

Lake County Schools

# Lost Lake Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# 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

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (56%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Lost Lake Elementary School

1901 JOHNS LAKE RD, Clermont, FL 34711

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>46%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>53%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
<b>Grade</b>	A	A	B	A

## 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.
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.
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.



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hansen, Daniel	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.
Henry, Stephanie L.	Other	ESE School Specialist coordinates educational placement and appropriate services for students with disabilities.
Farias, Nicole K.	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach assisting in the coordination and implementation of reading instruction in the K-12 curriculum at the school site.

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Sunday 7/1/2018, Frank Gomez

**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.*

3

**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.*

8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

52

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (56%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	105	136	128	133	136	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	783
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

**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	24	30	33	54	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	182

**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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/27/2020

**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	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

**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	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

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	553
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
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%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
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%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
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%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	70
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	67

Multiracial Students	
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	72
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	65
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.**

Based on available school data, our lowest performance was in Math overall achievement, which dropped from 80% to 78% from the 2018-19 school year. Math learning gains had a 10% increase, from 53% to 63%, however, improvement was only 1% over the state average of 62%. Additionally, a 6% increase in Math performance for our lowest performing 25%, moving from 41% to 47%, but remains 4% below the state average of 51%. Curriculum, student motivations, 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 was in overall Math in fifth grade, dropping 8% from 77% to 69%. Additionally, Math learning gains remain below the state average. These inequities are attributed to not targeting the specific subject area that needs support through our remediation block. For example, in most grade levels, for Smart Block (our intervention block) every student receives support in ELA for 60 minutes per week and every student receives support in Math for 60 minutes per week. For students only needing Math support, let's give them 120 minutes of Math intervention each week.

**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 in closing the gap in Math overall achievement and continuing to improve Math gains for our lowest performing children. Our remediation and acceleration block 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 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 results to drive instruction.

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

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. Equity and access
3. Remediation and acceleration block
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Math is identified as an area of focus due to Math achievement levels dropping 2% from 2018 to 2019, 80% to 78%. Specifically, we saw improvement in our learning gains for all fourth and fifth grade students from 2018 to 2019 (+10 points), and a +6 increase in learning gains with our lowest performing 25%. However, we remain 4% below the state average in learning gains for our lowest 25%. As we move forward, we will continue to focus on the learning gains of all students, and especially our most striving learners.

**Measurable Outcome:**

With a specific, targeted focus on Math achievement, we expect to see an increase in school level data, EWS data and classroom walk through data, both qualitative and quantitative from 47% to 51% (matching or exceeding the state average).

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kelly Cousineau (cousineau@lake.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

LCS instructional framework model includes focused instruction, guided instruction, collaborative learning, and independent learning. This framework will continue to be implemented school-wide, with an emphasis on guided instruction. Through a peer mentoring model, we will increase overall Math achievement results as evidenced by classroom walk-throughs, student performance in the classroom, and iReady diagnostic results.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

If we implement, monitor, and support instructional practice grounded in guided instruction, our students will benefit from consistent monitoring and support from their teachers. We will see Math achievement improve as guided instruction becomes embedded in our practice.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Leadership will provide professional learning around guided learning.  
 Consistent classroom walk-throughs will provide areas of growth in this practice, as well as help us highlight where we are seeing this practice being done well.  
 Quarterly data chats with teachers will provide projections on student achievement.  
 Ongoing professional learning will ensure this new strategy will become embedded in instructional practice.

**Person Responsible**

Kelly Cousineau (cousineau@lake.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

As we continue to develop a culture where the needs of every student are met and remain a high priority, we are going to engage staff in conversations rooted in Equity and Access for all, followed by intentional next steps to ensure access becomes embedded in our work. The need for this work is evident in our FSA scores from 2018 and 2019. On the 2019 Math FSA, at LLE 85.1% of white students passed with a level 3 or higher school-wide. On the same test, 61.8% of African American students passed with a level 3 or higher. In 2018, the percentage gap between these two groups on the Math FSA was 11.3%. ELA follows a similar pattern, with 82.5% of white students passing the ELA FSA in 2019 and 80% in 2018. In those same years, African American students passed with 62.3% and 63% pass rates.

**Measurable Outcome:**

We are going to grow a school culture that demonstrates every child has access to an education that ensures academic success. EWS data will be used to guide our conversations, and purposeful planning of lessons in PLCs will guide the work for teacher follow through. iReady mid-year data will be reviewed in PLCs and with leadership team. With intentional and purposeful actions developed by our LLE Equity Coalition, we will see growth of 3% or higher in the pass rate for ELA and Math FSA for African American students on the 2021 FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kelly Cousineau (cousineauk@lake.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Professional learning for staff around the work of Dr. Anthony Muhammad. Opportunities for staff to dive deep into previous data around our subgroups to land on one or two prime areas of focus in which we will set goals for improvement. Our work will be overseen by the LLE Equity Coalition, a group of stakeholders committed to ensuring all students get the support they need. With intentional and purposeful actions developed by our LLE Equity Coalition, we will see growth of 3% or higher in the pass rate for ELA and Math FSA for African American students on the 2021 FSA.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

As a school with typically high performance in many areas, our data shows we have work to do in the area of equity. On the 2019 Math FSA, at LLE 85.1% of white students passed with a level 3 or higher school-wide. On the same test, 61.8% of African American students passed with a level 3 or higher. In 2018, the percentage gap between these two groups on the Math FSA was 11.3%. ELA follows a similar pattern, with 82.5% of white students passing the ELA FSA in 2019 and 80% in 2018. In those same years, African American students passed with 62.3% and 63% pass rates.

It is time we talk about what is happening and take steps to fix it.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Professional learning around Equity and Access  
 Develop an Equity Coalition to guide goals and next steps

**Person Responsible**

Kelly Cousineau (cousineauk@lake.k12.fl.us)

### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because our lowest performing 25% results in Math sit at 47%, 4% below the state average of 51%. Continuing to refine acceleration and remediation opportunities will lead to an increase in learning gains for this group.

**Measurable Outcome:** By focusing on the lowest 25th percentile, we expect to see an increase in Math (47% to 50%) 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 with 30 minutes of remediation and acceleration four days per week, we will increase both categories of in ELA and Math by a minimum of 3%. To monitor this strategy, school data will be analyzed quarterly with teachers and leadership team.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** If we monitor and support teachers as they facilitate effective remediation and acceleration learning opportunities for students, then we will increase academic achievement among all learners, including those performing in the bottom 25% of their class.

#### Action Steps to Implement

Thirty minutes of uninterrupted time for remediation and acceleration.

Monthly data reviews in PLCs to look for trends in student performance.

MTSS data analysis.

Classroom walk-through data to support carryover from PLC.

After school tutoring for students scoring a level 1 or 2 on FSA (see SAI budget worksheet for details).

**Person Responsible** Karen Hart (hartk@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.

**As a leadership team, we will continue to engage our staff and stakeholders in conversation around student retentions. We will use data to show the long term impact of retention on a student, and we will collectively land on steps that will lead to an alternative to retaining a child.**

## 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.

A positive school culture is one where communication is a high priority, positive teacher and student actions are recognized and celebrated, and key decisions are driven with teacher and staff input. We have been intentional in growing our work in all of these areas the last two years. Let me share some specifics on how we have grown in these areas at Lost Lake ES:

Weekly Smore communication to staff

Weekly callouts to parents and families

Frequent use of social media to share teaching and learning and special events on campus

Principal Zoom meetings with staff and parents throughout the pandemic

Principal is a member of the South Lake Education Committee

Principal is a member of the South Lake Chamber

**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: Math				\$1.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	100-Salaries	0281 - Lost Lake Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	0.0	\$1.00
			<i>Notes: Extra Duty Math Tutor</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0281 - Lost Lake Elementary School		0.0	\$0.00
			<i>Notes: N/A</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

			0281 - Lost Lake Elementary School		0.0	\$0.00
			<i>Notes: N/A</i>			
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$1.00</b>