

Lake County Schools

Sawgrass Bay Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	28
Budget to Support Goals	28

Sawgrass Bay Elementary School

16325 SUPERIOR BLVD, Clermont, FL 34714

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

Demographics

Principal: Andrea Nelson

Start Date for this Principal: 11/23/2020

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)	82%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (48%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	28

Sawgrass Bay Elementary School

16325 SUPERIOR BLVD, Clermont, FL 34714

<https://sbe.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	82%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Sawgrass Bay Elementary promotes high levels of learning for ALL and strives for excellence as we cultivate the leaders of tomorrow

Motto: We are all learners. We are all leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Nelson, Andrea	Principal	Oversee the school improvement planning process, curriculum and instruction, school safety and daily management of the campus. Collaborate closely with the guiding coalition and ensure we are displaying a common vision across campus to move student learning and teacher expertise forward.
McHenry, Samantha	Assistant Principal	Ms. McHenry works closely with VPK, kindergarten, second grade, third grade, enrichment teachers and our ESE self-contained units. She is also the textbook manager, health coordinator, school safety chair, manages facilities and oversees systems within the ESE department.
Motyl, Manuela	Reading Coach	Ms. Motyl is the K-5 Literacy Coach. She works alongside teachers during the planning process, and coaches teachers to increase proficiency with instructional best practices.
Stratton, Kara	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Ms. Stratton helps oversee the MTSS process on campus. She analyzes the data and facilitates the Tier 2 and Tier 3 meetings. She also works closely with new teachers on campus, and is the school testing coordinator.
Lees, Christina	Math Coach	Ms. Lees is the K-5 Instructional Math Coach. She works alongside teachers during the planning process, and coaches teachers to increase proficiency with instructional best practices in math.
O'Connor, Hailey	School Counselor	Helps lead the guidance department in the following areas: attendance meetings, maintaining 504 accommodation plans, case reviews, in class guidance lessons, and individual/group counseling.
Block, Cheryl	Teacher, ESE	As the ESE school specialist, Ms. Block is the ESE contact on campus. She facilitates ESE meetings, maintains ESE records and IEPs, delivers professional development, models lessons, and assists with appropriate placement of students.
Larkin, John	Dean	As the dean, Mr. Larkin works closely with the Mental Health Liaison and the PASS teacher to decrease referrals and out of school suspensions across campus. He is also the restorative practices chair on campus.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 11/23/2020, Andrea Nelson

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

5

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

630

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

46

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

12

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	0	148	135	167	187	197	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	834
Attendance below 90 percent	0	48	39	43	56	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	0	7	9	11	87	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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 7/13/2021

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

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	22	38	67	68	99	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	389

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	22	38	67	68	99	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	389

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				55%	58%	57%	51%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				62%	57%	58%	48%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	49%	53%	36%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				50%	60%	63%	52%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				50%	56%	62%	41%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	39%	51%	29%	41%	47%
Science Achievement				57%	54%	53%	50%	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	44%	60%	-16%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	60%	-7%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	59%	-2%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	45%	62%	-17%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	61%	-14%	64%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	54%	56%	-2%	53%	1%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

I-Ready data was used as the progress monitoring tool to compile the data below.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26	44	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	7	29	48
	English Language Learners	13	20	30
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18	46	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	7	18	50
	English Language Learners	13	30	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26	52	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	35
	English Language Learners	17	29	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12	37	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	33	0	19
	English Language Learners	0	29	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42	53	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	14	17	33
	English Language Learners	15	15	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	34	43	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	3	6	N/A
	English Language Learners	5	0	N/A
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34	42	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	3	7	N/A
	English Language Learners	6	33	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16	34	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	7	10	N/A
	English Language Learners	11	10	N/A

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30	38	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	8	12	N/A
	English Language Learners	0	0	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20	36	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	13	13	N/A
	English Language Learners	10	10	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	63	58	
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A		
	Students With Disabilities	43		
	English Language Learners	56		

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	11	32	36	20	27	33	17				
ELL	42	59	54	37	59	71	33				
ASN	64			57							
BLK	35	64		38	40		31				
HSP	48	45	54	42	43	42	45				
MUL	52			50							
WHT	47	56		55	44		55				
FRL	39	47	55	36	30	22	35				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	45	38	17	31	30	17				
ELL	46	65	52	46	53	36	50				

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	60	50		67	50						
BLK	39	54	64	41	41		47				
HSP	51	64	49	44	50	41	49				
MUL	49	58		40	33		50				
WHT	69	64	38	62	57	37	74				
FRL	48	58	45	43	49	35	47				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	35	25	24	35	29	30				
ELL	39	54	39	47	39	39	16				
ASN	55			73							
BLK	38	34	25	38	26	23	33				
HSP	46	47	39	46	36	30	41				
MUL	61	50		59	35		83				
WHT	62	53	35	63	52	32	63				
FRL	46	45	36	45	37	29	42				

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	49
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	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	389
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	53
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	61
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	42
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	49
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	51
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	51
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	41
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?

Math achievement and math lowest quartile learning gains are definitely an area of focus this year. Based on our data we noticed that our student have some significant gaps across grade levels. This is evident across all subgroups but especially SWD, FRL, and ELL.

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

In looking at progress monitoring data across grade levels, we noticed that the gap in proficiency begins in second grade and widens as students progress to 5th grade. This is evident in both ELA and Math. In comparing growth from baseline to mid-year to end-of year data our students did not show as much growth as the year prior.

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

We identified gaps in student learning across grade levels in the area of Math. We plan to address these needs by embedding daily spiral review by domain through a problem of the day, continue to utilize number talks, and front load or introduce upcoming standards to students through morning work. We have also built in a separate math intervention block in the master schedule.

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

ELA Learning gains showed the most improvement this year from 48% to 62% making learning gains.

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

School-wide grade level data chats were conducted and used to determine next steps and focus areas after the mid-year progress monitoring. Our academic coaches met with groups of students in the lowest quartile twice a week and provided additional instruction and support in the areas of reading and writing. We also continued with a strong focus on reading and conferring across the school. We worked to incorporate authentic literacy across all disciplines. In addition to the core instruction, students who received tier 3 interventions in reading, worked with an interventionist using the Leveled Literacy Intervention from Fountas and Pinnell.

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

Teachers will utilize common formative assessment data to group and regroup students throughout the year. Each group will focus on individual needs of students in regards to ELA and Math. In ELA,

students will be focused on reading, writing, and discussing text through book clubs and other opportunities. In Math, students will engage in problem based learning opportunities.

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 development opportunities will be provided in the following areas:

- Guided Instruction
- Using common formative assessments to drive intervention - Systematic Interventions for ALL
- Wit and Wisdom
- Foundations

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

We will build capacity on our campus through professional development opportunities and utilizing the Learning by Doing book and the Professional Learning Community framework,

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the FSA ELA and Math results along with the i-Ready progress monitoring data from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section, instructional practice as it relates to standards-aligned instruction is one of our most critical areas of focus. This area of focus was assigned as a critical area of need because the data showed gaps in proficiency across grade levels in both ELA and Math. Teachers will intentionally plan for and engage students in standards-aligned instruction with a focus on guided instruction as a strategy to transfer knowledge and responsibility for learning to students by scaffolding through questioning, prompting, and cuing.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in ELA, Math, and Science proficiency. ELA proficiency will increase from 55% to 60% Math proficiency will increase from 50% to 55%. Science proficiency will increase from 57% to 60%.
Monitoring:	-progress monitoring through common formative assessments and i-ready data -classroom walkthroughs/learning walks
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Nelson (nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will continue work in professional learning communities with an intense focus on student learning, and results. The four PLC questions will guide the learning and work within the professional learning communities as teachers plan for standards based instruction through establishing the purpose, authentic literacy, and instructional best practices. This will be monitored through admin participation, classroom walkthroughs, and progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If teachers work collaboratively with a focus on student learning, results, and instructional best practices, then they will ensure all students receive a guaranteed and viable curriculum in ELA and Math. Extensive research has been completed about how an effective professional learning community impacts student achievement. As part of the PLC process teachers will also incorporate a book study, learning walks, and the coaching cycle as needed.

Action Steps to Implement

Grade levels will participate in a structured common planning two days a week centered on student learning as it aligns to the grade level standards. They will collaborate and have conversation around being intentional with scaffolds through guided instruction. Teachers will utilize all components of the Wit and Wisdom curriculum to implement grade level instruction. Data collected through the embedded assessments will be used to move instruction forward and provide core intervention and reteach opportunities as needed.

When: 8/9/2021-6/7/2022

Frequency: Twice a Week

Evidence: Norms, planning protocols, formative assessments

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

Professional development will continue to incorporate the book "Better Learning through Structured Teaching" and also "Guided Instruction" by Douglas Fisher and Nancy Frey which breaks down

implementation of the following elements:

- Questioning to check for understanding
- Prompting to facilitate students' thinking processes and processing
- Cueing to shift students' attention to focus on specific information, errors, or partial understandings
- Explaining and modeling when students do not have sufficient knowledge to complete tasks on their own

When: 8/9/2021-6/7/2022

Frequency: Embedded in common planning

Evidence: Google Docs Form (4 PLC Questions), Presentation, Classroom walkthroughs

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

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

When: 9/1/2021-6/7/2022

Frequency: As needed

Evidence: Coaching logs, classroom walkthroughs

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

Leadership will focus on building team lead's capacity in regards to facilitating common planning. We will meet bi-weekly and utilize the book "Learning by Doing" as a guide to support.

When: 8/16/2021-6/7/2022

Frequency: Bi-Weekly

Evidence: Google Docs Form, Presentation, Classroom walkthroughs, norms, planning protocols, slide presentations.

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

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

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

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

Monitoring:
-climate surveys
-early warning signs data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Samantha McHenry (mchenrys@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

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

Action Steps to Implement

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

When: 8/10/2021-6/7/2022

Frequency: Daily

Evidence: the learning environment, learning walks, talking to students

Person Responsible Samantha McHenry (mchenrys@lake.k12.fl.us)

Morning meetings will take place each morning to set the stage for learning and foster positive relationships. Reflection questions based on the 7 Habits are embedded in the daily news. Teachers will utilize the Leader in Me and Harmony curriculums for social emotional lessons and to build classroom community.

When: 8/10/2021-6/7/2022

Frequency: Daily

Evidence: Classroom Walkthroughs, lesson plans

Person Responsible Samantha McHenry (mchenrys@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

When: 8/10/2021-6/7/2022

Frequency: As needed

Evidence: Decreased OSS, Documentation

Person Responsible John Larkin (larkinj@lake.k12.fl.us)

Meet with the guiding coalition to analyze and support equitable practices across campus.

When: 8/10/2021-6/7/2022

Frequency: Monthly

Evidence: Meeting Notes, slide presentations

Person Responsible Samantha McHenry (mchenrys@lake.k12.fl.us)

To encourage positive behaviors students leaders will be selected and celebrated weekly and monthly for following the 7 Habits.

When: 8/10/2021-6/7/2022

Frequency: Weekly/Monthly

Evidence: Notes, Google Forms

Person Responsible Samantha McHenry (mchenrys@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional staff will use ongoing formative assessments and progress monitoring data to inform intervention and acceleration activities to increase learning gains for all students. All students will participate in a "walk to" intervention to best meet their instructional needs in both ELA and Math. If teachers use ongoing formative assessments and progress monitoring data to inform intervention and acceleration for all students, then students will receive timely feedback that will help move their understanding of the content forward.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in ELA and Math Learning Gains. ELA Learning Gains will increase from 62% to 65%. ELA Learning Gains (LQ) will increase from 48% to 55%. Math Learning Gains will increase from 50% to 55%. Math Learning Gains (LQ) will increase from 38% to 40%
Monitoring:	-common formative assessments -classroom walkthrough data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Nelson (nelsona@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Analyzing and using ongoing formative assessment and progress monitoring data to inform interventions and acceleration for ELA and math will help increase learning gains. This will be evidenced when discussing "What we will do for students who did not get it, and what will we do for those who already know it" within our professional learning communities. The progress monitoring data from Performance Matters and the frequent formative assessments will be analyzed on an ongoing bases by coaches, admin, and teachers. This data will be used to group and re-group students accordingly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If teachers use ongoing formative assessment and progress monitoring data to intervene or accelerate students then students will receive timely and effective intervention. To monitor this strategy, we will complete classroom walkthroughs during the acceleration block, participate in data analysis conversations with teachers and progress monitor students on the mastery of essential standards in both ELA and Math.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will analyze and discuss student work products and common formative assessment data and form intervention groups accordingly. Students who scored a Level 1 or 2 on the ELA FSA will be provided with additional reading support using the Scholastic Guided Reading Leveled library books and will be assessed using the benchmark assessment. Writing teams will meet throughout the year to review student data, form new intervention groups, and plan for instruction. Teacher will have access to an intervention resource room where they will be able to check out resources specific to their students' needs. Examples of the curriculum that will be used includes the following:

Leveled Literacy Interventions
 Scholastic Short Reads
 Collaborative Classrooms - Book Clubs
 Collaborative Classrooms - Being a Reader
 Scholastic Edge
 Scholastic Guided Reading Library - Fiction and Nonfiction

When: 8/16/2021-6/7/2022

Frequency: Daily

Evidence: IDR notebooks, Walkthroughs, Scholastic Benchmark Assessments

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

Teachers will implement “Number Talks” and Problem Based Learning Experiences during the math block to promote a focus on thinking and talking in math as well as increase mathematical fluency. Each teacher will receive the Number Talk book and professional development as needed. Teachers will also build in a daily spiral review through problem solving and front load or introduce upcoming standards through morning work.

When: 8/16/2021-6/7/2022

Frequency: Daily

Evidence: Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson Plans

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

The MTSS problem solving team will monitor and support tier 2 and tier 3 interventions specifically designed to increase proficiency of the lowest quartile using Leveled Literacy Intervention.

When: 8/16/2021-6/7/2022

Frequency: Monthly

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

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

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on the 2021 FSA ELA proficiency data and the beginning of the year i-Ready progress monitoring data, instructional practice specifically relating to ELA is a critical area of focus. This was identified as a critical area of focus because the 2021 data revealed that less than 50% of our students in grades 3-5 met reading proficiency. In addition, 33% of our students in K-3 are considered at-risk as evidenced by the beginning of year i-Ready diagnostic assessment. This area of focus will improve student learning and success by ensuring we are intentional in planning for and utilizing appropriate instructional strategies. In addition, we will use data to identify instructional needs, progress monitor frequently, provide timely supports/interventions to students and make adjustments to instruction as needed.

By focusing on this area we expect to see the following increases in the percentage of students scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2022 FSA ELA Assessment:

3rd Grade 42% to 45%

4th Grade 47% to 50%

5th Grade 45% to 48%

Measurable Outcome:

In addition, we expect to see a decrease of students in K-3 who are considered at-risk on the end of year i-Ready Assessment:

Kindergarten 65% to 20%

1st grade 9% to 1%

2nd grade 28% to 10%

3rd grade 28% to 10%

Monitoring:

i-Ready will be utilized to monitor progress towards the goal of increasing proficiency for all students. Students who have been identified as at-risk and in need of additional interventions will be monitored monthly through the i-Ready progress monitoring assessment. In addition, teachers will use ongoing common formative assessments to ensure students receive additional support and/or instruction and provide targeted interventions as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:

-Teachers will plan reading instruction in the six components of reading and implement core ELA materials aligned to standards that incorporate the science of reading and integrate content-rich texts while students engage in authentic literacy through reading, writing, thinking, and talking.

-Teachers in each grade level will utilize common formative assessment data to appropriately group students to receive targeted and timely intervention for 30 additional minutes outside of the 120 minute ELA block, 4 times per week. Teachers will provide systematic, explicit, and interactive small group instruction targeting foundational/barrier skills. Intervention groups will be fluid, flexible, allowing students to rotate based on evidence of their learning.

-The following evidence-based programs will be utilized: i-Ready Tools for Instruction, Leveled Literacy Intervention, FCRR - Florida Center for Reading Research

Rationale for Evidence-

If teachers plan for and engage in instruction that incorporates the science of reading and integrates content-rich texts then we will ensure all students receive a high-quality instruction. In addition if we provide systematic, explicit, and interactive small group

based instruction based on students' needs as evidenced by data, we will ensure we close gaps
Strategy: and continue to move students towards proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

-Teachers will engage in collaborative planning twice a week with the literacy coach and admin, as they plan for standards-aligned instruction and select appropriate strategies to deliver high-quality teaching for all students using the district adopted core curriculum, Wit and Wisdom. Teachers will have conversation around the purpose and ensure students have a clear understanding of what they are learning, why it's important, and how they will demonstrate understanding or mastery. In addition teachers will plan for students to consolidate their thinking through collaboration with their peers and also provide multiple opportunities to practice independently and show evidence of their thinking.

When: 8/9/2021-6/7/2022

Frequency: Twice a Week

Evidence: Norms, planning protocols, lesson plans

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

Teachers in K-2 will implement the core adopted Wilson Foundations program, which incorporates the science of reading and writing to address critical foundational skills. Formative assessments built into the program to monitor student learning.

When: 8/9/2021-6/7/2022

Frequency: Daily

Evidence: lesson plans, walkthrough data

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

Teachers will utilize diagnostic and other pre-assessment data to determine students' needs and form appropriate groups. Based on the data, the following intervention programs will be implemented with fidelity 4 times per week in 30 minute blocks to provide explicit instruction targeting foundational skills and comprehension as needed:

- i-Ready Tools for Instruction
- Leveled Literacy Intervention
- FCRR
- Collaborative Classrooms Book Clubs

Data will be analyzed bi-weekly or monthly depending on the standard or skills students are working on. Students will rotate groups as needed or indicated by the assessment data. Groups will target students with significant gaps, students close to proficiency, and also those who are on grade level or above.

When: 8/9/2021-6/7/2022

Frequency: Intervention Groups - 4 times per week, data conversations - bi-weekly/monthly

Evidence: lesson plans, intervention block grouping list

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

The leadership team will continue to focus on equitable practices across all subgroups through the guiding coalition. As we receive progress monitoring data, we will be discussing and reflecting on equitable practices that help reach all students. The ESE subgroup will be closely monitored based on the ESSA data by the guiding coalition. Students in the ESE subgroup will also participate in daily Reading and Math interventions to meet their individual needs and close existing gaps.

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.

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

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

We will collaborate with our SAC and PTO, hold family meetings and workshops, continually send out correspondence in both English and Spanish in order to reach all parents and guardians, announcements on the school website and the marquee. Flyers will also be taken to community business partners and to local apartment complexes to be distributed and we will send out the information through school messenger, Peachjar and electronic communication systems.

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
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00