# Lawton M. Chiles Elementary School



**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

## Table of Contents

# Lawton M. Chiles Elementary School

## 2525 SCHOOL HOUSE RD, Gainesville, FL 32608

## https://www.sbac.edu/chiles

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/17/2023.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

| Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI) |
|---|
| A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%. |

| Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) |
|---|
| A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years. |

| Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) |
|---|
| A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:<br><br>1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;<br>2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;<br>3. Have a school grade of D or F; or<br>4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years. |

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
| --- | --- | --- |
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

**Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

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

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

We are committed to the success of every student:
* All students will learn more than they presently know.
* All teachers will be child centered.
* All students will feel successful and be prepared for the 21st century.
* All teachers recognizes diversity in both students and staff.
* All students will important and valued..
* All students will learn to respect differences in individuals.
* All teachers and staff will serve as facilitators and ensure learning for all.

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

Lawton Chiles Elementary strives for excellence by actively involving all students, parents, faculty, staff, and the community in a safe, nurturing, and respectful environment.

### School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

**School Leadership Team**
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Tomlinson, Cory | Principal | Supervise teachers and staff<br>Instructional Leader |
| Booth, Suzanne | Assistant Principal | |
| Warner, Deidre | Behavior Specialist | Assist with school wide behavior and PBIS<br>Mrs. Warner serves as our ESE chair and attends IEP meetings and helps teachers with compliance |

**Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development**
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team meets to discus goals and objectives for the 23/24 school year that focus on the SIP. Specific goals are selected using data provided from ESSA subgroups to determine the focus. The SIP is reviewed by the SAC committee. The SAC is encouraged to ask questions specific to the SIP. The SIP is always available for parents and staff to review.

**SIP Monitoring**
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored by the principal and assistant principal. Specific goals and objectives focusing on ESSA subgroups will be shared and reviewed at meetings for staff and teachers. The subgroup information will be a focus for all teachers and the growth of these students.

| **Demographic Data** Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024 | |
| --- | --- |
| **2023-24 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 |
| **2022-23 Title I School Status** | No |
| **2022-23 Minority Rate** | 54% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 34% |
| **Charter School** | No |
| **RAISE School** | No |
| **ESSA Identification** *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| **Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)** | No |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)* |
| **School Grades History** *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B |
| **School Improvement Rating History** | |
| **DJJ Accountability Rating History** | |

**Early Warning Systems**

**Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 31 | 22 | 26 | 21 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 23 | 22 | 16 | 18 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 8 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 54 | 41 | 30 | 12 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 58 | 18 | 26 | 20 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 18 | 19 | 16 | 18 | 14 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:**

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

**Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 5 | 27 | 26 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in ELA | 2 | 18 | 20 | 15 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| Course failure in Math | 2 | 13 | 14 | 10 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 1 | 25 | 16 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2 | 19 | 22 | 14 | 18 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

### Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 5 | 27 | 26 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in ELA | 2 | 18 | 20 | 15 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| Course failure in Math | 2 | 13 | 14 | 10 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 1 | 25 | 16 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2 | 19 | 22 | 14 | 18 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

## II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 70 | | | 71 | 53 | 56 | 68 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 65 | 56 | 61 | 70 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 29 | 43 | 52 | 41 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 75 | | | 75 | 55 | 60 | 74 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 69 | 58 | 64 | 67 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 41 | 46 | 55 | 47 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 63 | | | 58 | 48 | 51 | 61 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 0 | 50 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | | | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | | | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | | | | |
| ELP Progress | 65 | | | 50 | | | | | |

*In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 69 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 347 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 57 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 458 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

## ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 39 | Yes | 2 | |
| ELL | 47 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 91 | | | |
| BLK | 43 | | | |
| HSP | 68 | | | |
| MUL | 77 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 76 | | | |
| FRL | 47 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 21 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| ELL | 57 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 87 | | | |
| BLK | 32 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 70 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| MUL | 58 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 77 | | | |
| FRL | 39 | Yes | 1 | |

## Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 70 | | | 75 | | | 63 | | | | | 65 |
| SWD | 39 | | | 32 | | | 18 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 33 | | | 42 | | | | | | | 3 | 65 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 87 | | | 93 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| BLK | 46 | | | 41 | | | 30 | | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 66 | | | 71 | | | 68 | | | | 5 | 73 |
| MUL | 77 | | | 77 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 76 | | | 83 | | | 68 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 51 | | | 43 | | | 39 | | | | 4 | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 71 | 65 | 29 | 75 | 69 | 41 | 58 | | | | | 50 |
| SWD | 23 | 14 | 6 | 23 | 38 | 25 | 20 | | | | | |
| ELL | 50 | | | 70 | | | | | | | | 50 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 87 | 64 | | 96 | 100 | | | | | | | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| BLK | 27 | 40 | 24 | 32 | 52 | 43 | 8 | | | | | |
| HSP | 71 | 64 | | 83 | 72 | | 61 | | | | | |
| MUL | 62 | 63 | | 57 | 50 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 88 | 77 | 50 | 89 | 75 | | 80 | | | | | |
| FRL | 40 | 47 | 26 | 40 | 56 | 38 | 22 | | | | | 40 |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 68 | 70 | 41 | 74 | 67 | 47 | 61 | | | | | |
| SWD | 29 | 38 | | 39 | 38 | | 9 | | | | | |
| ELL | 55 | | | 82 | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 83 | | | 96 | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 31 | 35 | 33 | 38 | 35 | 7 | | | | | |
| HSP | 62 | 60 | | 73 | 60 | | 53 | | | | | |
| MUL | 55 | | | 64 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 86 | 90 | | 88 | 78 | | 84 | | | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 32 | 31 | 41 | 52 | 47 | 13 | | | | | |

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 68% | 53% | 15% | 54% | 14% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 76% | 54% | 22% | 58% | 18% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 71% | 49% | 22% | 50% | 21% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 79% | 52% | 27% | 59% | 20% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 75% | 58% | 17% | 61% | 14% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 72% | 54% | 18% | 55% | 17% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 62% | 51% | 11% | 51% | 11% |

# III. Planning for Improvement

**Data Analysis/Reflection**
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was "students with disabilities". The data shows that during the 21/22 school our students ELA achievement was 23%, ELA learning gains was at 14%, and ELA learning gains for the lowest quartile was at 6%.

Contributing factors to student's performance in this area can be the ESE model used. The past 3 years we have adopted the support facilitation model for ESE instruction. This has been a challenge for grade levels because of class size, teacher effectiveness, and quality of instruction for ESE students.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year was "students with disabilities". The data shows a decline of 6% for ELA achievement and a 24% decline in ELA learning gains.

Contributing factors to this decline can be tied to teacher retention and effectiveness for the students being served, class size for the support facilitation classrooms for certain grade levels, student attendance, and scheduling of support facilitation.

**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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is students with disabilities. The state average is a 36 point difference in ELA, Lawton Chiles difference is 53 point difference which is a total difference of 17 points in ELA.

Another data component that needs attention is the gap focusing on math. The state average is a 30 point difference, Lawton Chiles is a 61 point difference for a total of 31 points in Math.

Contributing factors to this decline can be tied to teacher retention and effectiveness for the students being served, class size for the support facilitation classrooms for certain grade levels, student attendance, and scheduling of support facilitation.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in 3rd grade ELA. Looking back at 17/18 Lawton Chiles students were 66% proficient and increased to 71% for the 18/19 school year. Lawton Chiles fell back to 65% proficient in 20/21 and then again increased to 75% for the 21/22 school year.

During the 21/22 school year our district adopted a new reading series Benchmark Advanced. Our 3rd grade teachers focused on standard based instruction using the new Benchmark series and was very specific on what standards and how they were taught.

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

Looking at the early warning signs from Part 1 Lawton Chiles has identified attendance and ELA course failure as areas of concern. The EWS shows that Lawton Chiles has a total of 103 students at risk with attendance. The EWS also shows that 101 students are at risk of failing an ELA course during the school year.

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

ELA achievement for SWD
ELA achievement for Black/ African American Students
Math achievement for SWD
Math achievement for Black/ African American Students

**Area of Focus**
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

FAST data for 22-23 shows Black African American students scoring 47% proficiency on the federal index in ELA.

Provide standards-based instruction to all students using core materials in Benchmark Advanced, in whole and small groups. The instruction will match the level of content complexity required by the standards. Assessments will be aligned to test item specifications. Reteaching and intervention will be based on a regular review of student data.

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

Lawton Chiles Elementary will increase the overall percentage for Black African American students by 10% in ELA for the 23-24 school year based off of FAST progress monitoring data.

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

Principal, Assistant Principal and teachers will monitor FAST data on a quarterly basis to determine improvement or areas that need improvement.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Cory Tomlinson (tomlinsonc@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

FAST progress monitoring data will be used to determine improvement for this area of focus. LCES will also use the monthly Istation assessment and Benchmark Advanced assessments.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

FAST progress monitoring, istation and Benchmark Advanced data will allow for administration ad teachers to see up to date data to determine effectiveness of teacher strategies and remediation practices.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Students in grades Kindergarten, first, and second are receiving instruction in a phonics based program called UFLI. This program helps students learn to read using a variety of strategies and follow up work. This program is being implemented by the classroom teachers and is monitored by school administration through classroom walk through snapshots and formal observations.

High Dose tutoring for selected students and grade levels.

Provide standards-based instruction to all students using core materials in Benchmark Advanced, in whole and small groups. The instruction will match the level of content complexity required by the standards. Assessments will be aligned to test item specifications. Reteaching and intervention will be based on a regular review of student data.

After school tutoring for selected students and grade levels.

**Person Responsible:** Cory Tomlinson (tomlinsonc@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** May 2024

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

FAST data for 22-23 shows students with disabilities scoring 32% proficiency on the federal index in ELA.

Provide standards-based instruction to all students using core materials, in whole and small groups. The instruction will match the level of content complexity required by the standards. Assessments will be aligned to test item specifications. Reteaching and intervention will be based on a regular review of student data.

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

Lawton Chiles Elementary will increase the overall percentage for students with disabilities by 10%

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

Principal, Assistant Principal and teachers will monitor FAST data on a quarterly basis to determine improvement or areas that need improvement. walk throughs

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Cory Tomlinson (tomlinsonc@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

FAST progress monitoring data will be used to determine improvement for this area of focus. LCES will also use the monthly istation assessment and Benchmark Advanced assessments.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

FAST progress monitoring, istation and Benchmark Advanced data will allow for administration ad teachers to see up to date data to determine effectiveness of teacher strategies and remediation practices.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Students in grades Kindergarten, first, and second are receiving instruction in a phonics based program called UFLI. This program helps students learn to read using a variety of strategies and follow up work. This program is being implemented by the classroom teachers and is monitored by school administration through classroom walk through snapshots and formal observations.

LCES is shifting the services of SWD to a combination support facilitation and pull out model. The

students will be receiving whole group grade level instruction with non disabled peers and then being provided intensive small group instruction on grade level material by the ESE teacher.

Provide standards-based instruction to all students using core materials, in whole and small groups. The instruction will match the level of content complexity required by the standards. Assessments will be aligned to test item specifications. Reteaching and intervention will be based on a regular review of student data.

**Person Responsible:** Cory Tomlinson (tomlinsonc@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** May 2024

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Lawton Chiles Elementary will focus on student attendance for the 23/24 school year.

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

The percentage of students who missed 10% or more days will decrease by 10% overall for the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Attendance data will be pulled bimonthly and reviewed by truancy officer, family liaison, administration. Individual student attendance will be monitored through teachers, family liaison, and counselor. EPT meetings will be scheduled for the targeted students throughout the school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Cory Tomlinson (tomlinsonc@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Schoolwide PBIS will be implemented to focus on positive relationships with students and staff. Targeted students will be monitored and rewarded for attendance.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students who feel like they are part of the school community are more likely to attend school and benefit from daily instruction.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Lawton Chiles will continue to work with the truancy officer to monitor attendance and schedule EPT meetings when necessary. Classroom teachers will create a classroom environment to were all students are valued and accepted. Teachers will utilize classroom meetings and social emotional learning to accomplish this.

**Person Responsible:** Cory Tomlinson (tomlinsonc@gm.sbac.edu)

**By When:** May 2024

## CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The principal and district (support Principal or executive director) will review the data to ensure the identified areas of focus and action steps align to school needs as the data indicates. Subgroup data will be identified in addition to overall goals. Ongoing progress will be monitored on regular intervals to ensure alignment of action steps and student needs, including identified subgroups. Subgroups will be monitored in addition to school-wide, overall group data. The Federal Grants and programs department will aid in the budget alignment processes to ensure the student needs are met.

## Budget to Support Areas of Focus

### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American | | | | $12,800.00 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 |
| | | | 0510 - Lawton M. Chiles Elem. School | School Improvement Funds | | $12,800.00 |
| | | | *Notes: District provided funds for non Title 1 schools for after school tutoring. The students are selected and invited using data and assessments from Progress Monitoring 1 and Benchmark Assessments* | | | |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | | | | $0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | | | | $0.00 |
| | | | | | Total: | $12,800.00 |

### Budget Approval

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

Yes