
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Lawton Elementary School

151 GRAHAM AVE, Oviedo, FL 32765

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0131>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/24/2023.

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:

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.

The mission of Lawton Elementary School is to provide a caring, committed and connected school with exciting and meaningful learning experiences for everyone. Lawton Elementary works very closely with its students and families with the intent to educate one another on each other's' cultures, with the end result being to create a well-rounded school culture embracing each other's' differences and similarities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

While being Caring, Committed and Connected, Lawton Elementary School will be a premier elementary school in the Oviedo Cluster and a top 10 school in SCPS. Lawton will be recognized in the district and the state level for high standards, academic performance, and offering students customized educational pathways. Lawton will support the SCPS vision that every student will graduate from high school prepared for the future as a lifelong learner and a responsible citizen in a democratic society. All students and will perform at the highest levels. The school's personnel will be highly qualified, diverse, innovative, enthusiastic, energetic, and dedicated to the mission.

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
Navarro, Robert	Principal	Support the students, teachers, staff and parents with the academic and social development of development of all children in the school.
Marquez, Lyssa	Assistant Principal	Support the students, teachers, staff and parents with the academic and social development of development of all children in the school.
Hinrichs, Caryn	Administrative Support	Support the students, teachers, staff and parents with the academic and social development of development of all children in the school.
Giammalvo, Amanda	Instructional Coach	Support the students, teachers, staff and parents with the academic and social development of development of all children in the school.
de Castro, Camesha	School Counselor	Support the students, teachers, staff and parents with the academic and social development of development of all children in the school.
Sterling, Toni	Other	Support the students, teachers, staff and parents with the academic and social development of development of all children in the school.

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 involved PTA and SAC members in the creation of the SIP through meetings where feedback was taken on many subjects pertaining to community involvement and students safety. SAC committee members have been consulted on goals for the upcoming year, and student progress monitoring data will be shared throughout the year.

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))

Lawton Elementary will meet with the faculty/Staff each quarter to review the SIP and action plans imbedded in the document. Administration and the resource team will review monthly and make adjusts to student learning based on the current data trends at each grade level.

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	37%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	31%
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) 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: A 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	8	12	11	13	11	7	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	9	12	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	15	8	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	5	4	9	6	7	0	0	0	32

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	1	3	2	5	11	8	0	0	0	30

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	4	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	4	0	0	5	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	9	11	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	5	11	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	0	4	0	1	3	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	4	2	5	2	0	0	0	15
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	4	0	0	5	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	9	11	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	5	11	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	0	4	0	1	3	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	4	2	5	2	0	0	0	15
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*	71	61	53	74	65	56	80		
ELA Learning Gains				58			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			53		
Math Achievement*	80	64	59	77	46	50	74		
Math Learning Gains				67			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			33		
Science Achievement*	73	65	54	66	65	59	74		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	63	77	59	94			44		

* 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	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	361
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	527
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97
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	46			
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	94			
BLK	42			
HSP	59			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	79			

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%
FRL	55			

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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	59			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	53			

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	71			80			73					63
SWD	35			47			39				5	73
ELL	64			55			55				4	63
AMI												
ASN	94			94							2	
BLK	37			47							2	
HSP	49			64			62				5	69
MUL	87			71							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	77			85			78				4	
FRL	49			61			52				5	50

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	74	58	43	77	67	48	66					94
SWD	31	30	30	43	38	30	29					90
ELL	57	53		57	71							94
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	30		42	40							
HSP	58	56	45	64	55	40	59					94
MUL	67			67								
PAC												
WHT	81	59	49	82	70	56	72					
FRL	53	51	40	57	56	36	39					93

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	80	60	53	74	54	33	74					44
SWD	36	22	20	41	28	17	29					
ELL	74			58								44
AMI												
ASN	100			100								
BLK	46			23								
HSP	69	57	60	68	52		75					33
MUL	85			77								
PAC												
WHT	83	64	61	77	56	35	74					
FRL	64	36	31	53	33	24	41					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	66%	61%	5%	54%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	66%	14%	58%	22%
03	2023 - Spring	70%	60%	10%	50%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	97%	66%	31%	54%	43%
03	2023 - Spring	80%	66%	14%	59%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	87%	68%	19%	61%	26%
05	2023 - Spring	51%	44%	7%	55%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	70%	64%	6%	51%	19%

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.

According to the FAST PM3 data, 2nd and 5th grade reading and 5th grade basic math is an area of concern and demonstrates the greatest need for improvement.

2nd Grade ELA - 68% proficient

5th Grade ELA - 66% proficient

5th Grade Basic Math - 51% proficient

Contributing factors included: new instructional materials and frameworks, lack of PLC support from

administration, and consistent rigorous instruction The creation of 5th grade Math RAMP also created high and low achieving classes. We were better prepared to move the high achievers.

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

3rd, 4th and 5th grade ELA FAST data showed 72% of our students being proficient. That is a decline of 1.6% from the previous year. Contributing factors included: New BEST Benchmarks, New resources, shift from FSA to FAST, 5th grade proficiency being at 66%.

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.

There are no gaps when compared to the state average.

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

The data that showed the most improvement was 4th grade reading and math on FAST PM3.

ELA - 80% proficient
Math - 87% proficient

The contributing factor was implementing a different team structure for the 4h grade team in which teachers departmentalized and the students were split again for block 2. Similar to a middle school schedule. Teacher planning and support from the instructional coach were also contributing factors.

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

Student attendance and on-grade level performance in ELA and Math

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

1. Increase the number of students showing proficiency in Reading – Increase by 10%
2. Increase the number of students showing proficiency in Math – Increase by 6%
3. Increase the number of students showing proficiency in Science – Increase by 5%
4. Increase the number of 5th grade students earning their Digital Tools – Increase by 20%
5. Enhance Lawton atmosphere where more students feel connected to the adults who serve them.

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 Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities and Black/African American students. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities and Black/African American students.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Navarro (robert_navarro@scps.k12.fl.us)

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.)

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention, iReady or iStation, Success for All – FastTrack Phonics (at Title 1 schools), Reading Mastery, FastForward, Corrective Reading, Quick Reads and Elements of Reading.

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: iReady, DreamBox, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System, Seminole Numeracy Project.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum.

All of the listed interventions have been approved by Just Read, Florida through the vetting process for the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

Math- All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.

Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

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.

What do we want all students to do?

Lawton Elementary wants the Lower Quartile Learners to think critically, problem-solve, make academic growth, work independently and collaboratively, become proficient, and master their grade level standards.

How will we know if they learn it?

Lawton Elementary will know the Lower Quartile Learners have accomplished it by:

- ~ Listening to them articulate their thinking
- ~ Observe their collaborations
- ~ Observe them work independently
- ~ Demonstrate mastery of grade level content

Additionally, through progress monitoring through STAR, FAST, iReady, and classroom assessments. Small group support will be provided by the school interventionist and instructional paraprofessionals to our lowest quartile students' data.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

Based on student data and lack of growth, Lawton Elementary will respond by providing small group support by the school interventionist and instructional paraprofessionals to our lowest quartile students' to meet their needs. Lawton Elementary will also offer after school tutoring.

What evidence/data will there be to reflect monitoring for this strategy/action?

Data that will be monitored will include:

- ~ FAST
- ~ iReady
- ~ DRA scores
- ~ Classroom assessments

MTSS meetings and grade level data meetings will take notes.

Person Responsible: Robert Navarro (robert_navarro@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

#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.

Students succeed when conditions for learning are optimized. A focus on campus safety, development of a culture where student voice and belonging are valued and sharing collective responsibility for the success of all students in the school increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

5 Essentials Survey indicators for trust, collective responsibility and academic personalism will increase to or remain Well Organized.

Monitoring:

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

Conditions for Learning monitoring will occur during classroom walk through, PLC meetings, attendance and discipline data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Navarro (robert_navarro@scps.k12.fl.us)

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.)

The Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS) process is a team-based approach that relies on a strong collaboration between families and professionals from a variety of disciplines regardless of the level implemented. MTSS provides a positive and effective means to support student learning, attendance and behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

MTSS methods are research-based and proven to positively impact school climate and increase academic performance.

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.

Lawton Elementary School will implement the 2 by 10 building relationships strategies with in each classroom to help make stronger connections at the main point of contact. Team Leaders will discuss monthly how to continually improve student connections to adults in the school.

The following 5 Essential questions will be made a focal point during PLC meetings, Team Leader Meetings and Faculty/Staff Meetings: Help maintain discipline in the entire school, not just their

classroom? Feel responsible to help each other do their best. Feel responsible that all students learn. Feel responsible for helping students develop self-control. Feel responsible when students in this school fail.

Person Responsible: Robert Navarro (robert_navarro@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

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).

In collaboration with the Assistant Superintendent, school leaders identify and align resources to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Evaluation of student achievement data and related early warning factors such as attendance and discipline referrals are at the core of this work. Principals review data with the school leadership team, staff, and other relevant stakeholders, then develop or modify goals and strategies to align with the school needs presented. These goals and strategies are then operationalized through action items within the annual School Improvement Plan. These specific interventions or activities are noted within the SIP, and funding resources are assigned (i.e., Title I, Part A, UniSIG).