

Hendry County Schools

Labelle Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	18
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Labelle Elementary School

150 W COWBOY WAY, Labelle, FL 33935

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

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:

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

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, 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
Howard, Amanda	Principal	
Wright, Angela	Assistant Principal	
Krause, Melinda	Reading Coach	
Mell, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Kingman, Jennifer	Teacher, PreK	
Barber, Theresa	Teacher, ESE	
Roberts, Makenzie	Teacher, K-12	
O'Connell, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	
O'Ferrell, Wendy	Teacher, K-12	

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 Administration and Leadership Team disintegrate school data to develop the School Improvement Plan. Once the plan has been created, it is presented to the School Advisory Council for input and approval.

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 goals are kept at the forefront of topics with teachers throughout the school year in monthly Professional Learning meetings. Progress Monitoring Data is analyzed to determine if revision to the plan is necessary to ensure continuous improvement.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	72%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: F
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	1	3	7	4	6	4	0	0	0	25	
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	2	8	5	0	0	0	18	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	9	10	6	5	5	1	0	0	0	36	
Course failure in Math	1	2	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	28	22	0	0	0	68	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	17	27	0	0	0	76	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	0	3	1	7	4	0	0	0	16	
	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	0		
	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	0	1	2	3	4	11	0	0	0	21

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

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	14	21	21	13	18	19	0	0	0	106	
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	4	2	2	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in ELA	3	17	14	19	5	13	0	0	0	71	
Course failure in Math	3	8	6	11	4	1	0	0	0	33	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	19	24	0	0	0	69	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	24	31	0	0	0	72	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	8	19	27	21	24	0	0	0	100	
Two or more indicators	3	14	16	24	13	19	0	0	0	89	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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) 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	14	21	21	13	18	19	0	0	0	106	
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	4	2	2	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in ELA	3	17	14	19	5	13	0	0	0	71	
Course failure in Math	3	8	6	11	4	1	0	0	0	33	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	19	24	0	0	0	69	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	24	31	0	0	0	72	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	8	19	27	21	24	0	0	0	100	
Two or more indicators	3	14	16	24	13	19	0	0	0	89	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	

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*	35	42	53	41	46	56	39		
ELA Learning Gains				51			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			36		
Math Achievement*	38	50	59	40	49	50	41		
Math Learning Gains				52			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37			31		
Science Achievement*	34	43	54	34	53	59	37		
Social Studies Achievement*					61	64			
Middle School Acceleration					59	52			
Graduation Rate					40	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	54	53	59	62			40		

** 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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	203
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	25	Yes	4	1
ELL	33	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	42			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	41			
FRL	41			

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	37	Yes	3	
ELL	40	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	45			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	44			

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	35			38			34					54
SWD	11			22							3	42
ELL	28			33			19				5	54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	35			42			35				5	52
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	41			30			33				5	62
FRL	35			41			35				5	52

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	41	51	50	40	52	37	34					62
SWD	17	38		32	58							40
ELL	33	52	57	32	37	25	21					62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	42	53	48	43	50	33	29					61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	39	47		27	53		50					70
FRL	41	50	45	43	48	29	31					61

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	39	48	36	41	53	31	37					40
SWD	25			17			18					15
ELL	29	37		33	50		17					40
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	40	47	27	43	55		34					38
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	30			30								
FRL	38	49	36	38	57	31	37					36

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	35%	41%	-6%	54%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	32%	43%	-11%	58%	-26%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	36%	5%	50%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	44%	37%	7%	59%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	45%	4%	61%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	37%	35%	2%	55%	-18%

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.

After examining the 22/23 school year data, 4th grade students achieved the lowest proficiency in ELA among the school and district. Factors contributing to the low performance include: implementation gaps of ELA standards, one 4th grade teacher quit mid-year, and instructional time focused on classroom management.

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

4th Grade ELA showed the greatest decline from 2022 to 2023 by 19%. Factors contributing to the low performance include: implementation gaps of ELA standards, one 4th grade teacher quit mid-year, and instructional time focused on classroom management.

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 greatest gap compared to the state average was 4th grade ELA. LES 4th graders were only 32% proficient overall while the state average was 57%. As mentioned in response #1, the factors possibly contributing to the low performance include: implementation gaps of ELA standards, one 4th grade teacher quit mid-year, and instructional time focused on classroom management.

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

The data component which showed the most improvement was 5th grade math, gaining 13% points in proficiency. Strategies introduced in 5th grade math last year included: targeted small group

interventions, evidenced based instructional practices, data monitoring to make instructional decisions, and focus on positive culture building.

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

The number of students scoring a Level 1 on both the ELA and Math FAST Assessments are a great level of concern. These level 1s indicate a large gap in achievement for our students compared to their grade level peers among the state.

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

The areas needing the most improvement on our campus for this school year are:

1. Improve Tier 1 instructional practices in both ELA and Math among all grade levels.
2. Implement a strong phonetic foundation for students in Kindergarten, 1st, and 2nd grades so students are prepared for the academic and assessment demands of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades.
3. Improve the value of small group and after school instruction, basing the groups and focus on needs presented from progress monitoring data.
4. Create a sense of urgency among the students, parents, and staff for the need for students to become academically proficient before they transition to 6th grade.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

A critical need was found in ELA from our FAST data which showed that only 36% of our students in grades 3-5 are proficient in Reading. This low level of proficiency indicates that work needs to be done to improve Tier 1 instructions across all grade levels. UFLI Phonics will be implemented in grades K - 2 to build a stronger reading foundation. 3rd grade teachers will differentiate small groups according to need and use UFLI to fill in foundational gaps for non-reading students. Grade level PLCs and coaching cycles will be implemented in all grades to increase teacher efficacy. Targeted push in support has been added for ELL students with appropriate accommodations and an additional para allocated for ELL. The ESE team and General Education teachers are collaborating to design effective instruction in the general education setting. Students with Disabilities are scheduled to spend more time in the gen ed classroom to receive on level instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA Achievement will increase by a minimum of 5% across all grade levels on FAST PM 3.

Monitoring:

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

Student data from the ELA Progress Monitoring Assessments will be monitored to ensure the students are on on target for proficiency on the PM3 ELA FAST assessment. IReady Progress Monitoring Data will be tracked to monitor progression of the reading standards and benchmarks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Howard (howarda@hendry-schools.net)

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.)

In grades K-2 our instructional focus relating to ELA will be to ensure that our students are learning the foundations of reading through quality Tier 1 Phonics instruction through UFLI.

An effective reading block plan will be created for grades K-5 to ensure instructional minutes are used with fidelity and include differentiated group time with appropriate push in support. Weekly PLCs will be monitored by school administration and the Reading Coach to provide support for adult learning in order to build teacher capacity. The Reading Coach will also plan, model, and complete coaching cycles with teachers and grade groups to increase efficacy. Student Progress Monitoring and Walkthrough Data will be used to monitor effectiveness of coaching cycles, instruction, and to guide ongoing Professional Learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our goal is to improve collective efficacy among grade groups. PLCs were selected to provide teachers ongoing support which in turn will enhance student achievement. PLCs will address phonics instruction, planning, supporting SIP goals across all content areas, and data analysis to guide 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 1 - Strong Evidence

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.

UFLI Phonics implemented with fidelity in grades K through 2, tier 1.

UFLI Phonics implemented in 3rd grade as a tier 2 intervention.

Person Responsible: Melinda Krause (krausem@hendry-schools.net)

By When: K - 2, UFLI lessons begin the 1st week of school. 3rd grade interventions will start in September.

Grade level PLCs scheduled and implemented weekly.

Person Responsible: Amanda Howard (howarda@hendry-schools.net)

By When: Grade level PLCs begin the 2nd week of school.

Coaching Cycles with Reading Coach designed and implemented with teachers according to need.

Person Responsible: Melinda Krause (krausem@hendry-schools.net)

By When: Coaching Cycles will begin according to teacher need beginning the 1st quarter.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

A positive relationship with families and community stakeholders is necessary in order to support the academic and emotional needs of our students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Opportunities for families and stakeholders to participate in workshops and informational sessions related to their child's academics will increase by 25% this school year.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team will plan 3 additional family events throughout the school year to educate families and stakeholders of best practices to support their children's learning. These events will include student led data conferences where students take ownership of their progress and content related workshops.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Howard (howarda@hendry-schools.net)

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.)

Parental involvement events are planned for the school year to assist parents in understanding their role in supporting their child's learning at home. Workshops and informational sessions are planned to explain UFLI Phonics, ELA and Math Standards and will provide parents strategies in order to better support reinforcement of skills at home.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Parental involvement has a point .45 positive impact on student achievement according to Hattie's research.

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 1 - Strong Evidence

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.

Parental Involvement events scheduled and planned to include: UFLI, Math and Reading Standard information, and other family involvement activities.

Person Responsible: Angela Wright (wrighta@hendry-schools.net)

By When: Family events begin in September.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

In grades K-2 our instructional focus relating to ELA will be to ensure that our students are learning the foundations of reading through quality Tier 1 Phonics instruction through UFLI.

An effective reading block plan will be created for grades K-2 to ensure instructional minutes are used with fidelity and include differentiated group time with appropriate push in support.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

An effective reading block plan will be created for grades 3- 5 to ensure instructional minutes are used with fidelity and include differentiated group time with appropriate push in support.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

ELA proficiency rates will increase by 5%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

ELA proficiency rates will increase by 5%.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Weekly PLCs will be monitored by school administration and the Reading Coach to provide support for adult learning in order to build teacher capacity. The Reading Coach will also plan, model, and complete coaching cycles with teachers and grade groups to increase efficacy. Student Progress Monitoring and Walkthrough Data will be used to monitor effectiveness of coaching cycles, instruction, and to guide ongoing Professional Learning.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Howard, Amanda, howarda@hendry-schools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

LES will be implementing small groups utilizing explicit, systematic instruction in all grade levels focusing on the learning deficit areas. This practice aligns to the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidenced based Reading Plan and to the BEST ELA Standards.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The need to raise the proficiency rate among all students will be met by implementing small groups utilizing explicit, systematic instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Coaching will take place with Tier 2 & Tier 3 teachers to increase teacher efficacy and effectiveness. The coaching will include disaggregating data in order to plan systematic, explicit small group instruction.	Krause, Melinda, krausem@hendry-schools.net

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The School Improvement Plan will be shared with the School Advisory Committee during the 1st meeting of the school year. The school goals will also be shared with parents and stakeholders through quarterly newsletters and parent/teacher conferences.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Building a positive relationship with the families and community stakeholders in order to support the needs of our students is of high priority at LES. Additional opportunities for parental involvement are planned for the school year to assist parents in understanding their role in supporting their child's learning at home. Workshops and informational sessions are planned to explain UFLI, ELA and Math Standards, and will give parents strategies in order to better support reinforcement of skills at home. Students will be taught how to maintain student data folders and lead data chats with their parents during conferences. School goal progress will be shared with parents through quarterly newsletters.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(ii))

A critical need was found in ELA from our FAST data which showed that only 36% of our students in grades 3-5 are proficient in Reading. This low level of proficiency indicates that work needs to be done to improve Tier 1 instructions across all grade levels. UFLI Phonics will be implemented in grades K - 2 to build a stronger reading foundation. 3rd grade teachers will differentiate small groups according to need and use UFLI to fill in foundational gaps for non-reading students. Grade level PLCs and coaching cycles will be implemented in all grades to increase teacher efficacy.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

All students receive bi-weekly Tier 1 Social Emotional instruction from the School Counselor and Enrichment teachers during their Enrichment time. Counseling and school-based mental health services are provided on an as needed basis, with followup sessions supported by data collection. Mentoring services are planned through Big Brother/Big Sister to assist high needs students to help improved skills outside of the academic subject areas.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

LES hosts a "Career Day" event where members from the community present to the students and share awareness of postsecondary opportunities.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Teachers are trained on the MTSS process and coached on implementation processes to address behavior issues.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Teachers are in a continuous professional learning cycle with both administration and the Reading Coach through weekly PLC meetings, observations, modeling, and feedback. Data diving sessions are provided quarterly with documents to help plan and organizing small group interventions.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Parent meetings are held for inclusion students and VPK students. School visits are coordinated for daycare students between the school and local daycare facilities. Kindergarten Roundup happens yearly to inform parents of transition strategies and best practices to help acclimate students to the demands of Kindergarten.