coach to push in to the classrooms to provide support in the specific areas the individual teachers have expressed/requested.

Person Responsible: Ashlie Van Nest (avannest@thelearningcenter.org)

By When: The initial meeting between the teachers and instructional coach will occur within the first two weeks of school and the mentoring program will start by week three.

2. Incorporate both small group instruction and reading intervention sessions:

Students will be assessed with informal assessments from school curriculums as well as the FAST progress monitoring session 1.

Using this data, teachers will determine the areas of strength and weakness for the individual students in their class.

Based on this data, teachers will create small groups within the classroom to ensure instruction is meaningful and students are being supported where they area.

Teachers will then meet with the Assistant Principal and Instructional Coach for a data chat to determine which students are demonstrating the most need for the individual reading intervention program.

Teachers will collaborate in PLC's to create lesson plans, create instructional materials, teaching methodologies, and develop informal and formative assessments to support their students in small group instruction and to continuously evaluate their progress.

Person Responsible: Ashlie Van Nest (avannest@thelearningcenter.org)

By When: Small group instruction will begin by the second week of school. The data chat will take place by week 3 for reading intervention to begin in week 4.

3. Implement adaptive technology programs into the classroom:

All teachers will begin with trainings on the programs available (IXL, DreamBox) to ensure their understanding of the programs and how to navigate and implement their use in the classroom.

Teachers will establish time on their classroom schedule where students will have the opportunity to use technology and access the programs. Teachers can also collaborate with other teachers on the scheduling and use of the school computer lab to have a dedicated daily time for all students to be on the computer to use the program(s) at the same time to ensure all students have access.

Teachers will use the data collected by the programs to assess student progress and as part of their information for small group planning.

Person Responsible: Ashlie Van Nest (avannest@thelearningcenter.org)

By When: Technology will be assigned and available in the first week of school. Formative assessments in IXL and DreamBox will occur by the end of week 2.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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.

By focusing on strong, high quality academic interventions with the students of The Learning Center, student achievement will increase in both ELA and Math. The second instructional priority will be to provide students with meaningful interventions that support both their IEP goal instruction and aligns with state standards and expectations. All of the students at the school are identified as ESE and all have an IEP in place with varying degrees of need and supports in place. The FAST ELA and Math data results showed that the majority of students who participated in the progress monitoring (around 90%) scored within Level 1 for their respective grade level. This drives the need for high quality instruction and daily interventions to ensure our students receive the support they individually need to demonstrate growth and progress on the FAST progress monitoring sessions throughout the year. Between progress monitoring sessions, some students showed growth within Level 1, but many students showed between three to 32 point decreases which did cause a decrease in levels for 3% of students. This again drives the need for students to receive more intensive interventions to ensure they can consistently demonstrate growth between the sessions and have support for learning new and potentially difficult academic concepts.

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

By December of 2023, 80% of classroom teachers will have established a daily intensive curriculum-based intervention program for their students in conjunction with the instructional coach and reading interventionist team members.
By May 2024, 90% of classroom teachers will have a data tracking system in place to evaluate intervention progress for standards-aligned instruction as evidenced by data chat meeting documentation.
By May of 2024, The Learning Center will increase the overall percentage of students showing learning gains on the FAST ELA progress monitoring after receiving interventions by 3% which would bring the school to 10%. 75% of students participating in FAST progress monitoring will show a 3% growth in ELA scores from the previous school year after receiving daily academic interventions in the school setting.

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

Monitoring intervention data and individual student responses will be key in ensuring student growth within grade level content and on progress monitoring sessions. Data chats will be key in this for The Learning Center where teams will meet monthly to review collected data. These Data Chats will include teachers, administration, and the instructional coach and reading intervention support staff. All data collected will be shared and analyzed, and the entire team will collaborate on best practices and techniques that can be used to continue improving student data on interventions and progress monitoring sessions. In between data chats, teachers will need to have an effective data collection system in place that they can review in between Data Chats to ensure their instruction and intervention is effective and the student is demonstrating growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Charlene Roddy (croddy@thelearningcenter.org)

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.)

Small group instruction is key to match students and provide intensive instruction in the areas individually needed to ensure students are supported and able to demonstrate progress.
Professional Learning Community (PLC)/Professional Development: this intervention will allow for

continued collaboration of teachers on their interventions; teachers can share expertise, instructional strategies, best practices, and materials that will best support individual students and ensure the intervention developed is best meeting their needs to allow for the most positive progress. Instructional coaching/mentorship will align with the PLCs/PD for all new to the school teachers to ensure they have the direct support of the Instructional Coach as a mentor to increase their ability to provide effective instruction, collect meaningful data, and establish classroom schedules for intervention blocks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction will allow the teacher to tailor instruction to meet any gaps or deficiencies so the students receive the highest quality instruction. Small groups provide students with a more intensive intervention as the instruction is now more specifically targeted to their areas of difficulty or deficit, and is done in a setting where additional time and support can be dedicated to the individual students. Professional Learning Communities and Professional Development increase teacher knowledge in interventions and data analysis. These components are key to student success on attaining grade level expectations and demonstrating more consistent progress in their learning gains on progress monitoring sessions.
The mentorship of an Instructional Coach for new teachers brings more support and knowledge to teachers who do not yet have years of practice and collaborations to pull from.

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.

Incorporate small group instruction:
1. Students will be assessed through curriculum based assessments, informal assessments and observations, and by the FAST progress monitoring session 1.
2. New teachers will meet with their coach/mentor to analyze the collected data and determine the specific areas of weakness students may be demonstrating in the content area. Other teachers will analyze the data independently or with grade-level teams for collaboration.
3. The teachers will all create small group rotations by pairing students with similar areas of weakness/ need to ensure the designed interventions are specifically targeted as the students need them.
4. Teachers will collaborate with grade-level teachers and in PLC's to lesson plan, create instructional resources and materials, and develop ways to track and evaluate instruction and student progress.

Person Responsible: Charlene Roddy (croddy@thelearningcenter.org)

By When: Student assessments will be completed by the third week of school, with intervention groups starting by week four. Intervention will occur throughout the school year.

Professional Learning Communities/Professional Development:
1. The instructional coach will establish a PLC schedule with all instructional staff to include ESE and general education teachers, speech/language pathologists, and occupational therapists.
2. The PLC and PD focus will be to review assessment data results to create intervention groups and align curriculum with the areas of need demonstrated on the data.
3. The instructional coach will push into new teacher classrooms to model the intervention groupings and instruction and provide mentoring as the teacher works with the groups throughout the week.
4. Ongoing PLCs/PD sessions will be scheduled to continue with supports for lesson planning and

continued analysis of data collected on individual student responses to the interventions. The sessions will be designed for teacher mentorship and collaboration for the interventions in place.

Person Responsible: Ashlie Van Nest (avannest@thelearningcenter.org)

By When: PLCs/PD will begin by the 4th week of the school year after data collection has begun and occur monthly. Mentoring will begin by the 2nd week.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Teacher retention is an important aspect of the school climate and culture and key in ensuring students have the supports in place to make great academic strides in their own time. Providing a supportive environment where teachers have resources, mentoring, and strong connections with their administrators, co-workers, students, and families is a high priority for The Learning Center. In providing staff with surveys and meetings for feedback, staff have shared the importance of time for meeting and planning with mentors and other grade level teachers to best support students, having time to meet with the administrative team to be involved in problem-solving and planning for school-related activities and events, and having opportunities for growth within the school through additional responsibilities and moving to new positions of strength over time.

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

By November 2023, 70% of staff responses on a school-created survey will indicate overall positive feelings towards the school/their position in the areas of support, appreciation, and job responsibilities. The survey results will be utilized to determine areas staff would appreciate more support in and the administrative team will implement changes as able based on feedback to ensure a collaborative learning environment where staff feel important and heard in all areas.
By June 2024, we will increase our retention rate to 95% or greater of current instructional staff will indicate their return for the 2024-2025 school year as evidenced by signed contracts and/or survey results. This would be a 4% increase from the previous school year's retention rates and would reflect staff feeling supported and having opportunities for growth within their areas of strength and expertise.

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

The administrative team will host bi-weekly staff meetings to have face to face time with each group of educators to express ideas, host information/training sessions to increase teacher knowledge, and for direct feedback and input on school activities to ensure a strong school community. Surveys will be sent out for staff to report on morale and areas of need throughout the school year for administration to analyze the data and make changes and/or improvements as needed. Administration will also schedule open-door meetings monthly to meet with staff directly to ensure they are supported and can assist them in any specialized areas of growth they may be interested in pursuing, and ensure they are able to sign up for school-created programs such as the Teacher-in-Training program and other training programs that will allow for growth in their current positions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Charlene Roddy (croddy@thelearningcenter.org)

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.)

Professional Learning Communities (PLC) consisting of teachers where they will receive supports including additional mentorship, increased opportunities for collaboration and planning, and growth of leadership skills. These supports are key to a positive school culture and environment for team members. Professional Development opportunities for all teachers will allow their continued development as educators and increase their knowledge in academic content, curriculums, and instructional strategies so they can be as supported and successful in the classroom as possible.
Family supports and training opportunities for families: this creates stronger collaborations between school

and home and keeps a positive environment for all involved with more communication and working together to best benefit the students of the school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The PLC's will allow for there to be active collaboration between teachers, instructional coaches, ESE support staff, and administration which is key to staff feeling supported and continuously seen as key members of the school team. With the principal as an active participant in weekly instructional team PLC's, it makes leadership become more collaborative and best practices for the students and school itself are consistent across all team members. PLC's and PDs also allow for teachers to take on active roles in their own professional growth by actively collaborating to share their knowledge, taking the lead in grade level supports, and mentoring new teachers to provide additional supports and assistance to all team members. Family supports such as an active PTO, parent trainings, and open collaborations with families increases the happiness of all involved parties and increases student success rates in and out of the classroom.

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.

Establish PLC's and PD opportunities with administrative team
1. The administrative team will develop a schedule for bi-weekly team collaborations with all groups of the school-instructional staff, fine arts teachers, therapists, and support staff.
2. The administrative team will collaborate with each team to establish objectives for the PLCs/PD sessions for each month to support teams with areas they would like to further develop or feel they need more support with.
3. Staff surveys will be given at least 4 times per school year for the administrative team to collect data to bring to the PLC/PD meetings to analyze and make decisions to support staff in improving school achievement.

Person Responsible: Stacie Routt (sroutt@thelearningcenter.org)

By When: Administrative team-led PLCs will begin by the third week of school and occur bi-weekly for the entire school year.

Establish parent support programs
1. Work to increase the Parent Teacher Organization that will increase supports to both families and staff of the school. This will increase the support that staff of the school receive to keep staff morale and retention high, and increase the involvement of families which will create more positive experiences for both families and the staff supporting their students in the classroom.
2. Implement a communication schedule/system to all families to keep them informed and involved. The school will have a school-wide communication app, Bloomz, where weekly updates, monthly newsletters, and all school-wide communications will be shared directly to staff and families.
3. Establish a parent training program that meets monthly on topics that are shared as important from parents and staff. Topics will be derived from staff and parent feedback to ensure they are important and grow collaborations throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Stacie Routt (sroutt@thelearningcenter.org)

By When: PTO will establish monthly meetings by the third week. Parent communications will start the first day of school, and ongoing monthly trainings will start by month 2 of school.

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).

School resources and allocations are focused on hiring ESE teachers to allow for increased small group instruction opportunities due to lower staff to student ratios in the classroom, as well as ongoing professional development opportunities either on campus or in the area so the teachers can engage in focused planning that will strengthen their academic instruction and data collection/analysis. An instructional coach is also on staff to support and mentor teachers and ensure consistency with professional development for instructional staff and access and training regarding appropriate curriculums. School resources are also focused on curriculum resources themselves to increase student access and achievement of the Florida B.E.S.T standards, provide intensive reading interventions to students demonstrating deficiencies, and to have resources to support student social/emotional needs and growth.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Methods for dissemination of this SIP to stakeholders (students, families, school staff and leadership, and local businesses and organizations) will include being available at the school, shared with families through the school's mass communication system, shared by the school's parent liaison, having the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) communicate about the SIP and progress during meetings, and available via the school's website (www.thelearningcenter.org).

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The Learning Center plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress. The school has initiated a Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) that is now active and the administrative team hosts monthly family meetings on various topics of need. Classroom teachers report daily communication about each students day to their families via a communication app and report on IEP progress no less than three times per school year; Curriculum and Conference Nights occur during the year for additional team meeting opportunities. The school's Family Engagement Plan is posted on the school website (www.thelearningcenter.org) under 'Family Engagement Plan'.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

The Learning Center plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum through ongoing professional development for instructional staff in the areas of best instructional practices, IEP development, school culture, and academic interventions. Instructional coaching and mentorship will support and strengthen new teachers and allow them to increase the quality of their instruction to benefit students.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A