

Lake Wales Charter Schools

Dale R Fair Babson Park Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 12 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 17 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 17 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 19 |

Dale R Fair Babson Park Elementary

815 SCENIC HWY N, Babson Park, FL 33827

<http://lwcharterschools.com/babsonpark>

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.

Making a difference today for a better world tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Dale R. Fair Babson Park Elementary's vision is to challenge the curiosity of each student and provide an opportunity to discover, enrich, and expand the abilities, interests, values, attitudes, understanding, and skills appropriate to the individual's needs and level of development. We feel that our vision can be achieved through doing, exploring, discovering, and creating. The purpose and responsibility of our elementary school is to help a student learn how to think rather than what to think.

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 |
|------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Tyler, Elizabeth | Principal | |
| Fann, Blake | Assistant Principal | |
| McCarter, Nancy | Curriculum Resource Teacher | |
| Jacobs, Shelli | Curriculum Resource Teacher | |

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 SIP is developed with the input of the School Leadership Team and all SAC members. Grade Level Chairs are also involved in this process.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation through twice monthly meetings with all teachers to evaluate student progress. CAC (Class Analysis Charts) for reading and math will be kept and monitored by the teachers and the Literacy Coaches. Areas of concern will be addressed as they arise.

| Demographic Data | |
|--|--|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 27% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 70% |
| Charter School | Yes |
| RAISE School | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Identification | 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)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: B 2020-21: 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 | 16 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 27 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 10 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |

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 | 27 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 29 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 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 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 29 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 8 | 5 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 29 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 29 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 2022 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 61 | | 56 | 73 | | 57 |
| ELA Learning Gains | 60 | | 61 | 54 | | 58 |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 44 | | 52 | 39 | | 53 |
| Math Achievement* | 69 | | 60 | 79 | | 63 |
| Math Learning Gains | 65 | | 64 | 70 | | 62 |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 45 | | 55 | 54 | | 51 |

| Accountability Component | 2022 | | | 2019 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement* | 63 | | 51 | 63 | | 53 |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | 50 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | |
| ELP Progress | | | | | | |

* 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 | 58 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 407 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 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 | 29 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |

| 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% |
| BLK | 50 | | | |
| HSP | 52 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | | | |
| FRL | 51 | | | |

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)

| 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 | 61 | 60 | 44 | 69 | 65 | 45 | 63 | | | | | |
| SWD | 24 | 35 | 29 | 32 | 35 | 19 | 27 | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 50 | | 48 | 57 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 59 | 58 | 51 | 52 | 43 | 53 | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 60 | 39 | 77 | 68 | 37 | 66 | | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 60 | 44 | 53 | 57 | 42 | 58 | | | | | |

| 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 | 52 | 27 | 69 | 45 | 38 | 58 | | | | | |
| SWD | 41 | 19 | | 42 | 50 | | 33 | | | | | |
| ELL | 43 | | | 36 | | | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 59 | | | 53 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 59 | 27 | | 55 | 36 | | 55 | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 71 | 59 | | 74 | 50 | 60 | 59 | | | | | |
| FRL | 52 | 35 | | 52 | 43 | | 43 | | | | | |

| 2018-19 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 73 | 54 | 39 | 79 | 70 | 54 | 63 | | | | | |
| SWD | 49 | 41 | 31 | 54 | 59 | 44 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 45 | | | 64 | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 58 | 47 | | 74 | 71 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 64 | 55 | | 79 | 73 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 75 | | | 83 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 77 | 55 | 50 | 79 | 68 | 52 | 65 | | | | | |
| FRL | 64 | 49 | 41 | 68 | 61 | 48 | 48 | | | | | |

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.

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.

Our 5th grade ELA showed the lowest performance with a 53%, which is down from 58% the previous year.

The contributing factors to this low performance were retention of teachers due to maternity leave, illness, and long term subs.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was in 4th grade ELA. There was an 8% drop from the 21-22 school year to the 22-23 year, declining from 73% to 65%. A factor that may have contributed to the decline could be that we are comparing two different tests, state assessments in 21-22 to progress monitoring in 22-23. The decline may also be attributed to the students' lack of exposure to computer basics with the tests not being paper-pencil but computer-based this past year.

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.

When compared to the state averages, our averages were significantly higher in all areas except one. In math, we ranged from 16% higher than the state in 5th grade to 21% higher in 4th grade. In science we were 11% higher than the state. Our 3rd and 4th grade ELA averages were also 16% and 7%, respectively, higher than the state averages. The only area where we were lower than the state was in 5th grade ELA and that was only by 1%. Dale R. Fair Babson Park had a 53% average compared to the state at 54%.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was the 3rd-grade math scores. In 2021-2022 our 3rd graders scored 60% in math compared to the 2022-2023 3rd graders who scored 78% which was an 18% increase. Several actions were taken in this area. We acquired a new math series which is aligned with the new BEST standards. The principal and several teachers attended a multiple-day training on the new series and how to utilize it for maximum achievement.

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

An analysis of the data indicate a critical need for focusing on increased attendance. Another area of concern is to decrease the number of Level 1 scores in the 3rd-5th grades ELA area.

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

Our highest priority for the 2023-2024 school year is to decrease the number of Level 1 scores in the 3rd-5th grades ELA area. The other is to increase overall attendance.

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 availability of the Early Warning Signs provided the basis for our decision to focus on the lowering the number of Level 1 scores in the 3rd-5th grades.

Measurable Outcome:

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

A numerical count of the number of Level 1 ELA scores will determine the extent to which we accomplish this objective.

Monitoring:

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

On a monthly basis, the Literacy Team will meet with all grade levels to determine the extent to which progress is being made toward the accomplishment of this objective.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nancy McCarter (nancy.mccarter@lwcharterschools.com)

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 Progress Monitoring data, the evaluation of Class Analysis Charts, and small-group instruction will be an intergral part of our evidence-based interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The administration analyzed the data related to the number of students scoring Level 1 on ELA an determined that this objective should be implemented.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#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.

The faculty are responsible for creating a positive classroom environment using the PBIS training strategies. That includes motivational strategies throughout the school day and making full use of the encouragement process.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our area of focus is to decrease the number of out of school suspensions.

Monitoring:

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

This area will be monitored to determine the change in number of referrals and/or suspensions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Blake Fann (blake.fann@lwcharterschools.com)

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 PBIS framework will be used to implement this area of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This was selected because it was recently implemented in all the charter schools in our LEA.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

As being identified for ATSI, the low performing subgroup that will be addressed will be SWD.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to increase the percentage of SWD from 29% to at least 41% proficient.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored through a variety of assessment devices including CAC for comprehension, vocabulary, and SPARK achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Tyler (elizabeth.tyler@lwcharterschools.com)

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.)

A number of evidence-based interventions being implemented for this Area of Focus include but are not limited to rescheduling of classes, curriculum restructuring, implementation of research based specific instructional strategies based on student needs in levels of achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Current curriculum have not resulted in adequate achievement. Scheduling arrangements have not produced the desired outcomes for the students to be successful.

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.

The rescheduling of SWD classes to better serve the students.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Tyler (elizabeth.tyler@lwcharterschools.com)

By When: This action will be done by Oct. 13th, the end of the first quarter.

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

Rescheduling, curriculum revision, and specific instructional strategies along with professional development in these areas will be provided on a consistent basis. No funding allocations were provided to our school.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

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

The SIP is published and presented to the School Advisory Council and is published on our school website. Copies are also available to parents in the school 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))

All parents are welcomed and encouraged to participate in their child's education and on going activities at the school site. Dale R. Fair Babson Park Elem. provides numerous opportunities for parents to become more involved in their child's learning through, but not limited to, Annual Parent Workshop Nights, Family Night Check-Outs, All Pro Dad Nights, and Bring Your Parents to School Days

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)

The school plans to strengthen the academic program in a variety of ways. The Literacy Coaches provide demonstrations in class lessons as well as regular professional development sessions, observations, and debriefings. The reading consultant provides training based on the schools identified needs. The administration uses the strategies that have been presented during their formal and informal observations. The strategies are intended to enhance the achievement of all students with extra emphasis on the students currently scoring Level I on ELA.

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))

NA

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.B. | Area of Focus: -- Select below --: | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |

Budget Approval

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

Yes