Grassy Lake Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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

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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	54%

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

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Tucker, 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 teachers, SAC, school data, school improvement, discipline, MTSS, teaching assistants, food service, new teacher induction, vertical articulation, instructional leadership, behavior committee, remediation/acceleration
Coleman, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Provide instructional support to teachers, mentoring, modeling in the classroom, behavior committee, remediation/acceleration, textbooks, testing, discipline, health coordinator
Bidwell, Lori	Teacher, K-12	PASS teacher, build positive rapport with students proactively, provide support for teachers regarding behavior, behavior committee, remediation/acceleration, discipline, school safety
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, buses and backpacks program, VPK, Kindergarten Star Search
Bruener, Marie	Instructional Coach	Provide instructional support to teachers, mentoring, modeling in the classroom, behavior committee, remediation/acceleration, literacy motivation/support, awards
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.*

4

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

73

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,170

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

14

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

16

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	193	146	181	189	159	196	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1064
Attendance below 90 percent	3	21	10	18	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	3	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	2	4	26	17	10	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Course failure in Math	2	4	26	17	10	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	29	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	25	28	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	11	12	21	28	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

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	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	2	1	6	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/10/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	17	0	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				71%	58%	57%	69%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				66%	57%	58%	59%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	49%	53%	39%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				69%	60%	63%	71%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				69%	56%	62%	63%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	39%	51%	50%	41%	47%
Science Achievement				68%	54%	53%	72%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	72%	60%	12%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	65%	60%	5%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2021					
	2019	71%	59%	12%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	69%	62%	7%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	61%	5%	64%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	57%	11%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	67%	56%	11%	53%	14%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

For 1st and 2nd grades, the progress monitoring data is based on last year's iReady scores in reading and math. For 3rd through 5th grades, the progress monitoring data is based on iReady reading and math (fall and winter) and then FSA (spring). Fifth grade science data came from the Lake Standards Assessments (LSAs) for both fall (Q1) and winter (Q3), and the spring scores for 5th came from FSA data.

For the iReady based data, percent proficient was based on if the student's scores fell within the grade level range. For example, for 3rd grade students, the 3rd grade reading range is 511-602. If the student fell within or above that range, they were marked as proficient for the purpose of this table. For FSA data, a score of 3 or above was considered proficient.

Because all students receive free breakfast and lunch, we do not have exact economically disadvantaged data to report at this time.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	45 (30%)	96 (58%)	126 (78%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	5 (25%)	6 (29%)	10 (53%)
	English Language Learners	0 (0%)	3 (38%)	3 (38%)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	79 (49%)	79 (48%)	120 (74%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	3 (16%)	5 (24%)	10 (53%)
	English Language Learners	1 (20%)	2 (25%)	3 (38%)

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	65 (42%)	110 (66%)	122 (74%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	1 (4%)	5 (22%)	8 (36%)
	English Language Learners	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	4 (40%)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43 (28%)	76 (46%)	121 (77%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	1 (4%)	5 (23%)	9 (50%)
	English Language Learners	2 (25%)	2 (25%)	3 (43%)

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	97 (70%)	115 (80%)	99 (68%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	7 (32%)	10 (45%)	4 (19%)
	English Language Learners	5 (83%)	5 (83%)	4 (67%)
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30 (22%)	82 (57%)	107 (73%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	2 (10%)	7 (32%)	7 (35%)
	English Language Learners	2 (33%)	3 (50%)	4 (67%)

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	74 (44%)	92 (53%)	98 (60%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	9 (27%)	7 (20%)	7 (24%)
	English Language Learners	1 (14%)	3 (38%)	6 (67%)
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42 (25%)	67 (38%)	102 (62%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	3 (9%)	5 (14%)	4 (15%)
	English Language Learners	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (67%)

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	80 (46%)	90 (50%)	111 (64%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	3 (9%)	2 (6%)	5 (17%)
	English Language Learners	1 (11%)	2 (18%)	4 (36%)
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	66 (38%)	83 (46%)	77 (44%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	2 (6%)
	English Language Learners	2 (22%)	3 (27%)	5 (45%)
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	73 (46%)	143 (86%)	96 (55%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	2 (10%)	16 (73%)	5 (16%)
	English Language Learners	3 (4%)	7 (70%)	2 (20%)

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	17	24	21	16	12	11	12				
ELL	45	58		44	50		31				
ASN	75			67							
BLK	63	38		50	23		55				
HSP	58	63	54	52	33	17	46				
MUL	60			55							
WHT	67	49	13	64	38	21	62				
FRL	50	49	40	45	25	11	39				
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				

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
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						
WHT	71	54	42	73	69	56	70				
FRL	63	57	36	61	59	47	65				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	384
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	71
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	58
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	45
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Based on our 20-21 progress monitoring data, our 1st and 2nd grades show consistent proficiency increases throughout the year, including our ELL and ESE subgroups. Our 3rd grade math showed higher increases in proficiency than 3rd grade ELA, which is attributed to the addition of a new spiral review embedded in their common assessments and more frequent collaboration time together (in additional to the required time). Grade 4 showed consistent increases in proficiency for both ELA and math, with 4th grade ELL students showing the greatest increases at +53% and +67% respectively. Our 5th grade ELA and math continues to be a great concern as we did not see significant gains in these areas. In addition, although not a category in the progress monitoring data in Section IIC, we know that our 5th grade learning gains of the lowest quartile need to improve significantly. We have plans in place to address this need, as stated below and in Section III.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the progress monitoring data from 20-21, our ELL population did not show an increase in proficiency in 3rd grade reading (-16%). Our ESE group did not show an increase in proficiency in 3rd grade ELA (-13%), 4th grade ELA (-3%), and 5th grade ELA (-3%).

Our greatest concern from the 20-21 progress monitoring data is 5th grade ELA and Math, whereby both groups did not show a significant increase.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Based on the 20-21 progress monitoring data, we need to focus on increasing proficiency among our ESE subgroup in 3rd, 4th, and 5th ELA. In addition, we realize that 5th grade proficiency levels need to increase significantly. Although it wasn't a category in Section IIC of the grade level data review, we also need to place significant focus on increasing the learning gains of our lowest quartile students in both ELA and math.

Our new actions for improvement in these areas are to reframe how students are selected and grouped for our SAI budget based tutoring during the school day. We have a certified K-5 teacher who will spend approximately 9 hours per week pulling the bottom quartile in 5th grade math to help them close academic gaps.

With an increasing caseload of ESE students who need services, we will restructure the way we provide VE push-in support to make sure that all ESE students are getting high quality supports in a timely manner. We will also make sure that ESE VE teachers are collaborating not only with their

grade levels, but within the ESE department as well on a regular basis to analyze data, share best practices, and adjust instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the progress monitoring data from 20-21, our ELL population showed increased proficiency by at least 50 percentage points in 4th grade ELA (+53%), and 4th grade math (+67%), and 5th science based on Q1 and Q3 data (+66%).

Our ESE group showed increased proficiency in 5th grade science based on Q1 and Q3 data (+63%).

In addition to the ELL/ESE data above, overall student proficiency increased by at least 50 percentage points in 3rd grade math (+51%).

In the 2019 data, the component that showed the greatest improvement was 5th grade ELA achievement with an increase of 9 percentage points.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

During the 20-21 school year, we partially attribute our ELL increases to hiring a new ELL assistant who provided high quality, individualized assistance to our ELL students each week. She worked directly with our guidance counselor to ensure that all ELL students' needs were being met throughout the year.

We attribute the rest of our increases (within the 20-21 progress monitoring data) to an increase in the quality and quantity of collaborative planning within those grade levels. Each grade level who demonstrated significant increases were also the grade levels who spent additional time (beyond the required) collaborating with their colleagues examining data and quality instruction.

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.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

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. In 2019-20 we made improvements by serving the lowest 25th percentile with a restructured remediation block, utilizing LLI. Our progress monitoring data showed significant growth at midyear, and then we all left for distance learning due to Covid. Upon returning in 20-21, and Covid still being a factor, we continue to use LLI, but structured the group differently to avoid additional exposure to more children in the school. In 2021-22, we will go back to the LLI structure that provided us the greatest increases in growth.

In addition, we will utilize our STEM teacher to integrate advance literacy/STEM to our 3rd - 5th grade students who are gifted and/or needing acceleration during our remediation/acceleration block. We will continue to function as a strong PLC this year, focusing on the 4 major questions during each team's collaboration time together.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Based on our summer learning at Lake County Schools, we will institute continued school-wide professional development on working effectively as a PLC. This will be provided by administration, our leadership team, and teacher leaders who participated in the district level PD. In addition to the school-wide PD, our leadership team will continue to push in to all collaborative meetings to provide direction, guidance, and support.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We will continue to utilize our LLI program as well as our new STEM/literacy acceleration group during remediation/acceleration block. We will continue to utilize SAI funds to provide a tutor during school hours to support our lowest quartile as they strive to make greater learning gains. We will continue to utilize our SAC and PTO funds to help support after school tutoring initiatives to again provide extra support for our students in 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 (and by utilizing the PLC professional development from this summer) 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 teachers will also focus on how to enhance curriculum-based instruction within the district's instructional framework. This area of focus is key as we transition to the BEST standards as well. 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.
Measurable Outcome:	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. 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%.
Monitoring:	Administration and instructional coaches will be present in all collaborative sessions to provide guidance and support. The school's leadership team will continue to review data quarterly and provide guidance on how to adjust instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@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, our 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/collaboration schedule with clearly identified protocols and expected products.

Who: Administration and Teachers, Instructional Coaches
Frequency: Weekly
When: Start August 10, 2021
Evidence: Schedule, List of Expectations/Protocols, Learning Walk Data

Person Responsible Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Monitor through observation of collaborative 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 10, 2021
Evidence: Schedule, List of Expectations/Protocols, Learning Walk Data

Person Responsible Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@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%.
Monitoring:	Administration and school leadership team will monitor EWS data quarterly and make adjustments to our approach. Our core team, including teacher leaders, also addresses this area of focus at each of our bi-monthly meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@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 10, 2021
Evidence: Schedule, List of Expectations/Protocols, EWS Data

Person Responsible	Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@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 10, 2021
Evidence: Schedule, List of Expectations/Protocols, EWS Data

Person Responsible   Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@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 10, 2021
Evidence: Schedule, List of Expectations/Protocols, EWS Data

Person Responsible   Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	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. 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%.
Monitoring:	This will be monitored by Administration and the leadership team by progress monitoring iReady assessment data and course data. The data will be reviewed quarterly through leadership team led data chats with each teacher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
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, 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). We will also provide after school tutoring (funded through SAC) for struggling students in ELA and Math in grades 2nd through 5th for 3 hours per week. 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%.
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 10, 2021
Evidence: Schedule, Lesson Plans, List of Protocols/Expectations, Progress Monitoring

Person Responsible Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@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 10, 2021
Evidence: Schedule, Lesson Plans, List of Protocols/Expectations, Progress Monitoring

Person Responsible Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@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 10, 2021
Evidence: Schedule, Lesson Plans, List of Protocols/Expectations, Progress Monitoring

Person Responsible Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@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 10, 2021
Evidence: Schedule, Lesson Plans, List of Protocols/Expectations, Progress Monitoring

Person Responsible Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

According to the safeschoolsforalex.org site, for 2020-2021 GLES was ranked #1 in the district (#118 in the state out of 1395 elementary schools), earning us a "very low" rating for reported incidences. We did receive a high rating for the number of suspensions (46 in-school suspension, 0 out of school suspensions). Our primary area of concern would be to continue to lower the number of in-school suspensions, with a secondary concern to re-assimilate students who were on distance learning and coming back into our school with the expectations of structure/behavior in a brick-and-mortar school. Our number of incidences is fairly low, but we primarily use PASS (Positive Alternative to School Suspension), coded as in-school suspension for our students' consequences. During PASS, our students spend one-on-one time with a certified K-12 teacher, bridging any gaps in their academics as well as spend structured reflection and discussion time to help them choose more appropriate behaviors in the future. The reason our incidences are so low is due in part to the introduction of the PASS program and PASS teacher as well as the Mental Health Liaison on our campus. They work proactively with students who start to exhibit distress or challenging behaviors, building rapport with our students, and helping them learn and utilize strategies to help them get through their challenges in a more desirable manner.

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.

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, Class Dojo, and two GLES Facebook pages (one public and one private just for our parents).

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

> **Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.**

We encourage parent and community involvement at all levels, and have adjusted for safety within Covid protocols. Our parents communicate through our two Facebook pages, PTO, SAC, and continue to participate in school events such as 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, 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. We have community members such as the Kiwanis who have partnered with us for the Terrific Kid program. We also have several community members who continue to take part in our SAC and as volunteers.

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	2021-22
	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