Lost Lake Elementary School

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
students
mission
school improvement
ambitious
family and community involvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
success
areas of focus
instruction
needs assessment
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
resources
growth

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lost Lake Elementary School

1901 JOHNS LAKE RD, Clermont, FL 34711

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

Demographics

Principal: Frank Gomez

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2021

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 (67%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (64%)
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

Lost Lake Elementary School

1901 JOHNS LAKE RD, Clermont, FL 34711

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**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	56%

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.

Lost Lake Elementary School 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 School.

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 School.

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Clark, Scott	Assistant Principal	Lead instruction in our school; support students, teachers and families; oversees two grade levels; Safety Committee
Hart, Karen	Assistant Principal	Lead instruction in our school; support students, teachers and families; oversees two grade levels; Textbooks
Cousineau, Kelly	Principal	Lead instruction in our school; support students, teachers and families; oversees two grade levels
Pinkston, Katherine	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Assist in the coordination around new reading curriculums, model instruction in the classroom; coach teachers; work with students in small groups; other work related tasks as directed
Farias, Nicole K.	Instructional Coach	Facilitates the implementation of new reading curriculums (Fundations, Wit and Wisdom); model instruction in the classroom; coach teachers; work with students in small groups; other work related tasks as directed
Gault, Bonnie	School Counselor	Schedules students into classes; works to support students in families in K-2; oversees MTSS and 504's in grades K-2
Shryock, Donna	School Counselor	Coordinator of English Language Learners (ELL) program; works to support students in families in 3-5; oversees 504s in grades 3-5
Henry, Stephanie L.	Other	Supports students and families with special needs; works with teachers supporting students with special needs
Hansen, Daniel	Other	Supports students and families with mental health; leads the school in training on mental health initiatives; serves as a liaison between district departments to effectively manage and coordinate school-based mental health services

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/10/2021, 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

65

Total number of students enrolled at the school

983

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

5

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

9

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	139	162	167	166	159	159	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	952
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	2	4	8	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	6	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 8/10/2021

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	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

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	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

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				79%	58%	57%	75%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				69%	57%	58%	60%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				66%	49%	53%	43%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				78%	60%	63%	80%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				63%	56%	62%	53%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	39%	51%	41%	41%	47%
Science Achievement				68%	54%	53%	74%	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	80%	60%	20%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	83%	60%	23%	58%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2021					
	2019	71%	59%	12%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	86%	62%	24%	62%	24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	76%	61%	15%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
05	2021					
	2019	69%	57%	12%	60%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	66%	56%	10%	53%	13%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

First-second grade is iReady
Third-fifth grade is iReady for fall and winter, FSA for the spring

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32%	64%	78%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	65%	67%	85%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17%	51%	75%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	29%	38%	75%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42%	69%	79%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	10%	18%	29%
	English Language Learners	33%	33%	33%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13%	45%	79%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	11%	35%	51%
	English Language Learners	33%	33%	33%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	65%	79%	67%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	31%	45%	61%
	English Language Learners	0%	30%	38%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23%	54%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	9%	31%	49%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	18%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58%	64%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	24%	45%	49%
	English Language Learners	20%	40%	48%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43%	59%	67%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	14%	18%	21%
	English Language Learners	20%	20%	25%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43%	56%	58%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	12%	20%	28%
	English Language Learners	50%	50%	68%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38%	55%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	12%	8%	29%
	English Language Learners	16%	16%	35%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59%	72%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	15%	19%	39%
	English Language Learners	22%	31%	35%

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	23	22	23	26	29	27	22				
ELL	48	60		45	13		36				
ASN	68			64							
BLK	43	47		44	21	30	29				
HSP	62	46	50	57	32	9	50				
MUL	50			72							
WHT	76	46	20	77	47		69				
FRL	59	41	38	59	36	27	47				
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				

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
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				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	359
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	66
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	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
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	61
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	56
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	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

As we look at our subgroups for both the 2018 and 2019 years, I notice a large gap between the proficiency performance of black students and white students. This trend is most evident in ELA but it is evident in Math too. in Math in 2019, 62% of our black children scored proficient while 85% of white students met this threshold.

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

Learning gains of black students remain behind all other subgroups. In some categories, black students are 20+ points behind white students.

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

Last year we began conversations around why this is happening. Our guiding coalition is passionate about having real conversations about the opportunities we provide students, and our goal is to ensure every student is given what they need to be successful at school.

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

ELA learning gains for our most striving 25%- in 2018 we had 18% show gains, while 68% showed learning gains in 2019! In every category, students with disabilities improved from 2018 to 2019. In 4 of the 7 categories, we saw improvement of 15+ points.

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

In 2019, we were in our third year of Smart Block, which is our intervention/acceleration block. During this year we were more intentional in moving kids to where they could get the specific support they needed. Additionally, we introduced monthly data dives in PLCs, which provided more accountability on growth.

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

Moving kids during Smart Block again! We want to get better at provide feedback to teachers on the learning we observe when walking classrooms during Smart Block. One thing we are changing in Smart Block this year is we are breaking the 2-2 mold, which is where every student gets 2 days of intervention in Math each week and 2 days of intervention in Math each week. Some children need four days a week in one subject until they get proficient- and this year they are going to get it!

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.

Professional learning needs to center around the instructional framework- the repeated opportunities for teachers to see what it means to design instruction around the framework. We need to provide professional learning around data discussions and how we can use information collected from assessments to drive instruction. We also wonder about professional learning around lesson study cycle- opportunities to grow teacher practice working with and observing colleagues as they lead instruction.

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

This year we are focusing on increasing the level of support we provide new teachers and teachers new to teaching their content. For the first six weeks of school, our leadership team will meet every Monday to walk three teachers classrooms to see the beginning, middle, and end of a lesson. We will debrief positive glows and share a next step for growth with each teacher. In six weeks, we will see all of new teachers and the teachers new to their content area. In round two of walks, admin will continue the weekly walks while our coaches spend time modeling instruction in the teachers' classrooms. By November, we will start another cycle- like the first one- to observe growth. Being consistent in growing our new teachers will ensure we sustain a culture of high performing teachers.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will continue to focus professional learning around the Florida BEST Standards, focused curriculum (Wit & Wisdom) while focusing on the Lake County Schools instructional framework. We know that great instruction starts with intentional planning focused on the purpose for learning, modeling thinking for children, using collaboration strategies that work for kids, thinking forward on how independent learning can be achieved, and guiding instruction as a way of leading learners to new understanding. We have provided professional learning around guided instruction to include watching videos of teachers on our campus naturally weaving it into instruction, but we know we have work to do in this area as the evidence that it is happening was just not there during classroom walks.
Measurable Outcome:	By supporting teachers in leading their students to new understanding, we expect proficiency and learning gains to increase in ELA and Math. Specifically, we will see the learning gains for our most striving 25% of learners in both subjects grow to 50%.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through tracking TEAM Evaluations, walkthrough data and feedback provided in OneNote. Participate in weekly leadership walks to support new teachers and teachers new to teaching in their new content area. Through bi-monthly data chats with our leadership team, we will discuss where we are seeing guided instruction happening in the classroom- and where it is not. We are committed to using data collected from the walkthrough tool to monitor subject area content standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Cousineau (cousineauk@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Lake County Schools instructional framework includes focused instruction, guided instruction, collaborative learning, and independent learning. This framework will continue to guide our instructional planning, and campus-wide we will maintain an emphasis on improving all areas of the framework. Through professional learning around high yield strategies, feedback practices that focus on what the students are learning, professional learning communities (PLCs) that are intentional in growing teacher practice, we will see learning gains grow in ELA and Math.
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. Guided instruction will guide them to new understanding. We will see learning gains grow as guided instruction becomes embedded in our practice.

Action Steps to Implement

Consistent collection and monitoring of data on a weekly basis to ensure that teachers are using high yield teaching strategies to improve student learning.

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

Develop an action plan based on data to provide support for teachers through staff development, allocation of resources, time for planning with new curricula, and Professional Learning Communities to help grow and strengthen teacher efficacy.

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

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a campus with dozens of high-performing teachers, we know we have work to do to ensure all of our teachers are provided support and opportunities that allow them to grow to become high performers themselves. Our professional learning communities (PLCs) will focus on growing teachers. Through the process of the lesson study cycle, teachers will have an opportunity to collaboratively plan a lesson, implement it in the classroom, and share feedback with each other. This will lead to more student learning.
Measurable Outcome:	By growing teacher practice, we will reach our goal of having 50% of our most striving learners show learning gains. This evidence will be monitored by iReady during the year and with Florida Standards Assessment results in the spring.
Monitoring:	We will consistently monitor our progress toward our 50% goal by: Weekly review of classroom visit feedback in OneNote Quarterly data chats with teachers Monthly leadership data dives Weekly PLCs where instructional strategies are shared
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Clark (clarks@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategies that will be implemented will be lesson study cycle and collaborative planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Lesson study cycle is an inquiry cycle that supports teachers to experiment, observe, and improve their practice. As teachers work together to study student learning, they become better and more capable of growing children.

Action Steps to Implement

Dedicated Professional Learning Committee (PLC) time, 45 min weekly; 3.5 hours per term

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

Literacy Coach and Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT) available to support implementation of lesson study cycle

Person Responsible	Katherine Pinkston (pinkstonk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Provide classroom coverage to allow for peer observations

Person Responsible	Nicole K. Farias (fariasn@lake.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate coaching cycles with teams to reflect on lesson study cycle

Person Responsible	Scott Clark (clarks@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 learning gains decreased significantly in 2021. Our most striving 25% of students did not have their needs met, as 18% had learning gains in Math and 33% had learning gains in ELA. Continuing to refine acceleration and remediation opportunities will lead to learning gains at 50% in each subject for this group.
Measurable Outcome:	By ensuring our intervention time is intentional in supporting this group, we expect to see an increase in Math (18%-50%) and ELA (33%-50%) based on school level assessment data.
Monitoring:	This focus area will be monitored through classroom visit feedback in OneNote, observations made by our leadership walking team, and monthly data dives in PLC.
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 learning gains in ELA and Math. Learning gains for all students will meet 60%, learning gains for our most striving learners will meet 50% in ELA and Math. 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 the facilitate effective remediation and acceleration learning opportunities for students, then we will increase academic achievement for all learners, including those performing in our lowest 25% of their class.

Action Steps to Implement

Thirty minutes of uninterrupted time for remediation and acceleration four times a week.
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 level 1 and 2 on FSA.

Person Responsible	Karen Hart (hartk@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.

N/A

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.

It is a high priority that we have and maintain a positive school culture and environment. We work hard to secure teacher voice in the decisions we make, understanding that teachers appreciate having things done with them as opposed to having things done to them. An example of this is around our school-wide intervention plan. We developed a consulting team comprised of teacher leaders to shape expectations around time and planning for where children will go.

Our parents are amazing partners that deserve a voice around many of the practices in our school. Parent feedback is important to help us grow and become better able to meet the needs of our families. An example of how this happens is our feedback practices. After Meet the Teacher, we put a survey out to parents to learn what worked well for them and where we can improve.

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

All of Lost Lake Elementary School's (LLES) stakeholders play an important role in fostering a positive culture and environment. Our School Advisory Council (SAC) consists of parents, teachers, and educational support personnel who work together to enhance the student experience and promote student achievement and growth. Our Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) includes parents and teachers that host family events throughout the year to promote a positive culture. Together, they fundraise to support our staff and students with instructional materials and motivational tools. We also have a high volunteer rate, which includes families, high schoolers, college interns, and business partners that come to campus and work from home assisting staff members with various duties. In addition to volunteering, our business partners promote a positive culture when donating school supplies, snacks and luncheons, or monetary amounts. Our students also have a voice as stakeholders by participating in safety patrols, chorus, Lions Beats, and National Elementary Honor Society. Lost Lake also promotes Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS) by recognizing positive reinforcement that creates and maintains a positive school climate for students and teachers. School leadership promotes a positive school culture by modeling transparent communication with all stakeholders through weekly call outs to staff and families, social media updates, and a staff S'more from the Principal. The leadership team also meets on a regular basis to discuss achievement and social emotional data. It takes a team to work together to keep a positive culture and environment. The leaders of the school strive to be active listeners, relationship builders and problem solvers.

Part V: Budget

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

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