Lawtey Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lawtey Elementary School

22703 N PARK ST, Lawtey, FL 32058

bradfordschools.org/lawtey

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.

Our mission in partnership with the entire community, is dedicated to providing a quality education in a safe learning environment so that all students can excel academically and socially in order to become productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. We will provide students with learning opportunities that are rigorous and relevant to today's educational standards. We will ensure a working and learning environment that is built on being respectful, responsible, reliable, and ready to learn. Through these Champion Values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual expectations.

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
O'Quinn, Terri	Principal	Oversee all school functions, supervise the daily operation and management of the school, and provide leadership/mentoring. Coordinate professional development for all teachers, especially the mentoring of the new teachers. Utilize current research, performance data, and feedback from all stakeholders to drive the decision making process. Recruit and retain highly qualified instructional and non-instructional staff. Manage and adjust the master schedule for all courses, intervention, and ese support as needed. Manage the school's financial resources. Facilitate and participate in family engagement activities. Create a positive school climate and culture for all stake holders. Evaluation and coaching of staff.
Ansley, Rebecca	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Conducts data analysis process. Facilitates data meetings to review assessment and PBIS data and discuss next steps. Modeling and coaching teachers as needed. B.E.S.T. standards training and planning with teachers. Coordinates implementation of the RtI process. Organizes, trains, and supports teachers with all state and district assessments.
Eison, Heather	Math Coach	Monitors, coaches, and assist all math teacher as needed. Leads professional development related to the new math curriculum.

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 SAC team met throughout the 2022-2023 school year to monitor SIP goals and progress. The parent committee met with the principal in July of 2023 to progress monitor and create a Title I plan that aligns to the SIP for the 2023-2024 school year. The leadership team was involved in all meetings and data conversations, all input from the above listed stakeholders was considered when creating school SIP goals for 2023-2024.

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 SAC team meets three times a year (after FAST testing) to review student data as it relates to the SIP goals. Grade level teams meet monthly with the leadership team to monitor goals. The leadership

team meets with Khris Henderson (State of Florida) and the district leadership team monthly to monitor progress as well. Action steps are reviewed and adjusted as needed according to the student data.

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-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	20%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: D 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 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	16	10	11	10	7	5	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	2	3	2	0	2	7	0	0	0	16
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	13	3	4	7	4	3	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	4	3	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	6	8	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	3	4	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	6	5	9	3	8	0	0	0	39

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	12	5	4	7	5	8	0	0	0	41

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	11	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	33	18	16	16	11	18	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	2	5	6	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	4	3	2	6	1	2	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	2	2	1	6	0	1	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	1	10	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	2	7	0	0	0	10
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	

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	4	3	2	6	3	10	0	0	0	28

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	2	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2

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	33	18	16	16	11	18	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	2	5	6	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	4	3	2	6	1	2	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	2	2	1	6	0	1	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	1	10	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	2	7	0	0	0	10
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	

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	4	3	2	6	3	10	0	0	0	28

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	2	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2

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*	62	46	53	52	45	56	68		
ELA Learning Gains				38			63		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				21					
Math Achievement*	70	56	59	58	49	50	70		
Math Learning Gains				52			63		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				25					
Science Achievement*	44	34	54	35	46	59	50		
Social Studies Achievement*				58	64				
Middle School Acceleration				47	52				
Graduation Rate				38	50				
College and Career Acceleration					80				
ELP Progress		59							

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	240
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	281
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	38	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	2	
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	53			

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	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP				

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				
PAC				
WHT	42			
FRL	34	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	62			70			44					
SWD	35			41							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33			33							2	
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67			76			48				4	
FRL	52			66			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	52	38	21	58	52	25	35					
SWD	39	33		52	27		36					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

						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	31			46								
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	55	41	30	58	51	30	28					
FRL	46	30	20	50	42	20	32					

						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	63		70	63		50					
SWD	60			65								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	70	64		73	68		54					
FRL	65	62		69	69		44					

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	63%	45%	18%	54%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	50%	18%	58%	10%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	63%	53%	10%	50%	13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	65%	51%	14%	59%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	62%	9%	61%	10%
05	2023 - Spring	72%	63%	9%	55%	17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	44%	34%	10%	51%	-7%

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.

5th grade Science - 44% proficient, this is an increase from 33% proficient the prior year. The overall trend for Bradford County School District is that our 5th grade students are not performing at the state average for Science.

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

3rd grade Math proficiency declined from 74% to 68%. Class numbers were large for the 1st nine weeks, differentiation was difficult due to size. A third unit was added to third grade in October 2022, this addition contributed to an increase in student success for the remaining three nine week periods. Small group instruction was negatively affected once the third allocation was added due to decreased classroom time.

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.

5th grade Science (44%) - state average is 51%. BCSD average is 34%. There is an obvious link to lack of science instruction in K - 4th grade.

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

5th grade Math (72%) up from 24%. We implemented spiral review and pre-teaching of assessed benchmarks.

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

Low School-wide reading proficiency is linked to higher numbers of course failures, Level 1 in ELA, and substantial reading deficiencies.
Although absence rates have decreased from 112 students/44% (2021- 2022) with less than 90% attendance to 59 students/24% (2022 - 2023), we would like to see this number decrease to 20% and continue to improve our attendance rate.

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

1 - Reading proficiency
2 - Science proficiency

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.

The EWS indicated that we had a high number of ELA course failures (34 students), Level 1 on FAST (24 students), and substantial reading deficiencies (39 students).

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

Students with a substantial reading deficiency will decrease from 16% school-wide to 14%.

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

Classroom observation, weekly data meetings, ELA grades, STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, and ELA FAST will all be monitored.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Ansley (ansley.rebecca@mybradford.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.)

UFLI Foundations is utilized with all K - 2nd grade students. It is also used for targeted intervention for students in grades 3 - 5 that show a deficiency in phonics.

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

UFLI Foundations – Grades K-2 - Supported by the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade IES Practice Guide. Kindergarten through 2nd grade will

be partnering with the University of Florida Literacy Institute to supplement HMH Into Reading foundational

skills. UFLI Foundations does not meet strong, moderate, or promising levels of evidence; however, the following 2 IES Practice Guide recommendations support the program. UFLI Foundations develops awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters (strong evidence) through daily

phoneme blending and segmentation practice as well as grapheme-phoneme correspondences. The program also meets the recommendation for teaching students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words (strong evidence) through the blending drills, sound-spelling pattern work, reading and spelling decodable words in isolation and in connected texts. Students will also work on irregular words and high-frequency words in isolation and in connected texts. Second grade students work with more complex words that include several prefixes and suffixes.

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.

BOY data will be analyzed to determine students with significant reading deficiencies (and those on the bubble list). These identified students will receive targeted intervention using the UFLI program. These students' progress will be closely monitored via the STAR Reading CBM and the UFLI progress monitoring assessments.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Ansley (ansley.rebecca@mybradford.us)

By When: Monthly reports will be sent home describing student progress and adjustments will be made to the interventions as needed.

All UFLI instructors will be trained and coached on how to effectively implement the program.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Ansley (ansley.rebecca@mybradford.us)

By When: Initial training and/or review training will occur during preplanning. Coaching observations will be conducted monthly. Coaching cycles will be established according to classroom observations and student progress.

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

44% of the 5th grade student population was proficient on the Science FCAT, this is lower than the state average of 51%.

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

61% of the 5th grade student population will be proficient on the 2023-2024 Science FCAT.

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

School-wide classroom observations, benchmark assessment data, and data meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Terri O'Quinn (oquinn.terri@mybradford.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.)

We are adding a teaching unit for STEM education. All students will participate in STEM weekly as a part of their specials wheel. Students will be exposed to higher-level science questioning and activities during this time, thus laying a scientific foundation beginning in kindergarten.

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

All students need exposure to science experiments and higher order questioning in addition to Tier I classroom instruction. By adding STEM to the resource wheel, all students will be exposed to coding, robotics, and science experiments.

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?

Yes

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.

Improve Tier I classroom science instruction through classroom observations and data meetings.

Person Responsible: Terri O'Quinn (oquinn.terri@mybradford.us)

By When: Monthly data meetings will be held to progress monitor.

Science experiments, STEM lessons, and higher order questioning will be planned and monitored to ensure science benchmarks are being incorporated.

Person Responsible: Terri O'Quinn (oquinn.terri@mybradford.us)

By When: Weekly classroom walk throughs will occur.

#3. 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.

Over the last two school years, 6 teachers have either resigned or did not meet the state qualifications for teacher retention. Recruitment of qualified teachers continues to be an issue as allocations become available. In order to increase teacher efficacy, coaching cycles will be implemented as a means to accelerate teacher and student performance.

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

Increase teacher retention (non-retirement related) from 78% to 85% by providing ongoing coaching support.

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

Based on classroom observations and school wide "Look Fors", a tiered coaching process will be implemented to increase teacher capacity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Ansley (ansley.rebecca@mybradford.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 CRT and Math Coach will continuously coach all teachers according to the specific needs of the individual teacher.

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

Coaching can improve high quality instruction, build teacher capacity, increase teacher retentions, and increase student 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?

Yes

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.

Determine schoolwide look-fors and conduct classroom observations for coaching (non-evaluative).

Person Responsible: Rebecca Ansley (ansley.rebecca@mybradford.us)

By When: The first set of coaching observations will be completed by the third week of school. The first round of coaching cycles will begin by the third week of school. The cycles will continue year round based on current look-fors and observations.

Common standards-based planning by grade level will occur 2 - 3 days a week after school to ensure instruction is aligned to the BEST standards.

Person Responsible: Terri O'Quinn (oquinn.terri@mybradford.us)

By When: The coaches will join standards based planning on a rotational basis starting during preplanning.

The principal will meet with the coaches at regularly scheduled times to review coaching documentation and provide feedback and support.

Person Responsible: Terri O'Quinn (oquinn.terri@mybradford.us)

By When: Ongoing beginning after the first round of coaching observations are complete.

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).

First, The school administration meets with the district Grants Director and Assistant Superintendent to review the allocation and look at the data from FDOE showing the targeted areas of needs as well as the comprehensive needs assessment. Then the school administrator also meets with teachers, support personnel, parents, and community members (SAC Committee) to get additional stakeholder input. After getting input, the leadership team also reviews the proposed strategies for ESSA based intervention using Evidence for ESSA and the What Works Clearning House as a foundation wherever possible.

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

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

n/a

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.

n/a

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

O'Quinn, Terri, oquinn.terri@mybradford.us

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?

n/a

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?

n/a

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
n/a	O'Quinn, Terri, oquinn.terri@mybradford.us

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.

Our SAC team is composed of staff members, parents, and community members. We meet at least three times a year to progress monitor. The parents were invited to attend a Title I meeting prior to the first day of school to address school funding and needs. The SIP is published on bradfordschools.org and a copy is available in the front office.

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))

Numerous parent nights are planned to increase parental engagement and to build positive relationships. The mission is relayed monthly in the newsletter. Teachers are in contact with parents via the telephone or electronically to relay the student's academic achievement. Monthly reports are sent home for students with a significant deficiency in reading or math. The PFEF is available on bradfordschools.org.

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 strong focus will be placed on decreasing the number of students with a significant reading deficiency and increasing science proficiency. There is a specified time in the schedule for reading and math interventions and/or enrichments. STEM will be added to the resource rotation for increased science exposure.

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))

We are currently a CSI school. We meet monthly with the district leadership team and our School Improvement Specialist to ensure gains are being made in the targeted areas.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA				$64,803.33
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	0123	0131 - Lawtey Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$52,868.38
			Notes: Extended Days for teachers for Professional Development and Standards Aligned Planning. $33/hour x 1.5 hours per day x 2 days per week x 19 teachers x @29 weeks			
	5100	210	0131 - Lawtey Elementary School	UniSIG		$7,618.05
			Notes: Retirement for teachers for PD and Planning			
	5100	220	0131 - Lawtey Elementary School	UniSIG		$4,316.90
			Notes: FICA/Medicaid for teachers for PD and Planning			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				$61,546.67
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	120	0131 - Lawtey Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$46,500.00
			Notes: STEM Teacher to provide supplemental standards based instruction and hands on activities during resource to support science instruction in all grades.			

	5100	210	0131 - Lawtey Elementary School	UniSIG		$6,277.50
			Notes: Retirement for STEM teacher			
	5100	220	0131 - Lawtey Elementary School	UniSIG		$3,577.25
			Notes: FICA for STEM teacher			
	5100	230	0131 - Lawtey Elementary School	UniSIG		$5,191.92
			Notes: Health Insurance for STEM teacher			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				$0.00
					Total:	$126,350.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes