Lost Lake Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lost Lake Elementary School

1901 JOHNS LAKE RD, Clermont, FL 34711

https://loe.lake.k12.fl.us//

Demographics

Principal: Frank Gomez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
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 (67%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 is pending approval by the Lake County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Lost Lake Elementary School

1901 JOHNS LAKE RD, Clermont, FL 34711

https://loe.lake.k12.fl.us//

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	No	54%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	56%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

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.

Lost Lake Elementary, inspires, nurtures and facilitates students in becoming critical and global thinkers, leaders and problem solvers of tomorrow.

The mission and vision statements were created in 2014-15 with input from stakeholders at Lost Lake Elementary.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Investing in our future, one child at a time!

The mission and vision statements were created in 2014-15 with input from stakeholders at Lost Lake Elementary.

Lost Lake Elementary School will become a destination school with continued growth for all students, and especially students in our lowest quartile.

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
Cousineau, Kelly	Principal	Administer the coordination and management of all elementary school campus and academic activities. Responsible for developing, administering, and monitoring educational programs, optimizing academic opportunities, and promoting safe and successful development of each student. Accountable for enforcing and ensuring academic integrity, compliance with the faculty contract, appropriate credentials of teaching faculty, and the achievement of academic objectives through instructional programs, and accomplishes such in coordination with Schools Board goals and initiatives.
Hart, Karen	Assistant Principal	Serve in an administrator capacity for the coordination and management of elementary school academic programs. Responsible for overseeing and assisting with the preparation and management of the academic division budgets. Position is accountable for enforcing academic integrity, compliance with the faculty contract, appropriate credentials of teaching faculty, and the achievement of academic objectives through instructional programs, and accomplishes such in coordination with Schools Board goals and initiatives. Performs related work as directed.
Gault, Bonnie	School Counselor	Serves in a student advisement and advocacy capacity in fostering the attainment of student educational goals. Responsible for facilitating appropriate student entrance into the educational system and establishing a suitable course of academics based on identified goals and abilities of each individual student. Work includes maintaining communication, knowledge of student progress toward established goals, and providing professional counseling services. Monitors student progress, and facilitates achievement of academic success.
Shryock, Donna	School Counselor	Serves in a student advisement and advocacy capacity in fostering the attainment of student educational goals. Responsible for facilitating appropriate student entrance into the educational system and establishing a suitable course of academics based on identified goals and abilities of each individual student. Work includes maintaining communication, knowledge of student progress toward established goals, and providing professional counseling services. Monitors student progress, and facilitates achievement of academic success.
Olafsen, Kirsten	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach assisting in the coordination and implementation or reading instruction in the K-12 curriculum at the school site.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pinkston, Katherine	Instructional Coach	Curriculum Resource Teacher assisting in the coordination of an effective K-5 instructional program at the school site.
Clark, Scott	Assistant Principal	Assist in the administration, coordination and management of all elementary school campus and academic activities. Assist the Principal in the development, administration, and monitoring of educational programs, optimizing academic opportunities, and promoting safe and successful development of each student. Accountable for enforcing academic integrity, compliance with the faculty contract, appropriate credentials of teaching faculty, and the achievement of academic objectives through instructional programs, and accomplishes such in coordination with Schools Board goals and initiatives. Performs related work as directed.
Lopez, Maribel	Other	Mental Health Liaison providing direct support to schools and serves in a liaison role with various district departments to effectively manage and coordinate school-based mental health services.
Farias, Nicole K.	Other	PASS Teacher provides a supervised and structured environment for students assigned to the in-school suspension program, working with classroom teachers to coordinate the academic activities of assigned students and support students in completing the assigned work along with the implementation of social, emotional learning, behavioral and academic support.
Henry, Stephanie L.	Other	ESE School Specialist coordinates educational placement and appropriate services for students with disabilities.

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	147	151	154	156	179	188	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	975
Attendance below 90 percent	9	15	7	5	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	2	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	10	14	13	17	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	5	8	10	27	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	9	7	10	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
72

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 9/12/2019

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	6	8	6	11	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	2	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	3	6	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	27	52	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113

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	5	12	25	36	47	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169

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	6	8	6	11	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	2	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	3	6	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	27	52	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113

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	5	12	25	36	47	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169

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	79%	58%	57%	75%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	57%	58%	62%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	49%	53%	46%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	78%	60%	63%	81%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	56%	62%	65%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	39%	51%	48%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	68%	54%	53%	68%	49%	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	147 (0)	151 (0)	154 (0)	156 (0)	179 (0)	188 (0)	975 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	9 (6)	15 (8)	7 (6)	5 (11)	10 (9)	13 (14)	59 (54)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	3 (1)	2 (2)	2 (2)	7 (6)	2 (4)	16 (15)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (6)	10 (3)	14 (6)	13 (2)	17 (3)	12 (0)	66 (20)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (27)	13 (52)	5 (34)	18 (113)

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	80%	60%	20%	58%	22%
	2018	81%	61%	20%	57%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	60%	23%	58%	25%
	2018	70%	59%	11%	56%	14%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	71%	59%	12%	56%	15%
	2018	71%	55%	16%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	86%	62%	24%	62%	24%
	2018	83%	65%	18%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	61%	15%	64%	12%
	2018	72%	60%	12%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	69%	57%	12%	60%	9%
	2018	77%	58%	19%	61%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	66%	56%	10%	53%	13%
	2018	73%	54%	19%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
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	45	58	68	57	56	38	45				
ELL	68	68	40	79	77		71				
AMI	85			69							
ASN	86	71		89	79		77				
BLK	62	60	50	62	53	42	60				
HSP	80	73	68	75	63	56	61				
MUL	75	71		75	48						

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											
WHT	83	68	75	85	67	50	73				
FRL	73	68	67	69	59	44	56				

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	38	36	18	41	36	33	38				
ELL	46	63		73	64	50					
ASN	81	64		93	46		81				
BLK	63	57	44	71	49	29	75				
HSP	71	58	30	73	51	47	59				
MUL	69	44		90	69						
WHT	80	64	46	82	56	41	82				
FRL	69	57	41	72	49	35	70				

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	28	37	32	54	53	42	30				
ELL	66	57	45	63	38						
ASN	78	61		89	83		75				
BLK	73	68	36	79	60	25	48				
HSP	73	59	55	75	56	53	67				
MUL	67	67		78	57		67				
WHT	76	61	41	84	68	51	74				
FRL	66	56	49	75	60	49	60				

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	69
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	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	553
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
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	77
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	80
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	56
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	70
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	67
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	72
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	65
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.

Based on available school data, our lowest performance was in Math overall achievement, which dropped from 80% to 78% from the prior school year. Math learning gains had a 10% increase (53% to 63%), however, improvement was only 1% over the State level (62%). Additionally, a 6% increase in Math lowest 25th percentile (41% to 47%) was achieved, but still remains 4% below the State level (51%). Curriculum, student motivation and teacher attrition impacted the negative Math results.

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

Our greatest decline from last year was in overall Math achievement in 5th grade dropping 8% (77% to 69%) and Math lowest 25th percentile in 4th grade. These declines are attributed to a large SWD demographic, along with increased curriculum demands.

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.

Our focus for the upcoming school year will be closing the gap in Math overall achievement and continuing to improve Math in the lowest 25th percentile. Our remediation and acceleration learning sessions will be instrumental in improving math results for all students.

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

Our ELA results, specifically in 4th grade ELA, showed the most improvement. This was a direct result of our focus on ELA in remediation and acceleration learning sessions, Authentic Literacy, and Reading with Conferring. Teachers used collaborative time to plan and model effective ELA lessons, discuss conferring techniques, and sharing of formative and summative student results to drive instruction.

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

EWS data identified two areas of concern: decrease the number of out of school suspensions, and student retentions.

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

1. Math achievement / Math lowest 25th percentile
2. School culture
3. Remediation / Acceleration learning sessions
4. Authentic Literacy with a continued focus on Reading with Conferring and Phonics in Core instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Based on academic data from our Needs Assessment/Analysis section, improving Math achievement is one of our critical areas of focus.
Rationale	Math was identified as an area of focus due to Math achievement levels falling to 78% in 2019 from 80% in 2018 (-2%). Specifically, declines in the lowest 25th percentile in both 4th and 5th grade support our academic focus for the 2019-2020 school year. This area of focus will improve learning and success for all students, including those in the lowest 25th percentile, by ensuring growth in overall Math achievement levels.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By focusing on Math achievement, we expect to see an increase in school level data, EWS data and classroom walkthrough data, both qualitative and quantitative from 47% (School) to 51% (State).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelly Cousineau (cousineauk@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The district-wide instructional framework model includes focused instruction, guided instruction, collaborative learning and independent learning. This gradual release of responsibility will be implemented school-wide, with an emphasis on setting the student's purpose for learning. This will increase overall Math achievement results and will be monitored through classroom walk-throughs, student grades, and i-Ready diagnostic results.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we implement, monitor, and support the instructional strategy of setting the students purpose for learning, we will increase school-wide Math achievement levels by supporting students with what, why, and how they learn.
Action Step	
Description	1.Teachers will establish and support the students "Purpose" for learning. This will begin 8/12/19 and end 6/1/20. Evidence of student purpose will be obtained through classroom walk-throughs and collaborative planning discussions. 2.Data Chats will be held quarterly between teachers and leadership to discuss student achievement and academic concerns. 3. Teachers will receive professional development around the instructional frame work of focused instruction, guided instruction, collaborative learning, and independent learning.
Person Responsible	Kelly Cousineau (cousineauk@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Based on school culture data from our Subgroup/EWS Needs Assessment/Analysis section, our area of focus will be to grow a school culture of shared decision making to improve student learning.
Rationale	If we continue to develop a culture where communication is a high priority, positive teacher actions are recognized and celebrated, and key decisions are made with teacher input, then Lost Lake Elementary School will be a destination school for all students, families, and stakeholders.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Grow a school culture that values everyone's strengths and input, with shared decision making, by purposefully inspiring teachers and staff to encourage student learning. EWS data will be used along with classroom walkthroughs to decrease student out of school suspensions and attendance below 90%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Scott Clark (clarks@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The use of two additional staff positions, PASS (Positive Alternative to School Suspension) teacher and a Mental Health Liaison, along with support from our previously established PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions and Support) program, student out of school suspensions should decrease to 10 or less occurrences and attendance below 50% should decrease to less than 50 occurrences. To monitor this strategy school level EWS, PBIS, Mental Health reporting and classroom walkthrough data will be reviewed each 9-week period by administration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we implement student communication supports through PBIS, PASS and Mental Health interventions then we will see fewer occurrences of out of school suspensions and absenteeism.
Action Step	
Description	1. PBIS data analysis 2. Ongoing teacher surveys 3. Feedback opportunities through OneNote 4.. Observations 5. EWS school-wide data
Person Responsible	Scott Clark (clarks@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Based on intervention data from our lowest 25th percentile Needs Assessment/Analysis section, our area of focus will be to provide remediation and acceleration for all students in ELA and Math.
Rationale	This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need as our lowest 25th percentile results in Math were at 47%, 4% lower than the State average of 51%. Lowest 25th percentile results in ELA were our lowest subgroup at 66%, which remains higher than the state average of 53%, but a continued focus of our remediation and acceleration learning sessions.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By focusing on the lowest 25th percentile, we expect to see an increase in Math (47% to 51%) and ELA (66% to 69%) based on school level assessment data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Karen Hart (hartk@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	By providing all students a 30 minute remediation and acceleration block for ELA and Math, we will increase our lowest 25th percentile in both ELA and Math by a minimum of 3%. To monitor this strategy school data will be analyzed quarterly with teachers and leadership.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we monitor and support teachers as they facilitate effective remediation and acceleration learning sessions, then we will increase academic achievement among all learners, including those in our lowest quartile.

Action Step	
Description	1. Uninterrupted time for remediation and acceleration learning sessions. 2. Data reviews in professional learning communities to look for trends in student performance. 3. MTSS data analysis. 4. Administration walk-through during remediation and acceleration learning sessions. 5. Provide after school tutoring to children scoring a 1 or 2 on FSA last year (see SAI budget worksheet for details).
Person Responsible	Karen Hart (hartk@lake.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).

Our other schoolwide improvement priority is to strengthen our Authentic Literacy Block and continue to improve student achievement in ELA. Based on academic data from our Needs Assessment/Analysis section, results were improved based on the ELA focus in the prior year School Improvement Plan (+4% in ELA Achievement, +9% in ELA Learning Gains, and +23% in Lowest 25th percentile), however, it will remain a focus for the current school year. Last year we introduced Reading with Conferring in the ELA block and will continue to support student comprehension through voice and choice in Reading. This

year we will also be rolling out a K-2 systematic phonics curriculum with Discover Intensive Phonics, built into our Authentic Literacy Block. By building a stronger phonics base, we will improve student desire and ability to read. We will track the impact of both Reading with Conferring and phonics during classroom walkthroughs, collaborative planning, observation and iReady diagnostic data.