

Lake County Schools

Grassy Lake 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

Grassy Lake Elementary School

1100 FOSGATE RD, Minneola, FL 34715

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

Demographics

Principal: Julie Tucker

Start Date for this Principal: 11/1/2015

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)	57%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (60%)
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

Grassy Lake Elementary School

1100 FOSGATE RD, Minneola, FL 34715

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	46%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

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

Through the dedication and commitment of staff, parents, and the community, Grassy Lake Elementary provides a safe learning environment that challenges all students to strive for excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a happy, caring and academically focused environment where all students can reach their full potential and grow to be productive, respectful members of the community.

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
Williams, Julie	Principal	Campus safety, curriculum, learning walks, teacher evaluation, leadership team, budget, evaluation of office staff, SAC, PTO, school data, school improvement, discipline, MTSS, ELC, behavior committee, remediation/acceleration
Shaffer, Natalie	Assistant Principal	Student supervision, curriculum, learning walks, evaluation of 4th, 5th, and enrichment teachers, SAC, school data, school improvement, discipline, MTSS, awards, teaching assistants, food service, new teacher induction, vertical articulation, math articulation, behavior committee, remediation/acceleration
Adams, Gail	School Counselor	Student supervision, scheduling, counseling students, mental health referrals, MTSS, ELL, volunteers, support
Ardizone, Jennifer	School Counselor	Student supervision, scheduling, counseling students, mental health referrals, MTSS, 504, support
Carmody, Karen	Assistant Principal	Student supervision and safety, curriculum, learning walks, evaluation of 2nd, 3rd, and behavior support teachers, PTO, textbooks, school data, school improvement, discipline, MTSS, custodial staff, ELA articulation, behavior committee, remediation/acceleration
Coleman, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Provide instructional support to teachers, mentoring, modeling in the classroom, behavior committee, remediation/acceleration, textbooks, testing
Bruener, Marie	Instructional Coach	Provide instructional support to teachers, mentoring, modeling in the classroom, behavior committee, remediation/acceleration, literacy motivation/support
Bidwell, Lori	Teacher, K-12	PASS teacher, build positive rapport with students proactively, provide support for teachers regarding behavior, behavior committee, remediation/acceleration
Stinson, Bridgette	Other	Mental Health Liaison, build positive rapport with students proactively, provide support for students needing mental health resources/intervention, behavior committee, remediation/acceleration
Wells, Beth	Teacher, ESE	ESE School Specialist, team leader for ESE, point of contact for all ESE meetings, documentation, IEPs, services, etc, behavior committee, remediation/acceleration

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 11/1/2015, Julie Tucker

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

65

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)	57%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (60%)
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	115	144	133	148	165	170	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	875
Attendance below 90 percent	0	7	4	5	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	19	24	40	40	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191

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	2	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/25/2020

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	169	157	159	184	202	196	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1067
Attendance below 90 percent	4	11	16	11	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	1	5	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	18	7	24	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	0	7	4	22	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	3	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	169	157	159	184	202	196	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1067
Attendance below 90 percent	4	11	16	11	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	1	5	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	18	7	24	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	0	7	4	22	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	3	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	71%	58%	57%	70%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	57%	58%	64%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	49%	53%	51%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	69%	60%	63%	73%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	69%	56%	62%	74%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	39%	51%	46%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	68%	54%	53%	64%	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	72%	60%	12%	58%	14%
	2018	70%	61%	9%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	60%	5%	58%	7%
	2018	70%	59%	11%	56%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	71%	59%	12%	56%	15%
	2018	62%	55%	7%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	62%	7%	62%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	67%	65%	2%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	61%	5%	64%	2%
	2018	68%	60%	8%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	68%	57%	11%	60%	8%
	2018	64%	58%	6%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	67%	56%	11%	53%	14%
	2018	68%	54%	14%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	28	46	38	25	45	41	19				
ELL	45	49	29	54	54	38	25				
ASN	88	68		79	68		85				
BLK	49	55	43	46	45	47	37				
HSP	66	57	42	67	69	50	61				
MUL	78	67		78	73		64				
WHT	76	73	53	73	72	43	78				
FRL	58	61	48	57	59	43	53				
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	33	33	34	25	42	45	35				
ELL	42	43	31	55	46	47					
AMI	60			40							
ASN	78	84		87	63						
BLK	65	61		58	57	40	76				
HSP	65	58	25	69	58	46	73				
MUL	79	68		79	58						

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
WHT	71	54	42	73	69	56	70				
FRL	63	57	36	61	59	47	65				
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	30	43	45	19	24	16	23				
ELL	47	60		53	69		30				
AMI	70			70							
ASN	77	78		83	89		77				
BLK	56	61	42	60	70	44	46				
HSP	70	62	45	73	78	52	63				
MUL	78	63		77	80						
WHT	72	64	58	75	70	42	72				
FRL	63	62	46	68	76	48	55				

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	63
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	506
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	78
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	46
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	60
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	72
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	67
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	56
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.

Historically, GLES has always scored above the district and state average in all areas. However, in 2018-19 ELA, our lowest 25th percentile scored 1% lower than the district and 5% lower than the state. GLES implemented an ELA/Math remediation block in 2018-19, but each grade level was able to independently choose the resources to serve the needs of those students. This year we plan to serve the lowest 25th percentile with a restructured remediation block, utilizing LLI.

Our SWD subgroup showed low performance (28% ELA overall and 25% Math overall). Many of the students in the SWD subgroup also fall within the lowest 25th percentile. As described above, we believe our restructured remediation block with smaller groups using LLI will assist these students in achievement and learning gains. In addition, we will also have small group math tutoring through SAI funds.

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

We had two areas that showed the greatest decline. The first was 4th grade ELA. Historically our 4th grade data has been top in achievement. We analyzed the data to identify trends and saw one new teacher had considerably lower achievement than the rest of the 4th grade teachers. In response to her struggles, we had two instructional coaches working with her daily to model and support. In the end, it wasn't a good fit and we have since placed a top performing ELA teacher in her place. With no testing in 19-20, we anticipate the 20-21 scores to show an increase in this area. Our coaches and administration met with 4th grade to review the data, identify best practices, and produce action steps to ensure higher achievement.

The second area of notable decline was achievement of the African-American subgroup in both ELA (16% decline) and Math (12% decline). The majority of this subgroup who received level 1 on ELA/Math were brand new to GLES (and arrived with an academic gap) and/or also in the SWD subgroup. This decline was not a trend we have seen previously, and therefore as a leadership team have already addressed ways in which to bring up achievement in this subgroup. We will have smaller groups with more targeted assistance using LLI for ELA. We will have a math tutor during the day to provide remediation during school hours. We will continue to monitor during regular data chats/progress monitoring and adjust services as needed.

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.

Historically, GLES has always scored above the district and state average in all areas. However, this year in ELA, our lowest 25th percentile scored 1% lower than the district and 5% lower than the state. GLES implemented an ELA/Math remediation block this past year, but each grade level was able to independently choose the resources to serve the needs of those students. This year we plan to serve the lowest 25th percentile with a restructured remediation block, including smaller groups utilizing LLI.

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

The component that showed the greatest improvement was 5th grade ELA achievement with an increase of 9 percentage points. During the 18-19 school year, two out of three 5th grade ELA teachers were new to the grade level, which in a departmentalized setting accounted for two-thirds of all 5th grade students. When 2018 scores came out, the 5th grade ELA team expressed that they knew they could "do better". They made an extra effort to analyze progress monitoring data, compared/shared data with each other, shared best practices for each standard, and increased standards-based collaboration within their teams. This resulted in two of three teachers more confident with the 5th grade curriculum, which in turn raised the achievement score.

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

Our school showed improvement in every area of our EWS data, except for students with attendance below 90%. Two years ago we had 59 students in that category and last year we had 61, an increase of 2 students. We will continue to tweak the attendance incentive program at the school (currently classes receive recognition for every 10 days of no absences; highest class at semester's end receives a dance party). We need to take in account absences that are quarantine related and incentives that maintain safety in light of Covid. In addition, our Mental Health Liaison and PASS teacher will also meet with students to build rapport and encourage those students with poor attendance to proactively address concerns.

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

1. Increase learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile by at least 3% in both ELA and Math
2. Increase achievement in SWD subgroup by at least 5% in both ELA and Math
3. Increase achievement in African-American subgroup by at least 6% in both ELA and Math
4. Increase 4th grade achievement by at least 5% in both ELA and Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Through common planning, teachers will better understand, plan, deliver, and differentiate standards-based instruction in all content areas for all students. Students at GLEs will know what they are learning, why/how they are learning it, and how they know they have learned it (focus on "purpose"). During this time, our 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade teachers will also focus on how to use iReady support workbooks and Support Coach workbooks to enhance curriculum-based instruction within the district's instructional framework.

Measurable Outcome:

Rationale: If we implement, monitor, and support common planning, then we will have a scheduled time for teachers to plan for and evaluate formative assessments and work products. If we have common planning, then teachers will also have an opportunity to observe best practices in facilitating reading, writing, thinking, and talking, incorporate those ideas into their own lessons, and ensure that students will be able to understand and articulate a clear purpose: what they are learning and how they know if they have learned it.

By utilizing common planning with additional support to help teachers collaborate on the instructional framework, then teachers will be able to plan for and evaluate formative assessments and work products, observe best practices in facilitating reading, writing, thinking, and talking, incorporate those ideas in their own lessons, and ensure that students will be able to understand and articulate a clear purpose: what they are learning and how they know if they have learned it.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

As evidenced by the FSA, we plan to increase student achievement in ELA/Math by at least 3%, increase learning gains in all content areas by at least 3%, and increase learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile in all content areas by at least 3%.

Julie Williams (williamsj2@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will have scheduled time to common plan with their team on standards-based instruction in all content areas, to include collaboration on assessments, work products, authentic literacy (reading, writing, thinking, talking) and the instructional framework. Part of the instructional framework includes a focus on purpose, that students will understand what they are learning, why/how they are learning it, and how they will know if they've learned it.

During these common planning sessions, two instructional coaches will attend to share best practices and offer resources and guidance. The PASS teacher as well as Administration will also step in to provide further support to each team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

If we implement, monitor, and support common planning with additional support to help teachers collaborate on the instructional framework, then teachers will have better quality instruction that incorporates best practices in facilitating reading, writing, thinking, and talking, use those ideas into their own lessons, and ensure that students will be able to understand and articulate a clear purpose: what they are learning and how they know if they have learned it. Therefore, we will ensure improvement in student learning and success by increasing the outcome measures listed above.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create and establish a common planning schedule with clearly identified protocols and expected products.

Who: Administration and Teachers, Instructional Coaches

Frequency: Weekly

When: Start August 24, 2020

Evidence: Schedule, List of Expectations/Protocols, Learning Walk Data

Person Responsible Julie Williams (williamsj2@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Monitor through observation of planning time, review of expected products, and actual implementation in the classrooms, including learning walks.

Who: Administration and Teachers, Instructional Coaches

Frequency: Weekly

When: Start August 24, 2020

Evidence: Schedule, List of Expectations/Protocols, Learning Walk Data

Person Responsible Julie Williams (williamsj2@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: By utilizing Early Warning Signs (EWS) data, GLES will increase student attendance, positive student behaviors, and maintain a safe and supportive school environment for all students. This is a critical need area because if we develop and implement a system of motivational supports and behavior interventions/supports/incentives for our students, then we will foster a more welcoming and engaging environment/culture for our students with fewer undesirable behaviors, high expectations, and a collective commitment for success.

Measurable Outcome: Based on EWS data, we will decrease students absent (10% or more of the time) by at least 5%. We will decrease the amount of 1 (or more) out of school suspensions by 30%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Julie Williams (williamsj2@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The guidance counselors will implement and monitor the use of an attendance incentive system for all grade levels, minus Covid circumstances. Non-load bearing personnel will also proactively build rapport and offer support to students through regular meetings with students who are on the verge of having attendance concerns. We started a new behavior support committee with representation from each grade level where we collectively came up with a new school-wide behavior incentive system to increase positive behaviors based on the 7 Covey Habits. The PASS teacher will work with behaviorally at-risk students, meeting with them regularly to proactively address concerns and provide behavior strategies/restorative practices prior to needing interventions such as suspensions. Every teacher plays an active role in both the attendance incentive program and the positive behavior incentive program. This strategy's effectiveness, based on EWS data, will be monitored quarterly by the Leadership Team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we implement, monitor, and support an attendance incentive program and a positive behavior incentive program, students and teachers will share a collective commitment to maintaining a safe and supportive school environment for all students. If we develop and implement a system of motivational supports and behavior interventions/supports/incentives for our students, then we will foster a more welcoming and engaging environment/culture for our students with fewer undesirable behaviors, high expectations, and a collective commitment for success. We will ensure to improve student learning and success by increasing the outcome measures listed above.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a schedule of meetings and list of expectations for the attendance incentive program and behavior incentive program.

Who: Administration, Leadership Team, Teachers

Frequency: Quarterly

When: Start August 24, 2020

Evidence: Schedule, List of Expectations/Protocols, EWS Data

Person Responsible: Julie Williams (williamsj2@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Create a list of expectations and protocols for each of these programs.

Who: Administration, Leadership Team, Teachers

Frequency: Quarterly

When: Start August 24, 2020

Evidence: Schedule, List of Expectations/Protocols, EWS Data

Person Responsible Julie Williams (williamsj2@lake.k12.fl.us)

3. Implement the programs and progress monitor effectiveness, making necessary adjustments quarterly.

Who: Administration, Leadership Team, Teachers

Frequency: Quarterly

When: Start August 24, 2020

Evidence: Schedule, List of Expectations/Protocols, EWS Data

Person Responsible Julie Williams (williamsj2@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus	GLES will implement, monitor, and support quality interventions for struggling students as well as implement opportunities for acceleration for students already showing mastery of grade level standards.
Description and Rationale:	This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because by holding a daily remediation/acceleration time will ensure students will receive targeted interventions aligned to their remediation/acceleration needs. This will ensure the measurable outcomes (see below) to improve learning and success. This area of focus will also address our SWD subgroup, which had a Federal Index at 35% (below the 41% threshold).
Measurable Outcome:	This area of focus will reduce the number of students failing Math or ELA at the end of the year to 5% or less. As evidenced by the FSA, we plan to increase student achievement in ELA from 71% to 74%, ELA learning gains from 66% to 69%, and bottom quartile ELA learning gains from 48% to 51%. We will increase student achievement in Math from 69% to 72%, Math learning gains from 69% to 72%, and bottom quartile Math learning gains from 48% to 51%. We also plan to increase ELA proficiency in the SWD subgroup from 28% to 33% and Math proficiency in the SWD subgroup from 25% to 30%. We also plan to increase ELA proficiency in the African-American subgroup from 49%% to 55% and Math proficiency in the SWD subgroup from 46% to 52%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julie Williams (williamsj2@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will hold a daily remediation/acceleration block to provide interventions to the lowest 25th percentile of students in ELA (all grades) through utilization of the LLI program. In addition, based on SAI funding (\$7693.00), a certified teacher will be hired as a tutor (extra duty pay) to pull students during the day to provide remediation to the lowest 25th percentile in Math in grades 3-5 (180 hours total this school year). These intervention strategies will also include the SWD subgroup. The measurable outcomes are listed above, including raising achievement in all categories by at least 3%. This strategy will be monitored by Julie Williams (Principal) and Natalie Shaffer (AP) by progress monitoring iReady assessment data and course data. The data will be reviewed quarterly through Leadership Team led data chats with each teacher. In addition, a VE teacher will work to service all Lake Live students to meet their unique, individual needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor, and support quality interventions (remediation block/LLI/SAI math tutoring) for struggling students as well as implement opportunities for acceleration for students already showing mastery of grade level standard, then we will ensure to improve student learning and success by increasing the outcome measures listed above.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create and establish a schedule for a school-wide remediation/acceleration block. Administration will establish and communicate clearly defined expectations to teachers for this block, including any additional training to utilize the LLI system. A schedule will be established for SAI math tutoring.

Who: Administration and Teachers

Frequency: Reevaluate Quarterly

When: Start August 24, 2020

Evidence: Schedule, Lesson Plans, List of Protocols/Expectations, Progress Monitoring

Person Responsible Julie Williams (williamsj2@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Teachers will group the students according to mastery of the standards and placement in the correct F&P level of the LLI system to ensure targeted remediation to meet the unique needs of each student.

Who: Administration and Teachers

Frequency: Reevaluate Quarterly

When: Start August 24, 2020

Evidence: Schedule, Lesson Plans, List of Protocols/Expectations, Progress Monitoring

Person Responsible Julie Williams (williamsj2@lake.k12.fl.us)

3. Teachers will continue to monitor and adjust remediation/acceleration strategies as students progress with their skills.

Who: Administration and Teachers

Frequency: Reevaluate Quarterly

When: Start August 24, 2020

Evidence: Schedule, Lesson Plans, List of Protocols/Expectations, Progress Monitoring

Person Responsible Julie Williams (williamsj2@lake.k12.fl.us)

4. Our school secretary and bookkeeper will ensure that SAI funds are being distributed according to the approved plan (tutoring/supplies).

Who: Administration and Teachers

Frequency: Reevaluate Quarterly

When: Start August 24, 2020

Evidence: Schedule, Lesson Plans, List of Protocols/Expectations, Progress Monitoring

Person Responsible Natalie Shaffer (shaffern@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.

Our school showed improvement in every area of our EWS data, except for students with attendance below 90%. Two years ago we had 59 students in that category and last year we had 61, an increase of 2 students. We will continue to tweak the attendance incentive program at the school (currently classes receive recognition for every 10 days of no absences; highest class at semester's end receives a dance party). We need to take in account absences that are quarantine related and incentives that maintain safety in light of Covid. In addition, our Mental Health Liaison and PASS teacher will also meet with students to build rapport and encourage those students with poor attendance to proactively address concerns. Our plan for this is outlined above under Section III A. Culture & Environment specifically relating to EWS.

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.

Grassy Lake incorporates an estimated 40-50% parent involvement with activities on campus. We would like to continue to see an increase in attendance for our academic-based family activities. Academically, we have meet the teacher, curriculum nights for each grade level, designated parent conference nights in October, other parent conference nights throughout the year, awards ceremonies, reading carnival (2nd grade), STEAM night, art night, etc. We also have a Winter Wonderland festival, PTO and SAC meetings, family bingo night, family movie night, multiple dances (in which all parents attend), Mother's Day activities, classroom holiday parties, etc.

Our volunteer program has grown in that our volunteers now clock around 10,000 hours each year. They help us with field trips, classroom needs, STEAM activities, Wonderful Wednesdays, media center needs, front office help, etc. We have always received the Golden School Award for volunteerism at our school based on this criteria.

In addition to our successful volunteer program, we participate in "Dads Take Your Child to School Day" where we had 700+ dads (out of 1000 students) participate last year. The intent of the initiative is to highlight the significant difference father figures can make in their child's education.

We have implemented the "Remind App" for increased communication with our families in addition to using School Messenger and Class Dojo.

We are continuing to work to invigorate our PTO and SAC to increase parent involvement. We currently have community stakeholders within our SAC that assist with the direction of the school. We work with Kiwanis and other community groups to promote academics and good character within our schools.

In light of Covid, many of these activities may transition to virtual or we may need to adjust the activities themselves. We already had parent involvement with "Meet the Teacher" virtually across campus and will continue to seek out new ways to involve our stakeholders during this pandemic.

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				\$7,693.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100		0068 - Grassy Lake Elementary School	Other		\$7,693.00
			Notes: Based on SAI funding (\$7693.00), a certified teacher will be hired as a tutor (extra duty pay) to pull students during the day to provide remediation to the lowest 25th percentile in Math in grades 3-5 (180 hours total this school year).			
Total:						\$7,693.00