

Lafayette District Schools

Lafayette Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	12
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lafayette Elementary School

811 E MAIN ST, Mayo, FL 32066

<https://www.lafayette.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Newman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (55%) 2020-21: (59%) 2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lafayette County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

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

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Building a community of learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide all students educational opportunities within a safe environment conducive to learning which will enable them to become successful students and positive productive students.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Newman, Lisa	Principal	Oversee the day-to-day operations of the school that include, but are not limited to, instruction, safety, and the well-being of all students.
Vann, Gwen	Other	MTSS Coordinator
Kendrick, Amy	Assistant Principal	
Moseley, Pam	Reading Coach	
Pearson, Connie	Guidance Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Lisa Newman

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

Total number of students enrolled at the school

548

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

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	95	91	77	87	74	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	509
Attendance below 90 percent	47	44	28	26	19	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193
One or more suspensions	8	5	5	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	23	17	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	14	5	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	5	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	11	20	20	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	4	1	3	11	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	22	18	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/20/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	95	91	88	71	79	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	503
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	95	91	88	71	79	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	503
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	60%	60%	56%	59%			64%	64%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	62%	61%	48%			63%	63%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	56%	52%	29%			49%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	71%	71%	60%	79%			81%	81%	63%
Math Learning Gains	58%	58%	64%	76%			82%	82%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	25%	25%	55%	62%			63%	63%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	51%	51%	59%			71%	71%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	62%	62%	0%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	64%	0%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	65%	65%	0%	56%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	77%	77%	0%	62%	15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	82%	82%	0%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2022					
	2019	79%	79%	0%	60%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	69%	69%	0%	53%	16%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	26	47	39	28	13	9	25				
ELL	55	52		71	48						
BLK	18	60		53							
HSP	52	55		66	48	10	42				
MUL	50	73		57	73						
WHT	67	63	43	75	62	25	61				
FRL	48	59	58	61	52	25	42				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	17	23	14	46	68	54	29				
ELL	50	40		84	70		50				
BLK	45			55							
HSP	51	43		79	64		57				
MUL	53			67							
WHT	62	48	17	82	79	64	61				
FRL	48	49	29	72	72	58	50				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	24	38	33	52	66	50	36				
ELL	42	44		69	83						
BLK	15	40		54	80						
HSP	60	60	36	77	81	69	71				
WHT	70	68	55	85	84	50	75				
FRL	57	56	45	74	82	65	60				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	456
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

In reviewing the data, our overall school grade fell four points from 59% to 55%. Science achievement fell from 59% to 51%. Reading achievement increased while math achievement decreased. This was especially noted in the achievement of the bottom quartile.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The achievement level of our bottom quartile in math declined and is an area of concern. Science achievement has declined over the past three years. Achievement levels of our students with disabilities fell to 27%.

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

Discipline issues have taken students out of class, and therefore the students are missing core instruction. In order to reduce the amount of time out of class and allow students to receive instruction from their teachers, we are implementing a school-wide behavior initiative. In addition, we have created a behavior para-professional position. Professional learning is focusing on behavior and building relationships with students.

Students are receiving a dedicated Science class in 4th and 5th grade.

Last year, interventions focused on reading. This year, interventions will focus on reading and math. Students with disabilities are also receiving Tier 3 instruction in both reading and math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Learning gains in reading increased from 48% to 62%. ELA bottom quartile learning gains increased from 29% to 56%.

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

Through a grant, we were able to hire an MTSS Coordinator and additional interventionists to serve at each grade level. These interventionists focused on providing tiered support in reading. Additionally, we had quarterly data chats to analyze student progress.

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

Last year, interventions focused on reading. This year, interventions will focus on reading and math. Students with disabilities are also receiving Tier 3 instruction in both reading and math. In order to reduce the amount of time out of class and allow students to receive instruction from their teachers, we are implementing a school-wide behavior initiative.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

This year, professional learning is focusing on behavior and building relationships with students. In pre-planning, Ben Springer, a behavioral specialist, worked with our staff on building positive relationships with students. Throughout the year, we are partnering with NEFEC to build upon the knowledge base of staff and extend their learning in this area. We feel that this will improve discipline and encourage positive student behaviors.

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

The behavior initiative is on-going, and we expect to see a decrease in student referrals as well as time lost out of the classroom. Having an MTSS Coordinator and interventionists at each grade level serving our students with the greatest needs will continue this year. Our after school program offers students more opportunities for learning and enrichment. Select high school students also work in our after school program to help instruct and encourage our elementary students.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our students with disabilities subgroup is below the threshold at 27%. We will focus on improving achievement in this subgroup.

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

Increase the students with disabilities subgroup from 27% to 41%.

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

We will use progress monitoring data through the state FAST progress monitoring as well as iReady to monitor student progress and identify areas of concern.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Newman (lnewman@lcsbmail.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Small group and individual interventions will be implemented.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Research supports the effectiveness of the implementation of these strategies. Interventionists use research based instructional resources to provide tiered instruction.

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.

Develop a master schedule that allows for interventions to occur at each grade level. Purchase, utilize, and train on the research based instructional resources being used.

Person Responsible

Lisa Newman (lnewman@lcsbmail.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

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

NA

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

NA

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 new 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: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

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 take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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. Â§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?

NA

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific 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 practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NA

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

NA

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

LES implements many strategies to effectively communicate, build positive relationships, and encourage family involvement. Teachers send home reminders and information to parents using the Remind and Class Dojo apps and conference with parents quarterly. Parents have access to student's grades and assessment results on

Skyward, iReady diagnostic reports, and the FL Family Access Portal.

Students are recognized for academic and behavioral achievement at school and online. Parents are able to find the school's mission and vision on the school's website along with a calendar of upcoming events and recognition of school and student success. Parents complete a survey that allows them to voice any concerns and provide input regarding LES. The data from the survey is compiled and reviewed to drive future decisions. A School Advisory Council made up of parents, community members, and school staff meets monthly or as needed to address concerns and provide input on improvements that can be made.

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

Our administration sets goals and high expectations for our students, faculty, and staff. Our faculty and staff set goals and high expectations for our students. Our community has high expectations for our school system. Motivating and supporting students to be the best versions of themselves is the responsibility of faculty, staff, administration, parents, community members, and alumni.

Students are responsible for their actions and these actions should ultimately promote a positive school culture and environment.