

The School Board of Highlands County

Sun 'n Lake 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	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Sun 'n Lake Elementary School

4515 PONCE DE LEON BLVD, Sebring, FL 33872

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~snl/>

Demographics

Principal: Cheryl Vermilye

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 (64%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Highlands 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	23

Sun 'n Lake Elementary School

4515 PONCE DE LEON BLVD, Sebring, FL 33872

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~snl/>

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	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Highlands 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.

All stakeholders collaborate to create a student-led, positive learning community where excellence happens!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Successfully Nurturing Learners

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
Vermilye, Cheryl	Principal	Ensuring educational strategies are in place that support effective learning for all students. Serve as a facilitator, guide, and supporter of effective instructional practices to ensure student success.
Lowe, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Assist the school principal in the leadership, coordination, supervision and management of the school program and operation. Assist the principal in the transformation of the school culture into a results-oriented collaborative learning community.
Brown, Christine	Teacher, K-12	
Bullock, Morgan	Teacher, K-12	
Chavis, Christina	School Counselor	
Freeland, Melinda	Instructional Coach	
Roth, LaNita	Instructional Coach	
Saunders, Christin	Teacher, K-12	
Williams, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Zimmerman, Shonda	Teacher, K-12	
Manrique, Paul	Teacher, PreK	
Smith, Marilyn	Teacher, K-12	
McGovern, Kristina	Instructional Technology	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Cheryl Vermilye

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

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

652

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

10

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	116	104	111	103	91	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	626
Attendance below 90 percent	23	27	20	16	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	11	6	1	2	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	3	23	12	2	3	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Course failure in Math	3	14	7	4	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	3	6	1	7	22	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	8	12	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
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 8/31/2021

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	87	122	92	97	105	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	25	10	10	10	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	7	6	1	10	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA	51	40	1	18	5	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
Course failure in Math	35	31	2	27	12	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	

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	87	122	92	97	105	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	25	10	10	10	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	7	6	1	10	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA	51	40	1	18	5	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
Course failure in Math	35	31	2	27	12	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	
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	

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				66%	50%	57%	59%	48%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	54%	58%	48%	48%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	49%	53%	23%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				74%	57%	63%	62%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				72%	57%	62%	45%	50%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	44%	51%	19%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				65%	45%	53%	61%	52%	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	66%	50%	16%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	49%	14%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	45%	18%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	74%	56%	18%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	74%	60%	14%	64%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	49%	18%	60%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	61%	43%	18%	53%	8%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Progress Monitoring via iReady Diagnostic for Grades 1 - 5 ELA and Math

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65.20	51.7	64.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	61.7	50.0	59.8
	Students With Disabilities	55.6	40.7	48.0
	English Language Learners	50.0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	57.9	51.7	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	55.6	44.0	0
	Students With Disabilities	57.7	55.6	0
	English Language Learners	50.0	25.0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50.5	55.1	58.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	43.1	45.6	52.9
	Students With Disabilities	26.10	29.2	40.0
	English Language Learners	50	50	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35.8	44.9	33.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	24.6	35.3	0
	Students With Disabilities	17.4	33.3	0
	English Language Learners	50	100	
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53.1	47.2	53.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	52.1	40.0	50.0
	Students With Disabilities	56.3	38.9	55.6
	English Language Learners	12.5	11.1	11.1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	40.7	42.7	53.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	25.8	34.5	44.4
	Students With Disabilities	35.0	38.9	43.8
	English Language Learners	0	33.3	11.1

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	45.7	51.6	55.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	40.3	49.2	50.8
	Students With Disabilities	40.0	40.9	31.8
	English Language Learners	0	28.6	28.6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35.9	43.2	53.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	30.6	36.9	46.2
	Students With Disabilities	25.0	31.8	27.3
	English Language Learners	0	0	42.9
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53.9	61.3	70.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	45.5	47.9	64.6
	Students With Disabilities	42.1	55.0	65.0
	English Language Learners	42.9	42.9	57.1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	47.4	52.5	65.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	38.6	45.8	58.3
	Students With Disabilities	36.8	50.0	60.0
	English Language Learners	14.3	28.6	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	31			36							
ELL	48			48							
ASN	88			94							
BLK	50	40		43	27		43				
HSP	55	65		55	45		68				
MUL	64			64							
WHT	63	41		75	54		60				
FRL	57	44	25	59	44	47	53				
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	41	48	25	50	67	42	73				
ELL	56	73		67	75						
ASN	100			100							
BLK	44	51	41	54	62	67	48				
HSP	67	67	56	75	69	42	70				
MUL	73			91							
WHT	72	67	64	79	75	60	69				
FRL	58	57	46	67	68	59	58				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	42	28	28	30	17	14				
ELL	33	40		46	27						
ASN	95	93		95	71		100				
BLK	38	32	14	39	36	23	35				
HSP	56	46	37	57	36	14	47				
MUL	59			82							
WHT	69	52	25	71	53		73				
FRL	55	46	25	55	39	20	55				

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	362
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	48
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	91
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	41
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	58
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	64
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	59
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	47
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?

COVID-19: Students who were impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic beginning in March 2020.

Students with Disabilities was the lowest-performing area at 48% for the 2020-2021 school year. This subgroup was not below the federal index score of 41%. However, we would like to increase this overall number to 50% or higher for our students this year. We follow the state's inclusion model, high expectations for all students in the classroom. We need to continue to support our students within the classroom, monitor their data, and give a quality support facilitation model.

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

COVID-19: Students were impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic beginning in March 2020. Thirty-three percent of students within the lowest quartile demonstrated learning gains for ELA on the 2021 state assessment. Forty-two percent of students within the lowest quartile demonstrated learning gains for Math on the 2021 state assessment. The greatest need for improvement will be

increasing learning gains for students within our lowest quartile specifically focusing on student with disabilities.

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

COVID-19: Students were impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic beginning in March 2020. Due to the COVID -19, students have been out of the school setting for the last nine weeks of the 2019-2020 school year. 2019-2020 FSA testing, along with iReady was not administered, therefore there is a reasonable expectation for adjustment in the 2020-2021 SIP Goals and learning for students.

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

All of our subpopulations improved from the previous year, however, we will continue to focus on our students and their success. One area that we will work on this year will be our economically disadvantaged students. Their data increased to 60%, however, we would like to focus on increasing the student performance to 61% for our students in this population.

New actions our school has taken over the past two years have been: Growth Mindset believing in the Power of Yet, building student relationships, Data Chats with students:

students understanding that they are accountable for their learning, focusing teacher-small groups on lowest quartile, iReady, departmentalizing in grades 4 and 5 and

Professional Learning Communities for our teachers.

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

New actions our school has taken over the past two years have been: Growth Mindset believing in the Power of Yet, building student relationships, Data Chats with students: students understanding that they are accountable for their learning, focusing teacher-small groups on lowest quartile, iReady, departmentalizing in grades 4 and 5 and Professional Learning Communities for our teachers.

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

Continued focus on standards-based Tier I instruction

Weekly Focus Planning and Progress Monitoring with Teams during PLC time twice per week, Tuesday - ELA and Thursday - Math

WIN (What I Need) Time - Targeted Remediation/Enrichment focused on student needs for 30 minutes each school day.

Instructional Coaching: Coaching Cycles, IPG walkthroughs to support student-centered learning, working with TNTP (The New Teacher Project) to enhance coaching cycle/targeted feedback to teachers

Quarterly Progress Monitoring on individual students with individual teachers

Stocktake - Targeting academic focus areas and reviewing monthly goals

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.

PLC - Global Ed online resources, job-embedded training after team self-assessment

Stocktake - Targeting academic focus areas and reviewing monthly goals

District Training: Amplify, MTSS/MCC/SCC Meetings, MClass

School-Based Training - Data Analysis & Tools, Common Formative Assessments/Common Grades, Curriculum/Standards

Instructional Coaching: Coaching Cycles, IPG walkthroughs to support student-centered learning, working with TNTP (The New Teacher Project) to enhance coaching cycle/targeted feedback to teachers

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

Stocktake - This process allows for a continuous improvement model. Allowing administrative team and key stakeholders to review data and effective practices each month. This will then allow us to grow and adjust focus towards success as needed. Additionally, building teacher capacity around the student-centered coaching model will build sustainable effective best practices within the classroom for years to come.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed from the student achievement on the ELA FSA for the 2020-2021 school year. This Area of Focus impacts student learning and success by increasing learning gains for students in the lowest quartile in English Language Arts. Student success is measured when students are able to become more confident and successful readers and writers, demonstrating greater proficiency with the Florida State Standards.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase learning gains in literacy for students achieving in the lowest 25% from 33% to 50% for grades 4-5 on the ELA FSA.

Monitoring:

This Area of Focus will be monitored using mClass and iReady diagnostic data, formative classroom data, and the 2021-2022 ELA FSA data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

LaNita Roth (rothl@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

To increase student achievement in this area the evidence-based strategies will include: Admin will set the Focus of the year with staff by introducing current and historical data. Teachers will collaboratively plan using models of effective ELA instruction and components of the IPG. Teachers will be active members of a PLC. Teachers will monitor and discuss student data weekly at PLC. Teacher will meet with administrators/instructional coaches to review their data 4 times a year at progress monitoring meetings. Teachers will adjust instruction to meet student instructional needs. School-wide WIN (What I Need) time built into the master schedule to focus on intensive remediation and instruction daily. Instruction coaches will use the model of effective coaching cycles to provide support to teachers. Participate in monthly Stocktake meetings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The strategies listed above are research-based best practices. Each of these strategies align with the district strategic plan. The strategies are centered around metrics that can be measured and monitored with student data. Instructional practices will be data-aligned and monitored to support student learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed from the student achievement on the Math FSA for the 2020-2021 school year. This Area of Focus impacts student learning and success by increasing learning gains for students in the lowest quartile in Math. Student success is measured when students are able to become more confident and successful mathematical thinkers, demonstrating greater proficiency with the Florida State Standards.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase learning gains in math for students achieving in the lowest 25% from 42% to 50% for grades 4-5 on the 2021-2022 Math FSA.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored using iReady diagnostic data, formative classroom data, and the 2021-2022 Math FSA data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melinda Freeland (freelanm@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>To increase student achievement in this area the evidence-based strategies will include: Admin will set the Focus of the year with staff by introducing current and historical data. Teachers will collaboratively plan using models of effective Math instruction and components of the IPG. Teachers will be active members of a PLC. Teachers will monitor and discuss student data weekly at PLC. Teacher will meet with administrators/instructional coaches to review their data 4 times a year at progress monitoring meetings. Teachers will adjust instruction to meet student instructional needs. School-wide WIN (What I Need) time built into the master schedule to focus on intensive remediation and instruction daily. Instruction coaches will use the model of effective coaching cycles to provide support to teachers. Participate in monthly Stocktake meetings.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategies listed above are research-based best practices. Each of these strategies align with the district strategic plan. The strategies are centered around metrics that can be measured and monitored with student data. Instructional practices will be data-aligned and monitored to support student learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus	For the 2020-2021 school year, 72% of students attended school 90% or more school days. Instruction and student success are directly effected by student attendance, making this a critical need.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Increase attendance from 72% of students attending 90% or more days to at least 80% of students in attendance 90% or more school days.
Monitoring:	Attendance data will be monitored and reviewed weekly using Skyward (SIS) reporting.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christina Chavis (chavisc@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SARC (School Attendance Review Committee) meets weekly to progress monitor student attendance and update the spreadsheet as needed. Teachers building relationships with students and families through multiple means: Bloomz, phone calls, school app, and monthly attendance newsletter. Provide personalized early outreach through teacher, staff, or SARC contact.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that attendance improves when students feel welcome, connected, and cared for at school. Assisting families in understanding the negative effects of chronic absenteeism can encourage building a habit of regular attendance and emphasize its importance on their student's academic success.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

Per the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org

Sun 'n Lake Elementary is ranked as #859 out of 1395 elementary schools statewide.

Violent Incidents are rated at moderate/middle with 3 incidents of threat or intimation and battery.

Property Incidents are rated at very low with zero incidents.

Drug/Public Order Incidents are rated very high with 2 trespass incidents.

Student Suspension is rated very high with 60 reported student suspensions.

As a PBiS School, we are committed to creating a positive learning environment for all stakeholders, students, and staff. We will target reducing student suspension by having a proactive approach, working with our PBiS team to share data, positive intervention strategies, and work towards reducing student suspension rates.

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.

As we continue to work through the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, school culture and environment are even more critical than in the past. Our school motto for the year is "Success is Our Standard." We will promote positive relationships and family engagement through the year utilizing technology, such as Google Classroom and Bloomz to support student success. We will promote a positive school culture and learning environment through innovative practices.

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

Internal stakeholders include teachers, students, families of students, and school staff members. Stakeholders are involved in decision making and promoting a positive school culture and environment by participating in PTO, SAC, family nights (which may look different due to COVID concerns and restrictions), and communicating concerns through climate surveys.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00