

Hendry County Schools

# Labelle Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Labelle Elementary School

150 W COWBOY WAY, Labelle, FL 33935

[http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=7&sc\\_id=1171294169](http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=7&sc_id=1171294169)

## Demographics

**Principal: Ansley Cockram**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: F (28%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (41%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Labelle Elementary School

150 W COWBOY WAY, Labelle, FL 33935

[http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=7&sc\\_id=1171294169](http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=7&sc_id=1171294169)

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

## School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	F	C

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

At LaBelle Elementary School we are committed to providing a solid educational foundation for every child in a safe, caring environment while instilling a love of learning to prepare students for continued success.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

In order to meet the diverse needs of our student population, we use proven instructional practices to deliver standards-based curriculum. Students are challenged, encouraged, and supported daily to become critical thinkers through the use of a variety of positive reinforcement techniques and Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cockram, Ansley	Principal	Oversee leadership team and follow up to ensure duties are completed satisfactorily.
Greaves, Jeremy	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in leading the school in curriculum and leadership decisions.
Campo, Vanessa	School Counselor	
Barber, Theresa	SAC Member	Lead SAC team
Kingman, Jennifer	Teacher, PreK	VPK teacher & Lead Teacher
Burchard, Cathy	Teacher, K-12	KG teacher & Lead Teacher
Lozano, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	2nd grade teacher & Lead Teacher
Moore, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	3rd grade teacher & Lead Teacher
O'Ferrell, Wendy	Teacher, K-12	4th grade math teacher & Lead Teacher
Hernandez, Tina	Teacher, K-12	5th grade science teacher & Lead Teacher
McClinton, Tia	Teacher, K-12	PE teacher & Teacher Mentor
Abbott, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	ELL teacher & ELL support
Wright, Angela	Instructional Coach	MTSS support for teachers and students
Holt, Melanie	Instructional Coach	County Reading Coach
Tack, Sasha	Instructional Coach	County Reading Coach
	Instructional Coach	Assist classroom teachers in the instruction and delivery of the math curriculum
Williams, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	1st grade teacher and lead teacher

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Monday 7/13/2020, Ansley Cockram



**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

36

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: F (28%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (41%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	66	64	78	50	66	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	405
Attendance below 90 percent	13	9	4	2	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	4	0	1	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	5	0	0	0	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	17	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	5	1	0	0	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/11/2020

### Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	77	94	71	91	100	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	508
Attendance below 90 percent	20	13	11	13	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	7	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	29	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	5	1	9	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	77	94	71	91	100	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	508
Attendance below 90 percent	20	13	11	13	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	7	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	29	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	5	1	9	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	45%	50%	57%	37%	44%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	54%	58%	45%	48%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	50%	53%	46%	45%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	56%	63%	48%	48%	61%
Math Learning Gains	48%	62%	62%	44%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	45%	51%	37%	44%	51%
Science Achievement	35%	44%	53%	35%	42%	51%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

### Grade Level Data

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	47%	47%	0%	58%	-11%
	2018	43%	44%	-1%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%
	2018	30%	47%	-17%	56%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	33%	47%	-14%	56%	-23%
	2018	31%	45%	-14%	55%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	52%	0%	62%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	47%	48%	-1%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	57%	-4%	64%	-11%
	2018	48%	54%	-6%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	37%	53%	-16%	60%	-23%
	2018	33%	54%	-21%	61%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	34%	41%	-7%	53%	-19%
	2018	21%	43%	-22%	55%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data**

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	33	53	50	33	47	36	13				
ELL	27	47	64	34	49	35	13				
HSP	42	50	57	46	50	36	30				
WHT	69	70		63	40						
FRL	40	50	61	48	50	35	33				

  

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	13	11	5	22	11		20				
ELL	22	33	20	26	23	14	11				
BLK	30			27							
HSP	32	30	18	41	27	9	13				
WHT	63	61		70	61		46				
FRL	34	32	18	41	32	8	18				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	16	32	28	34	29	19	13				
ELL	16	45	42	39	51	44					
HSP	33	46	50	44	44	42	28				
WHT	56	42		69	50		75				
FRL	33	44	47	45	44	37	27				

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

**English Language Learners**

Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

**Native American Students**

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

**Analysis**

**Data Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Due to COVID-19, the data being examined is from the 2018-2019 school year. When examining this data, it is clear that fifth grade math and science are significantly below the district and state average. Although several interventions have been put into place since these scores, such as MTSS coordinator, highly qualified teachers in the grade, planning PLC's, and small group instruction, there was not enough time to increase student achievement as great as needed.

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

Due to COVID-19, the data being examined is from the 2018-2019 school year. All data components at LES (ELA, math and science) increased from 2017-18 to 2018-19.

However, our math achievement levels increased by only a total of 7%, which included a decline from 70% to 63% in the performance of white students on math FSA. There was also a decline from 61% to 40% in math learning gains among white students on the math FSA. The declines and little growth in performance were due to several factors. First, the Go Math textbook did not align well to the standards tested on the FSA. Next, so much time was invested in teaching our ELA curriculum with fidelity, that not as much time was spent on standards-based math planning. Third, 4th and 5th grade was departmentalized, with one teacher responsible for all the math instruction in 4th and 5th. Fourth graders responded well to this, but 5th graders did not. Last, we were unable to locate a qualified math coach to help with standards-based lesson planning and coaching teachers.

**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.**

Due to COVID-19, the data being examined is from the 2018-2019 school year. LES' third - 5th grade math performance (15% gap) and lowest 25% growth (19% gap) and 5th grade science performance (18% gap) had the biggest gaps when compared to the state average. Our ELA scores are much more compatible with county and state data. There is a math deficit from primary grades that has to be fixed. With a new math book, Pearson Envision, that is more closely aligned to Florida Standards. Our math resource teacher will meet with grade levels to work on new math maps. Our math resource teacher is pushing in to 4th and 5th grade to help work with students and to coach teachers on their math lessons, targets and tasks. Additionally, she will be available as 3rd-5th grade needs support. Our 5th grade scores in math and science were not close to county and state averages, Part of this trend in math is that there is gap in skills coming from lower grades. We have hired a high impact teacher for 5th grade math this year. We have push-in help for 3rd-5th graders in math. The deficit in science can be attributed to teachers not fully teaching to the grade level standards. To address this, we are implementing a 'big idea guide' to help teachers plan effective science lessons specific to their grade.

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

Due to COVID-19, the data being examined is from the 2018-2019 school year. The ELA bottom 25% showed over 60% improvement in the 2018-19 school year. This was much higher than the county and state average (which were 50% and 53%, respectively). Last year, we taught the Expeditionary Learning curriculum, a challenging and rigorous curriculum, with fidelity. We taught to Florida



standards with fidelity, with our school focus being standards-based planning. Teachers planned EL lesson plans with county reading coaches, who also modeled lessons, assisted teachers in unpacking standards and making Marzano scales and gave feedback on lessons. We also focused on interventions with our bottom 25% in our six month after school program, which was attended by more than 200 students 3 days per week. We used many supplementary online programs, like SumDog and Study Island, and paper-based materials, like Performance Coach books, to enhance learning. We also paid for paraprofessional support to push in to math and ELA classes to assist students who were below level.

### **Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

Looking at the early warning indicators for LES, Level 1 Performance on 3rd-5th grade FSA in 2019 would indicate that we need to do more to boost performance, especially since we had high growth last year. LES decreased the number of Level 1 students from 179 to 91 from 2017-18 to 2018-19 FSA testing. Our goal is to reduce that number further to 60 students making a 1 on the FSA math or reading in 2019-20. Additionally, the SWD and ELL subgroups were identified as performing below 41%, which makes them an area of focus.

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

1. Increasing SWD achievement on the FSA in reading, math, and science (FCAT).
2. Increasing ELL achievement on the FSA in reading, math, and science (FCAT).
3. Increasing math achievement on the FSA.
4. Increasing science achievement on the FCAT.
5. Increasing learning gains of the bottom 25% in ELA and math.

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

### **Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

In order to increase student achievement in reading and math, and science teachers will implement rigorous, standards based lessons using data to drive the planning process.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Increasing student proficiency in reading and math, the following proficiency goals have been established:  
 Reading: at least 50%  
 Math: at least 53%

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ansley Cockram (cockrama@hendry-schools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

The evidence-based strategy that will be implemented in order to increase student achievement, will be to have lesson plan checks quarterly as well as grade level planning PLC's.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

The rationale for setting up lesson plan checks, is to ensure that rigorous grade level standards are included in lesson plans so that teachers have the ability to delivery quality lessons to help increase student achievement. By planning together with their grade group in PLC's, teachers will be able to help facilitate addressing deficits in instruction.

**Action Steps to Implement**

In order to support the achievement of this goal, action steps have been set into place to help guide teachers. During grade level PLC's, the administration and district reading coaches will help to ensure that the following criteria are met:

- standards based lesson planning- the current Florida Standards will be the guiding document used to plan lessons for the week.
- small groups- a plan will be developed each week to include rigorous small group instruction for all students
- Expeditionary Learning- the pacing guide for this curriculum will be used to keep teachers aligned with the district pace.
- Weekly lesson plan checks- to develop a consistent routine with teachers in lesson plan expectations.

**Person Responsible**

Ansley Cockram (cockrama@hendry-schools.net)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

### Area of

**Focus** By implementing and maintaining a well-developed MTSS plan, teachers will be able to focus on differentiating instruction to struggling students, therefore increasing student achievement in reading, math, and science.

### Description and Rationale:

### Measurable Outcome:

By focusing on students in the MTSS process, overall student proficiency should increase. Proficiency goals have been set in each subject as a focus:  
 ELA:50%  
 Math:53%  
 Science: 50%

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ansley Cockram (cockrama@hendry-schools.net)

### Evidence-based Strategy:

Intensive instruction for students in MTSS process will be provided by classroom teachers and support staff. Angie Wright, the MTSS academic resource teacher, will be responsible for supervising the implementation of the MTSS goals and ensuring that rigorous standards based interventions are being used in this process.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

By focusing on the MTSS process, and ensuring the fidelity of it's implementation, struggling students will be given support to help bridge gaps in their learning. Angie Wright will be able to monitor all MTSS plans, communicate with students, teachers, and parents as progress is made.

## Action Steps to Implement

The increased focus on the implementation of the MTSS process will increase student proficiency. To monitor this process, Angie Wright will:

- Meet with teachers to do an initial overview of expectations
- Distribute data to teachers and update quarterly
- Schedule meetings with teachers and parents as students move through the MTSS process
- Lead PLC's with district level trainings and PD pertaining to MTSS

### Person Responsible

Angela Wright (wrighta@hendry-schools.net)

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**The school leadership team will be responsible for meeting and problem solving as data points are released throughout the year. The team will look at deficits in data, and develop a plan of action on how to improve in the areas of need. Additionally, the leadership team will be responsible for overseeing the planning process on their team. The lead teacher will be in charge of making sure that the lessons planned align with the standards and pacing guides provided. Using the SIP goals as a guide, the leadership teams will meet quarterly to discuss the progress being made towards the goals. At these meetings, the team will collaborate and establish a plan to move forward with.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Creating a welcoming and inclusive school environment for all stakeholders is the primary focus at LES. It is our intention to make sure that stakeholders are a part of all decisions, especially parents. To ensure that this happens communication is the key. Due to the high population of Spanish speaking families and community members, all information sent home with students is translate. In addition, translators are provided for all meetings held on campus. In addition, a monthly calendar is sent home, and translated, updating parents on any events or important dates to remember.

Due to the high need of social emotional needs, LES has access to a social worker. This social worker not only meets and counsels with students, but she also does family help sessions held at night. This is funded through the School of Hope grant.

Throughout the year, we have varies activities that include staff, students, parents, and community stakeholders. The following events are scheduled to be held this year:

- Open House
- Parent/Teacher conferences
- Spaghetti Dinner
- SAC meetings (4 per year)
- Book Character Dress Up Parade
- Swamp Cabbage Celebration
- Dad's Bring Your Child To Work Day
- Cinco de Mayo Bingo

In addition, the Blackboard Home Connect system, is the call out system that LES uses to make mass call-outs to the school community. These messages are always translated and sent in the home language identified at enrollment. The school Facebook page is also updated with any important information that pertains to the school. LES always invites and encourages visitors to come and volunteer on campus.

### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

## Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>