

Polk County Public Schools

Language & Literacy Academy For Learning



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Language & Literacy Academy For Learning

330 AVE C SE, Winter Haven, FL 33880

www.weexcelinreading.org

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, 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
Callins, Tandria	Principal	Manage overall operations of the school including but not limited to budgets, staffing, HR, facilities, marketing, professional development, safety, therapy services, community partnerships, health & food inspections, and supplies.
Adams, Sheenah	Assistant Principal	The AP provides oversight with the teachers, paraprofessionals, transportation, behavior supports, and Special Olympics.

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.

LLAL offers monthly parent & community engagement nights. We have public board meetings in which the public is invited. We complete semi-annual community, parent, & staff surveys to gather information regarding areas of improvement. We completed a strategic planning process which included community interviews. Data collected from the strategic planning process was used to develop a 5 year plan for LLAL. We are part of the Winter Haven Chamber and we attend local community events to engage with the community.

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 quarterly when interim and progress reports are distributed during conference nights. The teachers will add the SIP to the conference agenda and discuss students' academic performance in the classroom and on state assessments. The administrators will meet with the teachers quarterly as well to discuss achievement data and instructional practices that will increase student performance. If progress monitoring results warrant modifications to the SIP, the administrators will review the components that are relative to student performance. The SIP will be a fluid document and will be used to communicate with stakeholders regarding student outcomes.

Demographic Data	
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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	75%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: 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	11	9	7	14	4	9	13	11	9	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	1	2	4	1	6	18
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	9	6	8	17	12	8	60
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	8	6	20	16	13	75
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	16	24	24	27	11	17	44	22	20	205

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	12	10	8	9	14	12	65

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	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	2	0	3	2	0	2	1	2	14
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	1	11	26	16	11	103
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	4	14	26	19	13	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	35	14	16	11	8	21	29	23	21	214

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	2	0	11	4	11	26	18	11	113

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	0	2	0	3	2	0	2	1	2	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	1	11	26	16	11	76
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	4	14	26	19	13	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	35	14	16	11	8	21	29	23	21	178

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	2	0	11	4	11	26	18	11	83

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	16	56	57	8	61	61
ELA Learning Gains	32	53	55	30	58	59
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46	42	46		49	54
Math Achievement*	10	53	55	3	61	62
Math Learning Gains	26	56	60	15	56	59
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34	51	56		52	52
Science Achievement*	12	51	51	9	52	56
Social Studies Achievement*	21	77	72	11	79	78
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress						

* 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	25
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	197
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	94
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	27	Yes	2	2
ELL	17	Yes	2	2
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	17	Yes	2	2
HSP	21	Yes	2	2
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	28	Yes	2	2
FRL	26	Yes	2	2

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)

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	16	32	46	10	26	34	12	21				
SWD	16	32	46	10	26	34	12	37				
ELL	8	28	27	11	30		0					
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	7	23		6	27	30	6					
HSP	19	24	33	11	23	27	11					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	21	50		14	32		22					
FRL	16	31	43	11	26	34	13	37				

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	31	31	22	44	57	42	19				
SWD	18	31	31	22	44	57	42	19				
ELL	15	10		33								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	35		22	50							
HSP	19	32		27	44							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	12	25		7								
FRL	18	31	31	22	44	57	42	19				

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	8	30		3	15		9	11				
SWD	8	30		3	15		10	21				
ELL	7			7								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	3			0								
HSP	11			5								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	10			5			7					
FRL	9			0	18							

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
10	2023 - Spring	0%	40%	-40%	50%	-50%
05	2023 - Spring	7%	43%	-36%	54%	-47%
07	2023 - Spring	0%	36%	-36%	47%	-47%
08	2023 - Spring	*	39%	*	47%	*
09	2023 - Spring	*	39%	*	48%	*
04	2023 - Spring	*	53%	*	58%	*
06	2023 - Spring	3%	35%	-32%	47%	-44%
03	2023 - Spring	5%	42%	-37%	50%	-45%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	9%	38%	-29%	54%	-45%
07	2023 - Spring	6%	35%	-29%	48%	-42%
03	2023 - Spring	0%	51%	-51%	59%	-59%
04	2023 - Spring	*	56%	*	61%	*
08	2023 - Spring	0%	42%	-42%	55%	-55%
05	2023 - Spring	7%	44%	-37%	55%	-48%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	0%	33%	-33%	44%	-44%
05	2023 - Spring	0%	39%	-39%	51%	-51%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	37%	*	50%	*

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	37%	*	48%	*

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	11%	65%	-54%	66%	-55%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	49%	*	63%	*

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.

Mathematics showed the lowest performance data in 2021-2022 in comparison to ELA results in the same year. The results in 2020-2021 showed better results in both Mathematics and ELA. The contributing factors include that 94% of students were tested in 2021-2022 versus 71% being tested in 2020-2021. Science follows the same trend in 2021-2022 and 2020-2021. However, in Social Studies, the students performed better in 2021-2022 rather than 2020-2021. The data is consistent between all subgroups including race/ethnicity, students with disabilities, and English Language Learners. The learning gains in ELA were greater from 2020-2021 to 2021-2022 over the math learning gains covering the same years.

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

The math learning gains from year to year showed the greatest decline. The contributing factor include hiring a first year teacher in math for Middle school students. She is a certified teacher, however, it was her first year teaching as well as her first year teaching students with disabilities. Additionally, other contributing factors include the low reading achievement scores that are related to comprehension and solving math problems and the number of teachers in elementary who are teaching out of field.

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.

Math achievement scores demonstrated the greatest gap when compared to the state average. As stated above, the contributing factors include hiring first year teachers, teachers out of field, hiring long term substitutes, and students low reading abilities to comprehend solving math problems.

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

ELA showed the most improvement. The school invested in new curriculum, Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, to assist teachers in assessing student performance and providing the interventions and supports the students needed. Administrators reviewed the student data and observed/modified instructional practice throughout the year. The school provided additional professional development opportunities and increased collaboration with the therapists and the IEP team to ensure academic and therapeutic goals were being addressed.

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

One area of definite concern is inadequate learning gains in both math and ELA. The second area of concern is hiring certified and in field teachers.

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

1. Hiring Certified Teachers
2. Math student performance
3. ELA student performance

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 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.

During the charter renewal process, the PCSB identified hiring certified teachers as a high priority. The use of long term substitutes was an area of concern. LLAL will be more aggressive and intentional regarding teacher retention and recruitment. Additionally, LLAL has offered to pay for teachers to take their subject area tests, take their ESE exams, and to add their reading and ESOL endorsements to their licenses. Financial incentives are also built into teachers working on their ESE certifications and endorsements.

Measurable Outcome:

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

LLAL will increase the number of certified teachers/in field teachers in 2023-2024 by three in order to reduce the need for long term substitutes from 13 to 10.

Monitoring:

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

The Principal will evaluate the numbers from 2022-2023 and compare them to the number of certified/in field teachers in 2023-2024.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tandria Callins (tandria.callins@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.)

Teachers who are certified or teach in the field of study are more effective in producing higher achievement results for students. There is a correlation between higher student outcomes and higher teacher effectiveness.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

LLAL's federal index is below 41%, constituting the need for the school to be provided with Comprehensive Support Interventions through the school district. If LLAL is going to increase the school's Federal Index percentage, teacher qualifications have to be addressed through aggressive recruitment and retention strategies.

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. Attend job recruitment fairs
2. Continue to post open positions
3. Provide professional development opportunities to help teachers acquire their certification

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

By When: Ongoing as needed.

#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.

Benchmark-aligned instruction for both Math and ELA will be another area of focus. Reviewing the data on my report card, specifically the overall student performance in Math/ELA and the respective learning gains, LLAL will benefit from continued focus on instructional practice. Last year's SIP, LLAL included the need to purchase a more comprehensive curriculum, HMH. That was completed. To build upon what we have started with supplemental supports and interventions, we will purchase READ 180 and MATH 180 as approved interventions/companions for reading and math. LLAL will provide learning maps and scopes of sequence to teachers of ELA and Math in order for teachers to remain consistent with the timelines of the instruction of the B.E.S.T. benchmarks.

Measurable Outcome:

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

LLAL will provide benchmark aligned instruction in Math and ELA in order to increase student performance on state assessments by showing increased performance on progress monitoring data among all 3 data points (beginning, middle, end) for 25% of the students.

Monitoring:

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

This focus area will be monitored using the state assessment testing portal during all 3 progress monitoring collection points in Math and ELA. The teachers and administrators will review the data and set goals for each student. Teachers will use the supplemental curriculum (Waggle) and the interventions Read 180 and Math 180 to help support the students. Goals will be discussed with the parents and homework will be assigned to directly impact the student performance in the key areas that are identified as challenges for the students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sheenah Adams (sheenah.adams@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.)

Read 180 is an adaptive learning literacy program that provides reading intervention strategies for Tier II and Tier III students who are performing below grade level. Read180 integrates research around best practices, instructional strategies, and scaffolded support to build vocabulary, develop fluency, and strengthen comprehension. Math 180 is also an adaptive learning platform that targets students who are below grade level to achieve grade level proficiency. Math 180 rebuilds foundational math skills that struggling students need in order for algebra readiness.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Read 180 and Math 180 are intended for the following subgroups: students with learning disabilities, students with intellectual disabilities, English Language Learners, and any student at risk for academic failure. LLAL is targeting all of these groups.

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. Purchase the curriculum Read 180 and Math 180
2. Hire a Reading Interventionist
3. Hire a Math Interventionist

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

By When: Ongoing as needed.

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).

LLAL is identified as a CSI school. Dr. Tillman and LLAL will collaborate through out the year regarding specific teacher trainings and professional development opportunities for staff. The first one for the 2023-2024 year is already scheduled for August 8, 2023. Additionally, there is a meeting scheduled with Dr. Kenny Hodges, Dr. Tammy Cress, and Cassandra Peters to review the overall program and. services provided by LLAL. This oversight will be ongoing in order to ensure that LLAL is meeting all of their key deliverables.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

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

Measurable Outcomes

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

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes****Monitoring****Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

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

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

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.

www.llalschool.org

Stakeholders will be provided this information during public board meetings, during the Title I Annual Meeting, It will be available in the Title I PEN, conference nights, and/or monthly parent engagement nights. The school improvement plan will be discussed with the teachers and allow them to provide additional feedback throughout the year to determine if progress is being made to meet the goals of the SIP. Feedback will be requested via surveys and during Title I meetings.

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 school initiated monthly parent engagement nights last year. We will continue to do that this year. The monthly meetings are already scheduled and posted on our web page www.llalschool.org. We will further engage them during conference nights when interim reports are distributed. When the parents attend conference nights, it gives the teachers opportunities to discuss the goals and how they can help support the SIP by following through with homework requests using the interventions Read 180, Math 180, or Waggle.

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)

As stated previously, we will be purchasing Reading 180 and Math 180 interventions to help strengthen the academic program. We started tutoring with Learning Resource Center last year and will continue that partnership to assist the students after school.

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

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

LLAL provides interventions from a Mental Health facilitator, Social Worker, Board Certified Behavior Specialists, Registered Behavior Techs, Speech Language Pathologists, Occupational Therapists, and Physical Therapists. We also have two ESE Facilitators to manage the Individual Education Plans for all of our students.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

LLAL is a recognized Vocational Rehabilitation vendor. It's new for us and we are continuing to develop that program.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We provide training in Professional Crisis Management that trains staff in de-escalation strategies for behavior management in order to prevent and reduce student crises. We also train the entire staff in the Zones of Regulation. We will have the school wide training on August 10, 2023.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Our teachers are part of the Principal & Teacher Academy with the Florida Consortium of Public Charter Schools where they have unlimited access to courses and training opportunities. Teachers have the opportunity to be apart of the accreditation and strategic planning process of the school as well as attending conferences. Annually, we attend the ESE symposium held by the PCPS and they have access to all of the free trainings through FDLRS and the FIN support network.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

LLAL partners with the Early Childhood Coalition and Child Find. LLAL accepts students with an Individual Family Service Plan for students with disabilities from 12 months to 3 years old.

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: Teacher Retention and Recruitment				\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				\$68,754.22
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	394	8008 - Language & Literacy Academy For Learning	UniSIG	1.0	\$68,754.22
			<i>Notes: Charter Reimbursement - Reading Interventionist</i>			
					Total:	\$71,250.00

Budget Approval

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

No