

Lake County Schools

Sawgrass Bay Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Sawgrass Bay Elementary School

16325 SUPERIOR BLVD, Clermont, FL 34714

<https://sbe.lake.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Andrea Nelson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	82%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Sawgrass Bay Elementary School

16325 SUPERIOR BLVD, Clermont, FL 34714

<https://sbe.lake.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>80%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>69%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

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.

Educators Building Leaders for Life, One Student at a Time.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create a collaborative learning community that develops students who achieve excellence both academically and socially in order to become productive leaders in society.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Steenken, Andrea	Principal	Oversee the school improvement planning process, curriculum and instruction, school safety and daily management of the campus. Collaborate closely with the leadership team and ensure we are displaying a common vision across campus to move student learning and teacher expertise forward.
Kendrick, Bernice	School Counselor	Helps lead the guidance department in the following areas: attendance meetings, maintaining 504 accommodation plans, case reviews, in class guidance lessons, and individual/group counseling.
Block, Cheryl	Teacher, ESE	As the ESE school specialist, Ms. Block is the ESE contact on campus. She facilitates ESE meetings, maintains ESE records and IEPs, delivers professional development, models lessons, and assists with appropriate placement of students.
Nelson, Andrea	Assistant Principal	Ms. Nelson works closely with 3rd and 4th grade teachers within their professional learning communities. She also works on the master schedule, is the professional development contact, testing administrator, and helps oversee the MTSS process.
Motyl, Manuela	Instructional Coach	Manu is the instructional coach for kindergarten and first grade. She works alongside teachers during the planning process, and coaches teachers to increase proficiency with instructional best practices.
Stratton, Kara	Instructional Coach	Ms. Stratton helps oversee the MTSS process on campus. She analyzes the data and facilitates the Tier 2 and Tier 3 meetings. She also oversees our Title 1 tutoring, works closely with new teachers on campus, and is the school testing coordinator.
Ferrell, Catherine	Instructional Coach	Ms. Ferrell is the Literacy coach for 3rd-5th grade. She works alongside teachers during the planning process, and coaches teachers to increase proficiency with instructional best practices.
Lees, Christina	Instructional Coach	Ms. Lees is the instructional math coach for 2nd-5th grade. She works alongside teachers during the planning process, and coaches teachers to increase proficiency with instructional best practices in math.
Darr, Madison	Assistant Principal	Ms. Darr works closely with the ESE self-contained units and 2nd grade teachers. She is also the school safety chair, manages the facilities, the website and oversees systems within the ESE department.
McHenry, Samantha	Assistant Principal	Ms. McHenry works closely with kindergarten and first grade teachers. She is also the textbook manager, health coordinator, and ensures Title 1 inventory is accounted for.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Torres, Daniel	Dean	As the dean, Mr. Torres works closely with the Mental Health Liason and the PASS teacher to decrease referrals and out of school suspensions across campus. He is also the restorative practices chair on campus.
Self, Katherine	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Andrea Nelson

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

27

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

42

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

90

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	82%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students

School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%)
	2017-18: C (44%)
	2016-17: C (48%)
	2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	107	114	133	169	163	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	846
Attendance below 90 percent	17	12	18	12	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	3	4	6	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	1	4	8	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	1	4	8	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	22	38	67	68	99	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	389

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	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/28/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	189	198	195	219	240	260	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1301
Attendance below 90 percent	34	41	27	22	26	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
One or more suspensions	5	13	8	13	12	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	17	39	78	60	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	253
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	59	52	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168

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	38	45	49	78	76	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	382

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	189	198	195	219	240	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1041
Attendance below 90 percent	0	34	41	27	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	5	13	8	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	17	39	78	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	59	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111

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	38	45	49	78	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	55%	58%	57%	49%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	57%	58%	51%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	49%	53%	48%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	50%	60%	63%	55%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	50%	56%	62%	45%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	39%	51%	46%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	54%	53%	43%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	44%	60%	-16%	58%	-14%
	2018	55%	61%	-6%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	60%	-7%	58%	-5%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	52%	59%	-7%	56%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	57%	59%	-2%	56%	1%
	2018	43%	55%	-12%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	62%	-17%	62%	-17%
	2018	60%	65%	-5%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	61%	-14%	64%	-17%
	2018	49%	60%	-11%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%
	2018	41%	58%	-17%	61%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	54%	56%	-2%	53%	1%
	2018	47%	54%	-7%	55%	-8%
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	21	45	38	17	31	30	17				
ELL	46	65	52	46	53	36	50				
ASN	60	50		67	50						
BLK	39	54	64	41	41		47				
HSP	51	64	49	44	50	41	49				
MUL	49	58		40	33		50				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
WHT	69	64	38	62	57	37	74				
FRL	48	58	45	43	49	35	47				
2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	35	25	24	35	29	30				
ELL	39	54	39	47	39	39	16				
ASN	55			73							
BLK	38	34	25	38	26	23	33				
HSP	46	47	39	46	36	30	41				
MUL	61	50		59	35		83				
WHT	62	53	35	63	52	32	63				
FRL	46	45	36	45	37	29	42				
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	21	47	52	28	37	39	15				
ELL	34	42	43	45	39	43	20				
ASN	67			75							
BLK	29	44	50	48	39	50	28				
HSP	45	52	46	47	45	43	34				
MUL	62	47		62	60						
WHT	59	52	56	65	43	60	62				
FRL	43	47	50	49	42	45	33				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	442
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	57
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

The lowest performance came from the math learning gains in the lowest quartile. One contributing factor is the focus we had as a school on ELA instruction and intervention. The built in acceleration block was reserved for reading intervention and enrichment.

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

The greatest decline was with math proficiency, especially in third grade. As a school we decreased 2% in this area, however in 3rd grade we decreased proficiency by 15%. One contributing factor is the time allotted for professional development and coaching centered around the math standards and instructional best practices in math.

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 had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. One contributing factor is the time allotted for professional development and coaching centered around the math standards and instructional best practices in math.

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

ELA Learning gains showed the most improvement this year from 48% to 62% making learning gains. This year, we had a strong focus on reading with conferring across the school. We also worked to incorporate authentic literacy across all disciplines. In addition to the core instruction, students who received tier 3 interventions in reading, worked with an interventionist using the Leveled Literacy Intervention from Fountas and Pinnell.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

There are 34 students receiving failing grades in ELA and/or math. One contributing factor is the structure for using formative assessments to intervene in a timely manner.

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

1. Increase student proficiency in math.
2. Increase learning gains for students in the Lowest Quartile for ELA and Math.
3. Increase overall proficiency for students with IEPs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Teachers will intentionally plan for and engage students in standards based instruction with a focus on collaborative learning. If we focus on collaborative learning during standards based instruction, students will have opportunities to apply new learning and consolidate thinking.

Measurable Outcome: By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in ELA, Math, and Science proficiency.
 ELA proficiency will increase from 55% to 59%.
 Math proficiency will increase from 50% to 55%.
 Science proficiency will increase from 57% to 62%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Andrea Steenken (steenkena@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will work in professional learning communities with an intense focus on student learning, collaboration, and results. The DuFour PLC questions will guide the learning and work within the professional learning communities as teachers plan for standards based instruction through establishing the purpose, authentic literacy, and instructional best practices. This will be monitored through admin participation, classroom walkthroughs, and progress monitoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If teachers work collaboratively with a focus on student learning, results, and instructional best practices, then they will ensure all students receive a guaranteed and viable curriculum in ELA and Math. Extensive research has been completed about how an effective professional learning community impacts student achievement. As part of the PLC process teachers will also incorporate a book study, learning walks, and the coaching cycle as needed.

Action Steps to Implement

Grade levels will participate in a structured common planning two days a week centered on student learning as it aligns to the grade level standards and incorporates collaborative learning within every lesson.

When: 8/25/2020-6/7/2021
 Frequency: Twice a Week
 Evidence: Norms, planning protocols, formative assessments

Person Responsible Andrea Steenken (steenkena@lake.k12.fl.us)

Professional development will incorporate the book “Better Learning through Structured Teaching” and “HEART” which includes instructional best practices and working as a professional learning community to meet the needs of all students.

When: 8/25/2020-6/7/2021
 Frequency: Twice a Month
 Evidence: Google Docs Form, Presentation, Classroom walkthroughs

Person Responsible Andrea Nelson (nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us)

The instructional coaches will implement the coaching cycle in order to focus on continuous improvement of instructional best practices as needed.

When: 9/1/2020-6/7/2021

Frequency: As needed

Evidence: Coaching logs, classroom walkthroughs

Person Responsible Manuela Motyl (motylm@lake.k12.fl.us)

Google Training will be provided to assist teachers with collaborative learning in a virtual world.

When: 8/11/2020-8/17/2021

Frequency: As needed

Evidence: Google Form

Person Responsible Andrea Nelson (nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: With high expectations, we will foster and grow positive relationships where we are collectively committed to the success of all students. If we have high expectations, we will make Sawgrass Bay a place where people are collectively committed to all students.

Measurable Outcome: By focusing on high expectations and positive relationships we expect to see a decrease in students receiving failing grades.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Andrea Nelson (nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Fostering positive relationships and being collectively committed to the success of all students will help decrease students receiving failing grades in core subjects.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we foster positive relationships and are collectively committed to all students, students will be at school and in class more frequently to learn the material.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers and staff will embed the use of the Covey Habits in all classrooms and common areas that set expectations for positive student behaviors and relationships.

When: 8/25/2020-6/7/2021
 Frequency: Daily
 Evidence: the learning environment, learning walks, talking to students

Person Responsible Katherine Self (selfk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Morning meetings will take place each morning to set the stage for learning and foster positive relationships. (Resources: Harmony, Leaderinme.org, Collaborative Classroom Social Emotional lessons)

When: 8/25/2020-6/7/2021
 Frequency: Daily
 Evidence: Classroom Walkthroughs, lesson plans

Person Responsible Bernice Kendrick (kendrickb@lake.k12.fl.us)

Incorporate restorative practices across campus to promote respect, relationships, responsibility, repair, and reintegration. The PASS teacher, guidance counselors, and mental health liaison will implement restorative practices and trauma informed practices with students receiving multiple referrals and help decrease the number of students serving OSS.

When: 9/1/2020-6/7/2021
 Frequency: As needed
 Evidence: Decreased OSS, Documentation

Person Responsible Daniel Torres (torresd4@lake.k12.fl.us)

Instructional staff will work as a professional learning community throughout the year with a focus on high expectations for student learning, collaboration, and student results.

When: 8/25/2020-6/7/2021

Frequency: Twice a week

Evidence: PLC notes, Progress monitoring data

Person Responsible Andrea Nelson (nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us)

Create an equity guiding coalition to analyze and support equitable practices across campus.

When: 9/15/2020-6/7/2021

Frequency: Monthly

Evidence: Progress Monitoring Data, Meeting Notes

Person Responsible Andrea Steenken (steenkena@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Instructional staff will use ongoing formative assessments and progress monitoring data to inform intervention and acceleration activities to increase learning gains for all students. If teachers use ongoing formative assessments and progress monitoring data to inform intervention and acceleration for all students, then students will receive timely feedback that will help move their understanding of the content forward.

Measurable Outcome: By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in ELA and Math Learning Gains. ELA Learning Gains will increase from 62% to 65%. ELA Learning Gains (LQ) will increase from 48% to 53%. Math Learning Gains will increase from 50% to 55%. Math Learning Gains (LQ) will increase from 39% to 50%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Andrea Nelson (nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Analyzing and using ongoing formative assessment and progress monitoring data to inform interventions and acceleration for ELA and math will help increase learning gains. This will be evidenced when discussing "What we will do for students who did not get it, and what will we do for those who already know it" within our professional learning communities. The progress monitoring data from Performance Matters and the frequent formative assessments will be analyzed every three weeks by coaches, admin, and teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If teachers use ongoing formative assessment and progress monitoring data to intervene or accelerate students then students will receive timely and effective intervention. To monitor this strategy, we will complete classroom walkthroughs during the acceleration block, and monthly progress monitoring of students receiving tier 2 and tier 3 interventions.

Action Steps to Implement

Grade levels will deliver and reflect on common formative assessments throughout the unit that will inform instruction.

When: 9/1/2020-6/7/2021

Frequency: Weekly

Evidence: Formative Assessments, PLC minutes, Classroom walkthroughs

Person Responsible Andrea Nelson (nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will analyze and discuss student work products and information received through their individual conferencing. Teachers will receive "A Teacher's Guide to Reading Conferences" and spend time learning how to best use reading conferences as a formative assessment.

When: 8/18/2020-6/7/2021

Frequency: Daily

Evidence: IDR notebooks, Walkthroughs

Person Responsible Katherine Self (selfk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will implement "Number Talks" and Problem Based Learning Experiences during the math block to promote a focus on thinking and talking in math as well as increase mathematical fluency. Each teacher will receive the Number Talk book and professional development as needed.

When: 8/25/202-6/7/2021

Frequency: Daily

Evidence: Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson Plans

Person Responsible Christina Lees (leesc@lake.k12.fl.us)

All grade levels have an acceleration block built into their schedule to provide timely intervention and acceleration opportunities for all students. ESE VE teachers and Intervention teachers will use Leveled Literacy Intervention and Being a Reader to increase reading proficiency for students in our lowest quartile.

When: 9/1/2020-6/7/2021

Frequency: Four times a week

Evidence: Progress monitoring data of ESE subgroup, classroom walkthroughs,

Person Responsible Madison Darr (darrm@lake.k12.fl.us)

The MTSS problem solving team will monitor and support tier 2 and tier 3 interventions specifically designed to increase proficiency of the lowest quartile. Reading A-Z will be used as an intervention for our Lake Live students this year.

When: 9/10/2020- 6/7/2021

Frequency: Monthly

Evidence: Progress monitoring data in performance matters, Problem solving team minutes

Person Responsible Kara Stratton (strattonk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The leadership team will continue to focus on equity across all subgroups by forming a guiding coalition. As we receive progress monitoring data, we will be discussing and reflecting on equitable practices that help reach all students. The ESE subgroup will be closely monitored based on the ESSA data by the guiding coalition.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Electronic newsletters will be sent to families each month to provide information about the curriculum and upcoming events. We will also communicate with families through maintaining an active social media presence, school messenger, and parent conference nights. Parents and community members are also invited to attend our SAC meetings and frequent nightly events. Nightly events include: STEAM Night, Literacy Night, Title 1 Night, parent conference evenings, Media Nights, Light it Up Blue, Heritage Night...etc.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00