

Hendry County Schools

Labelle Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Labelle Elementary School

150 W COWBOY WAY, Labelle, FL 33935

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

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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)	100%
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* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: F (28%) 2016-17: C (42%)
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

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.

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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Labelle Elementary School

150 W COWBOY WAY, Labelle, FL 33935

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=7&sc_id=1171294169

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>78%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	F

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cockram, Ansley	Principal	Oversee leadership team and ensure that the school is run effectively on a daily basis.
Greaves, Jeremy	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in leading the school in curriculum and leadership decisions.
Krause, Melinda	Teacher, K-12	kindergarten teacher and mentor
Lozano, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	2nd grade teacher and mentor
Moore, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	3rd grade teacher and mentor
O'Ferrell, Wendy	Teacher, K-12	4th grade math teacher and mentor
Barber, Theresa	Teacher, ESE	ESE push-in teacher and mentor
O'Connell, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	
Rodriguez, Janette	Teacher, K-12	
Rodriguez, Suzanna	Teacher, K-12	

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

394

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

9

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

7

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	59	59	63	76	45	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	359
Attendance below 90 percent	12	15	9	12	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	2	0	2	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	10	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	28	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	20	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	28	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	8	3	3	10	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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

Monday 9/13/2021

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	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

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	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

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				45%	50%	57%	36%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	54%	58%	34%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	50%	53%	19%	43%	48%
Math Achievement				48%	56%	63%	44%	53%	62%
Math Learning Gains				48%	62%	62%	33%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				32%	45%	51%	8%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				35%	44%	53%	20%	44%	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	47%	47%	0%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	33%	47%	-14%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	52%	52%	0%	62%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	57%	-4%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	37%	53%	-16%	60%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	34%	41%	-7%	53%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tools used at LES for each grade level are the iReady/performance matters benchmark assessments that are given three times a year.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9	25	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	26	55
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	25
	English Language Learners	7	14	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6	19	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	19	52
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	14	0	29

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	5	25	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	21	50
	Students With Disabilities	0	22	13
	English Language Learners	4	11	36
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2	16	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	15	52
	Students With Disabilities	0	11	13
	English Language Learners	0	18	50

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	53	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	50	33
	Students With Disabilities	0	27	13
	English Language Learners	26	57	88
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4	22	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	20	37
	Students With Disabilities	0	18	27
	English Language Learners	5	13	35
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9	17	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	14	22
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	11
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6	17	21
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	14	28
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	5	17

Grade 5					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		16	26	33
	Economically Disadvantaged		16	24	30
	Students With Disabilities		0	8	8
	English Language Learners		0	8	8
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		12	33	48
	Economically Disadvantaged		11	28	43
	Students With Disabilities		0	8	8
	English Language Learners		0	17	25
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		1	6	24
	Economically Disadvantaged		0	5	21
	Students With Disabilities		0	0	13
	English Language Learners		0	0	8
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	25			17			18				
ELL	29	37		33	50		17				
HSP	40	47	27	43	55		34				
WHT	30			30							
FRL	38	49	36	38	57	31	37				
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				

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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	325
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
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	34
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
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	30
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

The trends that emerge across grade levels when analyzing subgroup data are a significant deficit in ELA proficiency. The subgroups SWD and ELL tend to be the lower achieving subgroups across all grade levels. Additionally, the data shows a lower achievement level for grades 4-5 when compared to the other grade levels.

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

The data components that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement are ELA and science. In both of these components, LES is significantly below the state average.

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

Contributing factors to the needs of improvement in ELA and science are the covid-19 pandemic which hugely impacted student attendance. Additionally, due to the pandemic, students missed a half of year in school, which created significant learning gains. Another factor was that staff/teachers were out for 10 days at a time due to contact tracing, which directly impacted the quality of instruction students received.

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

The data component that shows the most improvement when compared to 2019 is fifth grade. All measurable areas increased in 5th grade from 2019 to the 2021 assessment. Although not significant, progress is being made in ELA, math, and science.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement was the group of students being assessed. Traditionally, this group of students has performed better than previous groups. Additionally, science gains can be attributed to the curriculum being implemented with fidelity by the teacher.

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

In order to accelerate learning, small group instruction has been adjusted to include time for tier 2 and tier 3 interventions. Additionally, we have an MTSS coordinator to help facilitate the data collection process and tiered interventions being conducted by teachers for students who are below grade level.

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.

Professional development has been planned every month on our early release days. Staff will be able to participate in a variety of training opportunities including ELA curriculum instruction, small group planning process, data desegregation and data driven planning, and specific PD on resources/ programs used at the school. Teachers are also participating in weekly PLC's with a reading coach and administration. This time is used to focus on specific areas of need including ELA instruction,

planning, resources, SEL learning, and restorative practices. All of these professional development opportunities will help to better equip teachers and staff to accelerate the learning process at LES.

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

The additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond are continued support from an on-site reading coach. This person will be responsible for PD and collaboration in all grades. Additionally, continued support from an on-site MTSS coordinator who can supervise the MTSS process on campus in all grades, helping to strengthen tiered instruction in all grade levels.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: ELA was identified as a critical area of improvement due to the reading proficiency level being a 41% for the school. This was a drop from the 2019 school-wide state assessment data, which LES had 50% of students proficient.

Measurable Outcome: In order to increase student achievement in ELA, LES will increase the state assessed school-wide ELA proficiency from 41% to 47%.
Monitoring: In order to monitor progress towards the ELA proficiency goal, the iReady diagnostic will be administered 3 times during the school year. The data from these assessments will be used to make adjustment to small groups and whole group instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ansley Cockram (cockrama@hendry-schools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence based strategies that will be implemented will be using tools like accelerated reader, LLI, and maxscholar to use as interventions during small group time. Using these programs will allow teachers to place students, and monitor their progress, in a systematic MTSS system. All students at LES will be instructed through small group instruction daily, helping to target areas of concerns for all students which will help to accelerate them on a path towards success no matter their level.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rational for using small group instruction with evidence based resources was made to ensure that teachers were equipped with the right tools to impact student achievement in the most effective way possible. In order to ensure that these resources/strategies were appropriate, meetings were conducted with the director of elementary principals, Tressa Duncan, to review choices and options.

Action Steps to Implement

Implementing the MTSS process with fidelity using approved intervention resources such as Flocabulary, Maxscholar, and LLI. Interventions will take place during structured small groups daily. All students will receive small group instruction no matter their achievement level.

Person Responsible Rebecca Doud (doudr@hendry-schools.net)

Use a school-wide reading accountability program using Accelerated Reader. Students will have goals set for the week, quarter, and year. Incentives will be in place to reward students for their progress and effort in practicing reading to improve their reading proficiency.

Person Responsible Ansley Cockram (cockrama@hendry-schools.net)

Progress monitoring checks will be done three times a year using the iReady diagnostic assessment. Teachers will meet for data reviews and professional development following the assessments to adjust instructions and interventions in place.

Person Responsible Ansley Cockram (cockrama@hendry-schools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The state reported data shows that LES has a science proficiency of 37%. This is significantly below the state average proficiency of 47%. Although there has been an increase in proficiency for LES since 2018, which was only 21%, this is still an area of concern.

Measurable Outcome: LES will increase student achievement in science from 37% proficient to 41% proficient on the state assessment by the end of the 2022 school year.

Monitoring: To monitor students progress towards this goal, three benchmark assessments will be used as progress monitoring data throughout the year. Teachers will make adjustments to their instruction and groups based on this data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence based strategy being implemented to help increase science proficiencies is project based learning through science experiments. Additionally, science is being taught using evidence based literacy strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rational for using the project based learning strategy is to emerge students in science based learning through experimental discovery in hopes to increase their foundational understanding of science.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement a rotation of project based scientific experiments in fifth grade to increase students' understanding of the scientific process.

Person Responsible Tina Hernandez (hernandezt@hendry-schools.net)

Use the data from the three science benchmarks to drive instruction.

Person Responsible Jeremy Greaves (greavesj@hendry-schools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.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.

Due to our school having a moderate rating according to the 2019 discipline data, it is clear that a focus needs to be made on the number of restraints in our self-contained ESE classroom. In order to accomplish this, we have reached out for some professional development from the administrator of exceptional students and student services, Lynnette White. Ms. White has set up training once a month for all of our self-contained staff. Additionally, all teachers are being trained on restorative practices and restorative circles. Beginning in October, all classroom teachers will be asked to conduct restorative circles and turn in documentation for them. This documentation will be turned in to LES administration.

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.

It is very important at LES that we create an positive school culture for students, staff, and stakeholders. We believe that it is crucial to the success of students to have an inclusive environment for students, staff, parents, and all community members. Due to the high population of Spanish speaking families and community members, all communication sent home is sent in English and Spanish. In addition, translators are provided during events and parent teacher conferences. A monthly calendar is also sent home that shares all events that are happening at LES each month.

Throughout the year at LES, we hold various events to promote a positive culture. Events planned for this year are:

- Open house
- Spaghetti dinner night
- Parent/teacher conferences
- SAC meetings (4 per year)
- Book character parade
- Swamp Cabbage Celebration
- Dad's bring your child to work day
- Fall Festival
- Christmas under the stars
- Cinco de Mayo bingo
- Celebration for FSA 3's, 4's, and 5's
- AR end of the year color run

In addition, we utilize a school-wide class dojo messaging system. This allows all teacher to communicate with parents and share all happenings in the classroom. In addition, it allows the school to relay important information to parents quickly. This program translates information for our parents.

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

The stakeholders and their rols at LES are listed below:

Students- responsible for being respectful and learning every day.

Teachers and staff- responsible for creating an inclusive learning environment where all students can experience success.

Parents- responsible for communicate needs of students to the teacher and being a positive support to

students.

Community members- responsible for being a positive support to the school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00