Sun 'n Lake Elementary School

leadership
students
analysis
Florida
mission
college and career
ambitious
school improvement
family and community involvement
striving
teaching
achievement
relationships
success
areas of focus
instruction
needs assessment
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
resources
growth

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sun 'n Lake Elementary School

4515 PONCE DE LEON BLVD, Sebring, FL 33872

http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~snl/

Demographics

Principal: Cheryl Vermilye

Start Date for this Principal: 4/25/2011

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (50%) 2014-15: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Highlands County School Board on 10/8/2019.

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.

Table of Contents

Sun 'n Lake Elementary School

4515 PONCE DE LEON BLVD, Sebring, FL 33872

http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~snl/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	73%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	C	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Highlands County School Board on 10/8/2019.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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.

All stakeholders collaborate to create a student-led, positive learning community where excellence happens!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Successfully Nurturing Learners

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Laye, Linda	Principal	
Freeland, Melinda	Instructional Coach	.5 MTSS and .5 Support Facilitation
Roth, LaNita	Instructional Coach	
Brown, Christine	Teacher, K-12	
Vermilye, Cheryl	Assistant Principal	
Chavis, Christina	School Counselor	
Saunders, Christin	Teacher, K-12	
Veulens, Belkis	Teacher, K-12	
Williams, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Courtney, Sheleena	Teacher, K-12	
Bullock, Morgan	Teacher, K-12	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by 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	109	107	103	108	85	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	624
Attendance below 90 percent	33	15	15	7	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	10	3	9	6	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA or Math	64	55	12	36	9	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	197
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	1	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	6	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
41

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 8/16/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	14	12	9	8	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	1	6	7	6	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in ELA or Math	32	52	17	13	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	56	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148

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	20	26	9	12	24	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

Prior Year - Updated

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	14	12	9	8	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	1	6	7	6	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in ELA or Math	32	52	17	13	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	56	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148

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	20	26	9	12	24	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	66%	50%	57%	61%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	54%	58%	68%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	49%	53%	61%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	74%	57%	63%	69%	59%	61%
Math Learning Gains	72%	57%	62%	67%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	44%	51%	50%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	45%	53%	48%	47%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	109 (0)	107 (0)	103 (0)	108 (0)	85 (0)	112 (0)	624 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	33 (14)	15 (12)	15 (9)	7 (8)	3 (7)	6 (7)	79 (57)
One or more suspensions	10 (1)	3 (6)	9 (7)	6 (6)	9 (16)	16 (15)	53 (51)
Course failure in ELA or Math	64 (32)	55 (52)	12 (17)	36 (13)	9 (17)	21 (17)	197 (148)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (31)	14 (56)	20 (61)	34 (148)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	66%	50%	16%	58%	8%
	2018	63%	48%	15%	57%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	49%	14%	58%	5%
	2018	57%	45%	12%	56%	1%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	63%	45%	18%	56%	7%
	2018	56%	47%	9%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	56%	18%	62%	12%
	2018	70%	61%	9%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	60%	14%	64%	10%
	2018	59%	53%	6%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	67%	49%	18%	60%	7%
	2018	53%	52%	1%	61%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	61%	43%	18%	53%	8%
	2018	60%	50%	10%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	41	48	25	50	67	42	73				
ELL	56	73		67	75						
ASN	100			100							
BLK	44	51	41	54	62	67	48				
HSP	67	67	56	75	69	42	70				
MUL	73			91							
WHT	72	67	64	79	75	60	69				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
FRL	58	57	46	67	68	59	58				

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	23	42	28	28	30	17	14				
ELL	33	40		46	27						
ASN	95	93		95	71		100				
BLK	38	32	14	39	36	23	35				
HSP	56	46	37	57	36	14	47				
MUL	59			82							
WHT	69	52	25	71	53		73				
FRL	55	46	25	55	39	20	55				

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	26	38	33	37	50	38					
ELL	40	70	71	50	78	71					
ASN	95	94		95	80						
BLK	38	55	60	50	63	42	20				
HSP	58	69	64	68	65	63	35				
MUL	64	60		64	70						
WHT	73	71	64	77	69	43	65				
FRL	54	64	57	64	65	50	43				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	520
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	69
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	100
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	65
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	82
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - 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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Students with Disabilities was the lowest-performing area at 49% for the 2018-2019 school year. This subgroup was not below the federal index score of 41%. However. we would like to increase this overall number to 50% or higher for our students this year. We follow the state's inclusion model, high expectations for all students in the classroom. We need to continue to support our students within the classroom, monitor their data and give a quality support facilitation model.

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities 49%
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% 0

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

All areas showed growth compared to the 2018-2019 school year data. The contributing factor was focusing efforts on the lowest quartile and closely monitoring student data, student attendance and discipline throughout the year through Professional Learning Communities.

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.

All areas were higher performing than the state this year.

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

All of our subpopulations improved from the previous year, however, we will continue to focus on our students and their success. One area that we will work on this year will be our economically disadvantaged students. Their data increased to 60%, however, we would like to focus on increasing the student performance to 61% for our students in this population.
New actions our school has taken over the past two years have been: Growth Mindset believing in the Power of Yet, building student relationships, Data Chats with students: students understanding

that they are accountable for their learning, focusing teacher-small groups on lowest quartile, iReady, departmentalizing in grades 4 and 5 and Professional Learning Communities for our teachers.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Student attendance is an area that we will continue to monitor and focus on. When students are at school. we know that they are able to review quality instruction. From that, we will have a focused effort with teachers, families and a weekly School Attendance Review Committee to determine how we can assist and/or intervene early to communicate the importance of students being at school each day.

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

1. Sixty-five percent of students taking the ELA FSA will demonstrate learning gains as indicated by the state calculation of the school grade.
2. Fifty-two percent of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains as indicated by the 2020 ELA FSA.
3. Seventy-three percent of students taking the Math FSA will demonstrate learning gains as indicated by the state calculation of the school grade.
4. Fifty-seven percent of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains as indicated on the 2020 Math FSA.
5. Sixty-six percent of fifth-grade students will score a level 3 or above on the 2020 Science Standards Assessment.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Sixty-five percent of students taking the ELA FSA will demonstrate learning gains as indicated by the state calculation of the school grade.
Rationale	This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed from the student achievement on the ELA FSA for the 2018-2019 school year. This Area of Focus impacts student learning and success by increasing student learning gains in English Language Arts. Student success is measured when students are able to become more confident and successful readers and writers, demonstrating greater proficiency with the Florida State Standards.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Sixty-five percent of students taking the ELA FSA will demonstrate learning gains as indicated by the state calculation of the school grade.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Linda Laye (layel@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	To increase student achievement in this area the evidence-based strategies will include: Admin will set the Focus of the school year with staff by introducing current and historical data. Teachers will collaboratively plan using models of effective ELA/Math and Science (5E) instruction and the components of the IPG. Teachers will be active members of a PLC. Teachers will monitor and discuss student data weekly at PLC. Teachers will meet with administrators/instructional coaches to review their data 4 times a year at progress monitoring meetings. Teachers will adjust instruction to meet student instructional needs. School-wide WIN (What I Need) time to focus on intensive remediation and instruction 3-5 times per week. Instructional coaches will use the model of effective coaching cycles to provide support to teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The strategies listed above are research-based best practices. Each of these strategies aligns with the district strategic plan. The strategies are centered around metrics that can be measured and monitored with student data. Instructional practices will be data aligned and monitored to support student learning gains.

Action Step	
Description	1. Create a master schedule that supports core subject areas blocks. 2. Within the master schedule, have time allotted for intervention time. 3. Use Data to drive instruction. 4. Support teachers to align standards and learning targets including the aspects of rigor. 5. Create WIN student groups to focus on the academic needs of students.
Person Responsible	LaNita Roth (rothl@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Fifty-two percent of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains as indicated by the 2020 ELA FSA.
Rationale	This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed from the student achievement on the ELA FSA for the 2018-2019 school year. This Area of Focus impacts student learning and success by increasing students in the lowest quartile to increase learning gains in English Language Arts. Student success is measured when students are able to become more confident and successful readers and writers, demonstrating greater proficiency with the Florida State Standards.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Fifty-two percent of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains as indicated by the 2020 ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Melinda Freeland (freelanm@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	To increase student achievement in this area the evidence-based strategies will include: Admin will set the Focus of the school year with staff by introducing current and historical data. Teachers will collaboratively plan using models of effective ELA/Math and Science (5E) instruction and the components of the IPG. Teachers will be active members of a PLC. Teachers will monitor and discuss student data weekly at PLC. Teachers will meet with administrators/instructional coaches to review their data 4 times a year at progress monitoring meetings. Teachers will adjust instruction to meet student instructional needs. School-wide WIN (What I Need) time to focus on intensive remediation and instruction 3-5 times per week. Instructional coaches will use the model of effective coaching cycles to provide support to teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The strategies listed above are research-based best practices. Each of these strategies aligns with the district's strategic plan. The strategies are centered around metrics that can be measured and monitored with student data. Instructional practices will be data aligned and monitored to support students who are in the lowest quartile to achieve learning gains.

Action Step	
Description	1. Admin will meet with instructional coaches weekly to monitor data. 2. Teachers and admin will progress monitor student data each nine weeks with monitoring twice during the first nine weeks to review the first iREADY diagnostic. 3. Grade level PLC's will review student work to create SMART goals 4. Teacher will plan using the IPG (Instructional Practice Guide) 5. Conduct MTSS meetings monthly.
Person Responsible	Linda Laye (layel@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Seventy-three percent of students taking the Math FSA will demonstrate learning gains as indicated by the state calculation of the school grade.
Rationale	This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed from the student achievement on the FSA Math for the 2018-2019 school year. This Area of Focus impacts student learning and success by increasing student learning gains in Math. Student success is measured when students are able to become more confident and successful mathematicians, demonstrating greater proficiency with the Florida State Standards.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Seventy-three percent of students taking the Math FSA will demonstrate learning gains as indicated by the state calculation of the school grade.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cheryl Vermilye (vermilyc@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	To increase student achievement in this area the evidence-based strategies will include: Admin will set the Focus of the school year with staff by introducing current and historical data. Teachers will collaboratively plan using models of effective ELA/Math and Science (5E) instruction and the components of the IPG. Teachers will be active members of a PLC. Teachers will monitor and discuss student data weekly at PLC. Teachers will meet with administrators/instructional coaches to review their data 4 times a year at progress monitoring meetings. Teachers will adjust instruction to meet student instructional needs. School-wide WIN (What I Need) time to focus on intensive remediation and instruction 3-5 times per week. Instructional coaches will use the model of effective coaching cycles to provide support to teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The strategies listed above are research-based best practices. Each of these strategies aligns with the district's strategic plan. The strategies are centered around metrics that can be measured and monitored with student data. Instructional practices will be data aligned and monitored to support student learning gains.

Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will Implement district level curriculum with fidelity. 2. Teachers will use models of effective instruction. 3. Teachers will align instruction to learning targets 4. Instructional coaches will provide instructional support though best practices and differentiated PD. 5. Instructional coaches will observe the classroom using effective models of coaching including observation, modeling, feedback.
Person Responsible	Melinda Freeland (freelanm@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#4	
Title	Fifty-seven percent of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains as indicated on the 2020 Math FSA.
Rationale	This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed from the student achievement on the FSA Math for the 2018-2019 school year. This Area of Focus impacts student learning and success by increasing student learning gains for students in the lowest quartile in Math. Student success is measured when students are able to become more confident and successful mathematicians, demonstrating greater proficiency with the Florida State Standards.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Fifty-seven percent of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains as indicated on the 2020 Math FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Melinda Freeland (freelanm@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	To increase student achievement in this area the evidence-based strategies will include: Admin will set the Focus of the school year with staff by introducing current and historical data. Teachers will collaboratively plan using models of effective ELA/Math and Science (5E) instruction and the components of the IPG. Teachers will be active members of a PLC. Teachers will monitor and discuss student data weekly at PLC. Teachers will meet with administrators/instructional coaches to review their data 4 times a year at progress monitoring meetings. Teachers will adjust instruction to meet student instructional needs. School-wide WIN (What I Need) time to focus on intensive remediation and instruction 3-5 times per week. Instructional coaches will use the model of effective coaching cycles to provide support to teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The strategies listed above are research-based best practices. Each of these strategies aligns with the district's strategic plan. The strategies are centered around metrics that can be measured and monitored with student data. Instructional practices will be data aligned and monitored to support student learning gains.

Action Step	
Description	1. Provide time for PLC's for teachers to discuss student progress including analyzing data. 2. Review teacher lesson plans weekly 3. Observe classrooms regularly and provide feedback to teachers 4. Provide opportunities for vertical alignment with respected grade levels 5. Keep instructional time sacred without multiple daily interruptions.
Person Responsible	Linda Laye (layel@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#5	
Title	Sixty-six percent of fifth-grade students will score a level 3 or above on the 2020 Science Standards Assessment.
Rationale	This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed from the student achievement on the State Science Assessment for the 2018-2019 school year. This Area of Focus impacts student learning and success by increasing student learning gains in ELA, due to the complex reading requirements of the science assessment. Student success is measured when students are able to become more confident and successful readers and writers, demonstrating greater proficiency with the science content.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Sixty-six percent of fifth-grade students will score a level 3 or above on the 2020 Science Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cheryl Vermilye (vermilyc@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	To increase student achievement in this area the evidence-based strategies will include: Admin will set the Focus of the school year with staff by introducing current and historical data. Teachers will collaboratively plan using models of effective ELA/Math and Science (5E) instruction and the components of the IPG. Teachers will be active members of a PLC. Teachers will monitor and discuss student data weekly at PLC. Teachers will meet with administrators/instructional coaches to review their data 4 times a year at progress monitoring meetings. Teachers will adjust instruction to meet student instructional needs. Teachers will monitor 5th grade formative and summative assessments to determine needs. Teachers will use Science Test Specs to determine the depth to teach standards presented. Instructional coaches will use the model of effective coaching cycles to provide support to teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The strategies listed above are research-based best practices. Each of these strategies aligns with the district's strategic plan. The strategies are centered around metrics that can be measured and monitored with student data. Instructional practices will be data aligned and monitored to support student learning gains.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will use models of effective instruction including the 5E. 2. Teacher will use common assessments to analyze data and make revisions in their instruction. 3. Teachers will incorporate science learning labs instruction. 4. Teachers will use authentic literature to impact science learning 5. District level specialists will observe our science practices.
Person Responsible	LaNita Roth (rothl@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

School safety remains at the forefront of our daily focus. A safe campus means that we have a safe learning environments where instruction and learning can happen. This year there are additional safety measures such as new gating, secured areas, additional gate supervision, Threat Assessment Teams. State reporting, scheduled safety drills and other safety measures that we are also focusing on.

Our district continues to work to find ways for teacher recruitment and development.

Another area of focus will be student attendance. There was a daily average rate of attendance of ninety-five percent for the 2018-2019 school year. For the 2019-2020 school year, the goal will be for ninety-seven percent or higher daily average attendance rate for our students.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

We will promote positive relationships and family engagement throughout the year. We will encourage families and community members to attend functions throughout the year.

PFEP Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Meeting the social-emotional needs of students at Sun 'n Lake is addressed first by each classroom teacher. Our guidance counselor serves as a resource for teachers and students who are experiencing problems at home or school. A grief counselor, a social worker, a school psychologist and a license mental health counselor are also available resources for our students.

Our behavior resource teacher serves as an extra layer of support for students needing a mentor. A check-in/check-out system serves as way to talk with students about their school day and helps the student if problems arise.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

FLKRS is administered to all incoming Kindergarten students. Teachers will also conduct informal assessments to determine the background knowledge and learning styles of students. Results will be shared with Kindergarten teachers who will meet as a team to analyze the information and plan for instruction. Advanced Academics classes will be formed for those students who demonstrate advanced

mastery of skills. All placements are considered flexible and all students will be progress monitored quarterly or monthly depending on need.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The school-based MTSS team meets monthly to review student performance data and to identify areas of needed improvement in the core curriculum, and instruction. MTSS team members then meet with grade-level teams to review student progress, identify areas of need, develop interventions, and the resources needed to improve student learning. Students identified as needing Tier 2 or Tier 3 services are progress monitored on a more frequent basis. MTSS team reviews student progress monitoring data and meets with individual teachers or grade-level teams to identify available resources and develop targeted interventions.

Title I, Part A :
Will provide funds to all district elementary schools in a school-wide project format, to target academic assistance to all students, professional development for teachers and parent involvement activities. Monies also provide resources (clothing, school supplies, and social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for free and appropriate education. This grant is also the funding source for implementing the requirements of ESSA.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

We have a literacy-rich - standards-based curriculum to promote academic success for all students that will make them college and career ready.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Sixty-five percent of students taking the ELA FSA will demonstrate learning gains as indicated by the state calculation of the school grade.**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Fifty-two percent of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains as indicated by the 2020 ELA FSA.**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Seventy-three percent of students taking the Math FSA will demonstrate learning gains as indicated by the state calculation of the school grade.**	$0.00
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Fifty-seven percent of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains as indicated on the 2020 Math FSA.**	$0.00
5	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Sixty-six percent of fifth-grade students will score a level 3 or above on the 2020 Science Standards Assessment.**	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00