

Lake Wales Charter Schools

Dale R Fair Babson Park Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	70%
2020-21 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	2020-21: A (51%) 2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	68%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	29%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	A	A	A	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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Tyler, Elizabeth	Principal	
Jacobs, Shelli	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
McCarter, Nancy	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Robillard, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	
	Assistant Principal	
barker, jordan	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

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

491

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	99	84	68	76	73	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	491
Attendance below 90 percent	10	7	6	5	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	19	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	13	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	4	2	0	5	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	19	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/7/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	68%			73%		57%	68%		56%
ELA Learning Gains	52%			54%		58%	62%		55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	27%			39%		53%	46%		48%
Math Achievement	69%			79%		63%	77%		62%
Math Learning Gains	45%			70%		62%	62%		59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%			54%		51%	46%		47%
Science Achievement	58%			63%		53%	56%		55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	85%			58%	27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	72%			58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%			56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	73%			62%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	84%			64%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	76%			60%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	63%			53%	10%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

MAPS was used for all grade levels (K-5) for the reading and math data.

A paper based, teacher created, grade equivalent assessment was used for each grade level for the science data.

For the writing data, grades 1 through 5 used a selection from their grade level "Common Core Writing to Texts Prompt". K used a teacher created prompt.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	72%	47%	48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	36	36
	Students With Disabilities	5	5	5
	English Language Learners	1	1	1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	68%	42%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	36	36
	Students With Disabilities	5	5	5
	English Language Learners	1	1	1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68%	42%	45%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48%	54%	68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	35	35
	Students With Disabilities	8	8	8
	English Language Learners	1	1	1
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53%	31%	42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	35	35
	Students With Disabilities	8	8	8
	English Language Learners	1	1	1
Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69%	61%	67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	31	31
	Students With Disabilities	17	17	17
	English Language Learners	4	4	4
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55%	63%	71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	31	31
	Students With Disabilities	17	17	17
	English Language Learners	4	4	4

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	60%	60%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	30	30
	Students With Disabilities	21	21	21
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	49%	48%	79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	30	30
	Students With Disabilities	21	21	21
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	69%	69%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	31	31
	Students With Disabilities	17	17	17
	English Language Learners	2	2	2
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	62%	45%	67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	31	31
	Students With Disabilities	17	17	17
	English Language Learners	2	2	2
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	5%	5%	23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	31	31
	Students With Disabilities	17	17	17
	English Language Learners	2	2	2

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	41	19		42	50		33				
ELL	43			36							
BLK	59			53							
HSP	59	27		55	36		55				
WHT	71	59		74	50	60	59				
FRL	52	35		52	43		43				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	357
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

As was expected, based on state data, there was a decrease in learning gains in all areas except for one.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Even though we were higher than the state average, our greatest need for improvement is in the area of 5th grade math. In 2018-2019 the 5th graders scored a 76% and in 2020-2021 they scored 58%, which is a decrease of 18%.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factor to this need for improvement was COVID. COVID caused the school to be closed down in March of 2020. Also, the majority of low performing students were students who remained online all year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The ELA Learning Gains in 5th grade showed the most improvement from the 2018-2019 to the 2020-2021 school year. We were at 61% for 2018-2019 and increased to 67%, which is an increase of 6%, for the 2020-2021 school year.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Grade levels met every nine weeks to evaluate all student performance and make adjustments to students' curriculum to meet their needs.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

The most important strategy to accelerate learning will be face to face learning. Teachers and staff will also continue to revise the the pacing maps for math and assure they are aligned with the current state standards.

Culyer Strategies in Reading will also continue for all staff.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will meet two times a nine weeks to evaluate student progress in math and reading. We will continue our Culyer Strategies in Reading professional development throughout the year for all staff and with emphasis on new staff.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

One additional service that has been added for this year is that of an Interventionist. Mrs. Jolley was hired to provide extra support for struggling 2nd graders. Two new paras have also been hired as additional support and will be working in K Support and 3rd grade.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.floridacims.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

According to the state discipline data, Dale R. Fair Babson Park Elementary's discipline data is only 1.255 per 100 students. Even though the state has us ranked as "High", we are only one incident removed from a "Moderate" ranking.

Any student that receives a discipline referral is brought to the attention of the administration, teachers, paras, and social worker. The social worker and/or mentor spends time with these students to correct the behavior and give them tools to make better choices.

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.

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, Family Night Check-Out, All Pro Dad Nights and Bring your Parents to School Days.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Administrators, teachers, and support staff all play a role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Part V: Budget

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

Total:	\$0.00
--------	--------