Lafayette High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lafayette High School

160 NE HORNET DR, Mayo, FL 32066

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

School Board Approval

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

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.

Building a community of learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

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
Hancock, Stewart	Principal	Oversees daily activities and operations within the school.
Ginn, Paula	Assistant Principal	Assist the Princiapl in carrying out the daily activities and operations within the school.
Hanson, Tim	Dean	Responsible for school discipline.
Palomino, Cathy	Instructional Coach	

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.

Student data is evaluated by teachers and leadership and drives the development of our SIP. Our School Advisory Council is comprised of school leadership, parents, teachers and staff, business and community members, and students. The group shares responsibility for guiding the school toward continuous improvement and comes together to discuss, develop, and approve the SIP.

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))

As progress monitoring occurs throughout the year, student data is readily available to us. We use professional learning days throughout the year to evaluate our data on the school, grade, teacher, and student level. Our performance drives our instructional planning, our goals, and our SIP. Our schedule is set up to allow for data chats with teachers and students throughout the year to evaluate the progress of the student and determine next steps for success.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	32%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	90%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	*Data will be uploaded when available*
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)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2020-21: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	9	38	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	10	16	43
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	1	11	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	2	12	43
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	17	23	56
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	11	20
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	8	21	46

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	34	33	201
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	20	19	85
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	6	8	53
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	11	10	64
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	24	16	140
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	13	49
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	0	19	10	12	87

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	34	33	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	20	19	49
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	6	8	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	11	10	40
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	24	16	65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	13	39
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	0	19	10	12	41

The number of students identified retained:

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

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.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	53			57			56		
ELA Learning Gains	53			63			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37			45			38		
Math Achievement*	64			71			64		
Math Learning Gains	59			54			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48			46			39		
Science Achievement*	64			67			65		
Social Studies Achievement*	76			75			70		
Middle School Acceleration	85			88			78		
Graduation Rate	97			100			97		
College and Career Acceleration	88			88			85		
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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	724
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	97

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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	64			
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	60			

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	53	53	37	64	59	48	64	76	85	97	88	
SWD	13	32	37	24	33	28	25	33		93	46	
ELL	45	55	50	62	55	40		80				
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	48	33	36	40		33					
HSP	47	51	38	56	54	42	63	66	91	100	93	
MUL	36	50		42	58							
PAC												
WHT	58	55	37	70	62	49	70	80	89	97	89	
FRL	43	48	34	53	54	53	49	68	72	98	88	

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	57	63	45	71	54	46	67	75	88	100	88	
SWD	17	40	35	42	44	30	34	43				
ELL	49	56	23	75	58	62	60					
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	53	54	59	48	55		60				
HSP	48	63	50	65	54	50	62	80	91	100	100	
MUL	40	43		58	36							
PAC												
WHT	63	65	42	75	56	41	70	76	86	100	91	
FRL	46	57	52	59	47	46	56	71	83	100	85	

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	56	55	38	64	43	39	65	70	78	97	85	
SWD	21	38	26	38	46	38	23	35				
ELL	35	40		94	43							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43	43	30	48	38		50	60				
HSP	53	50	33	69	43	46	66	70	62	100	64	
MUL				42								
PAC												
WHT	58	58	42	66	43	39	67	75	85	96	89	
FRL	44	51	38	60	44	41	60	66	67	95	76	

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

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.

Reading achievement was the data component that showed the lowest performance for the 2022-2023 school year at 59%. Although, our reading achievement level increased by 6 points from the year before and was higher than the state average. Reading achievement levels continue to be lower than math achievement levels for the district as a whole.

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

Social Studies proficiency decreased from 76 to 74 percent. US History proficiency actually increased from last year. We had a new Civics teacher this year, and that proficiency decreased from 92 to 83 percent. This proficiency was still far above state average.

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.

Math proficiency was very strong for us, especially in 7th grade. In 7th grade Math, we were 35 points above the state mean. We also led the state in Geometry EOC proficiency, 24 points above the state mean. We used Math Nation curriculum, and we have excellent veteran Math teachers who are committed to excellence.

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

7th grade math was drastically above the state average. With our lower-performing math students, we set up a team teaching approach with our math teacher and our inclusion teacher. Those teachers work together with students in small group settings to address student-specific needs. Also working with our Instructional Coach, we improved the ability to have data chats with teachers and with students.

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

Attendance and the amount of students who scored a Level 1 on state ELA assessments.

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

1. Promoting collective teacher efficacy and student efficacy. This is a district-wide priority.
2. Attendance
3. Improve learning gains of bottom 25%

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

:

#1. 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.

We will work to promote collective teacher efficacy and student efficacy. We feel that this will improve attendance, and in turn, achievement.

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

Overall attendance will improve. Last year, we had 163 students with attendance below 90%. This year we will reduce that number to 140. If students feel more engaged in their classrooms, their attendance will improve.

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

Our MTSS Director and our Dean will monitor attendance continuously and communicate attendance issues with students and parents in a timely, consistent manner.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tim Hanson (thanson@lcsbmail.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

POWER 5 - Teacher self-efficacy and student efficacy

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

Teachers' personal values drive their goals and behaviors at school. Moreover, values can support subjective well-being and an individual sense of self-efficacy. Teachers' self-efficacy, namely teachers' beliefs in their ability to effectively handle the tasks, obligations, and challenges related to their professional activity, plays a key role in influencing important academic outcomes.

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.

District-wide professional learning

Person Responsible: Cathy Palomino (cpalomino@lcsbmail.net)

#2. 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.

Our students with disabilities continue to be below the 41% threshold for the third consecutive year. This subgroup was at 36% according to 21-22 data. ESSA subgroup information for the 22-23 school year has not yet been released.

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 36 to 41%.

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

We will use progress monitoring data to guide decision-making and instruction for these students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stewart Hancock (shancock@lcsbmail.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Small group instruction, Peers as Partners, collaborative teaching, and individualized learning will be implemented.

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

Research supports the effectiveness of the implementation of these strategies. Moby Max will be used in intensive math courses for individualized learning as it is proven to close learning gaps and increase student engagement. CommonLit 360 will be used to individualize learning in intensive ELA courses.

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 Black/African-American

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.

ESSA Subgroup data for 21-22 showed the Black/African-American subgroup at 37%. ESSA Subgroup data for 22-23 has not yet been released.

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

Increase the Black/African-American ESSA subgroup data from 37% to 41%.

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

We will use progress monitoring data to guide decision-making and instruction for these students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stewart Hancock (shancock@lcsbmail.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Collaborative teaching, cooperative learning, small group instruction, and individualized learning will be implemented.

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

Research supports the effectiveness of the implementation of these strategies. Moby Max will be used in intensive math and ELA courses for individualized learning as it is proven to close learning gaps and increase student engagement. Common Lit 360 will be used to individualize learning in intensive ELA courses.

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).

We use Title IA and Title IIA funds for professional learning for school improvement.

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

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

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

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

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.

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

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?

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?

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

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 plan is reviewed and approved by our School Advisory Council which is comprised of student, parent, community, and school leadership representation. The plan is also posted on our website for review by all stakeholders at https://lhs.lafayette.k12.fl.us/announcements.

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))

LHS implements many strategies to effectively communicate, build positive relationships, and encourage family involvement. Teachers send home reminders and information to parents and conference with parents when needed. Parents have access to student grades and assessment results on Skyward, Edgenuity, and the FL Family Access Portal. Teachers post assignments with detailed instructions on Google Classroom. Deficiencies are sent home each 9 weeks.

Students are recognized for academic and extracurricular achievement at school, at School Board Meetings, in the local newspaper, on the school and district websites, and at sporting events. 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 LHS. The data from the survey is compiled and reviewed to drive future decisions. A School Advisory Council made up of parents, community members, students, and school staff meets monthly or as needed to address concerns and provide input on improvements that can be made. The Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available on the school district website: https://www.lafayette.k12.fl.us/Home

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 II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Our school is very successful, and that is in large part due to the high expectations held by the faculty, staff, students, parents, and community. While we are proud of our accomplishments, we are always looking to identify opportunities for improvement. This year we plan to focus on promoting collective teacher efficacy and student efficacy. We feel that this will strengthen the academic program in the school and improve attendance. Improved attendance will result in students being more actively engaged in what is happening in class in real-time instead of playing catch-up to their peers. Because we are a small school, many of our students are involved in multiple extracurricular activities. Most of these activities result in students being checked out of school early to participate. Scheduling is tweaked to ensure students are participating in core instruction early in the day so that participation in extracurricular activities does not disrupt class time.

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 require all of our high school students to enroll in at least one career and technical education course each year that they are in high school. Providing our students with many career and technical education programs ensures a successful start to their future. We continue to work to add programs and industry certification opportunities for our students. In the 2022-2023 school year, LHS students earned 380 industry certifications. For the past five years, Lafayette High School has led the state in College and Career acceleration.

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))

Refer to District's Mental Health Plan.

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))

Our students are required to participate in a CTE program each year of high school. Many of our students participate in postsecondary opportunities at three local postsecondary institutions while in high school. Our CTE Director and School Guidance Counselor take our students on tours of the institutions in our area offering postsecondary opportunities to our students. Approximately 40% of our juniors and seniors participate in postsecondary dual enrollment classes through North Florida College. We offer ACT boot camps and PERT testing on our campus to allow our students the opportunity to attend a postsecondary institutions while still secondary school students. We have found that our students are not only more likely to attend a postsecondary institution, but are also much more successful if they begin those programs while still in high school.

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).

We follow the MTSS model provided by the state. Our MTSS Coordinator works with teachers to address problem behavior and provide early intervention.

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))

Professional learning is data-driven. We set up our school calendar to provide a professional learning day following each academic quarter. Teachers use this day to evaluate progress monitoring and benchmark data. We conduct New Teacher training prior to pre-planning, and our new teachers participate in the PDCP program with NEFEC. We have mentor teachers for all of our new teachers, and our Instructional Coach works closely with our new teachers. We have professional learning time scheduled throughout the school year to support our teachers.

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))

NA

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	$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.

No