Dale R Fair Babson Park Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dale R Fair Babson Park Elementary

815 SCENIC HWY N, Babson Park, FL 33827

http://lwcharterschools.com/babsonpark

Demographics

Principal: Elizabeth Tyler

Start Date for this Principal: 8/24/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	70%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Dale R Fair Babson Park Elementary

815 SCENIC HWY N, Babson Park, FL 33827

http://lwcharterschools.com/babsonpark

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	65%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	31%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	B	B

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

Making a difference today for a better world tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Dale R. Fair Babson Park Elementary's vision is to challenge the curiosity of each student and provide an opportunity to discover, enrich, and expand the abilities, interests, values, attitudes, understanding, and skills appropriate to the individual's needs and level of development. We feel that our vision can be achieved through doing, exploring, discovering, and creating. The purpose and responsibility of our elementary school is to help a student learn how to think rather than what to think.

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
Tyler, Elizabeth	Principal	
Thomas, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	
Jacobs, Shelli	Teacher, K-12	
Sheffer, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Flint, Anna	Teacher, K-12	
McCarter, Nancy	Teacher, K-12	
barker, jordan	Teacher, K-12	
gravel, alicia	Teacher, K-12	
Stentz, Kelly	Instructional Technology	
Hanrahan, Brandi		
Robillard, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 8/24/2014, Elizabeth Tyler

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	70%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	95	73	75	72	83	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	463
Attendance below 90 percent	7	2	5	3	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	1	5	6	8	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in ELA	24	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	24	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/24/2020

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	95	73	76	77	68	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	475
Attendance below 90 percent	7	2	5	3	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	1	5	6	8	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in ELA or Math	25	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	1	1	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	25	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	95	73	76	77	68	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	475
Attendance below 90 percent	7	2	5	3	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	1	5	6	8	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in ELA or Math	25	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	24	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	73%	0%	57%	63%	0%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	0%	58%	48%	0%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	0%	53%	45%	0%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	79%	0%	63%	74%	0%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	0%	62%	61%	0%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	0%	51%	51%	0%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	0%	53%	62%	0%	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	85%			58%	27%
	2018	73%			57%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%			58%	14%
	2018	72%			56%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	61%			56%	5%
	2018	56%			55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%			62%	11%
	2018	78%			62%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%			64%	20%
	2018	82%			62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	76%			60%	16%
	2018	67%			61%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	63%			53%	10%
	2018	56%			55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
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	49	41	31	54	59	44					
ELL	45			64							
BLK	58	47		74	71						
HSP	64	55		79	73						
MUL	75			83							
WHT	77	55	50	79	68	52	65				
FRL	64	49	41	68	61	48	48				
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	31	33	27	40	29	9	8				
ELL	60			70							
BLK	54	53		62	47						
HSP	62	62	54	69	50	50	47				
MUL	62			62							
WHT	72	66	50	82	68	53	64				
FRL	58	51	52	67	58	43	44				
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

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	432
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	63
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	68

Hispanic Students	
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	79
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	64
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	54
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.

The bottom quartile in ELA performed the lowest. This is not a trend. There had been a very slight increase in the previous years.

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

The greatest decline from the 18-19 school year was in the Lowest 25th Percentile in ELA. The Lowest25th Percentile in ELA went from 46% 2018 to 39% on 2019.

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 bottom quartile in ELA had the biggest gap when compared to the state average. We had a 39% and the state had a 53% which was a fourteen point difference.

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

The Math Learning Gains and the Lowest 25th Percentile in Math showed the most improvement. We were at 62% for 2018 and increased to 70% for 2019 in Math Learning Gains. We saw the same increase in the Lowest 25th Percentile in Math going from a 46% in 2018 to 54% for 2019. Teachers and staff revised the pacing maps for math and assured they were aligned with the current state standards. Grade levels met every nine weeks to evaluate all student performance with attention to the bottom quartile students.

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

When evaluating our EWS data, we noticed that several students have more than one indicator. For the 2020-2021 school year, we will add additional supports for these students depending upon their needs. This may include, but is not limited to, small groups working on social skills, academic small groups, or a mentor.

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

1. bottom quartile in ELA
2.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:
No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our area of focus will be the bottom quartile in ELA.
The rational for our area of focus is the decline in the bottom quartile in ELA the last time the students were assessed, 2018-2019. The intended outcome is to not only halt the decline in the bottom quartile in ELA but to make an increase in the area. The Assistant Principal, Rebecca Thomas, will be the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.
Targeted students will receive tutoring, instruction in smaller groups, and mentoring.
Training in Culyer Strategies in Reading will be continued for all staff. Reading training will include, but not be limited to, inference questioning, avoiding yes/no questions, using higher order thinking skills, theme and main idea, and cause/effect.

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.

All parents are welcome and encouraged to participate in their child's education and ongoing activities at the school site. Dale R. Fair Babson Park Elem. provides numerous opportunities for parents to become more involved in their child's learning through, but not limited to, Annual Parent Workshop Nights, K Evenings, Family Night Check-Out, All Pro Dad Nights, and Bring Your Parents to School Days. Weekly Communication Reports are sent home with each child detailing their academic progress as well as their behavior. Parents sign and return the reports. Agendas are also a form of daily communication with our parents.

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.

Total:	**$0.00**