

The School Board of Highlands County

Lake Country 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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Lake Country Elementary School

516 COUNTY ROAD 29, Lake Placid, FL 33852

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

Demographics

Principal: Laura Halloran

Start Date for this Principal: 12/17/2020

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	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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (47%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Lake Country Elementary School

516 COUNTY ROAD 29, Lake Placid, FL 33852

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

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	57%

School Grades History

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

Lake Country Elementary School's Mission Statement:

Lake Country Elementary, where

Leaders

Celebrate

Excellence

Provide the school's vision statement.

Transforming Today's Learners into Tomorrow's Leaders.

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
Halloran, Laura	Principal	Principal
Gilbert, Christine	Assistant Principal	
Ming, Valerie	Instructional Coach	MTSS Coordinator
Baker, Jennifer	Reading Coach	
Tomlinson, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Veley, Linda	Teacher, K-12	
Lipscomb, Meredith	Teacher, K-12	
Wirick, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Duncan, Katherine	Teacher, K-12	
Farmer, Linda	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 12/17/2020, Laura Halloran

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

618

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

1

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

5

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	109	119	91	92	81	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	38	23	20	20	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	5	10	7	8	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	6	7	6	6	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	17	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	20	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	1	6	2	11	27	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

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	7	10	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/24/2021

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	98	94	87	97	85	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	535
Attendance below 90 percent	13	6	9	5	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	3	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	21	15	10	20	19	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Course failure in Math	16	13	6	14	22	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	16	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	7	2	3	7	18	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	6	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	98	94	87	97	85	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	535
Attendance below 90 percent	13	6	9	5	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	3	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	21	15	10	20	19	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Course failure in Math	16	13	6	14	22	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	16	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	7	2	3	7	18	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	6	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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				46%	50%	57%	42%	48%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	54%	58%	53%	48%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	49%	53%	52%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	57%	63%	59%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				66%	57%	62%	59%	50%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	44%	51%	45%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				43%	45%	53%	41%	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	42%	50%	-8%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	49%	-2%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	45%	-1%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	56%	-5%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	68%	60%	8%	64%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	49%	6%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	40%	43%	-3%	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.

MTSS
Aims Web
mClass
iReady

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31	30	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	30	46
	Students With Disabilities	19	25	56
	English Language Learners	14	14	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35	42	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	39	34
	Students With Disabilities	31	50	38
	English Language Learners	0	14	7
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35	41	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	37	39
	Students With Disabilities	27	35	35
	English Language Learners	15	25	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23	40	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	34	40
	Students With Disabilities	31	39	39
	English Language Learners	15	20	30

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36	50	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	43	44
	Students With Disabilities	29	50	48
	English Language Learners	33	23	39
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31	47	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	43	35
	Students With Disabilities	28	46	50
	English Language Learners	11	54	23
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32	53	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	44	51
	Students With Disabilities	41	60	63
	English Language Learners	17	29	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31	42	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	37	53
	Students With Disabilities	35	60	70
	English Language Learners	32	32	52

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31	36	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	31	31
	Students With Disabilities	38	38	33
	English Language Learners	7	0	7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18	29	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	28	30
	Students With Disabilities	22	46	39
	English Language Learners	7	7	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			40
Science	Economically Disadvantaged			37
	Students With Disabilities			65
	English Language Learners			19
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			

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	38	42		43	58		50				
ELL	40	53		48	53		19				
BLK	27	33		33	42		17				
HSP	55	58	83	56	58	60	30				
WHT	68	58		69	74		80				
FRL	51	50	60	52	58	57	37				
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	27	42	50	40	62	59	24				
ELL	17	50	53	41	59	60	20				
BLK	23	40	27	34	47	55	20				
HSP	42	56	54	55	63	54	36				

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
WHT	61	63	67	74	79	82	65				
FRL	43	54	51	56	65	59	40				
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	9	48	43	16	48	45	8				
ELL	32	50	47	51	55	27	24				
BLK	32	64	64	39	55	43	7				
HSP	38	51	48	60	60	43	35				
WHT	49	51	50	66	61	54	57				
FRL	39	53	52	57	58	45	36				

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	54
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	435
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
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	57
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	70
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	53
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?

Continued growth in ELA achievement, with growth in ELA learning gains and lowest quartile in grades 3-5.

Black and ELL students are lowest performing in ELA and Math.

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

Science Achievement for 5th grade. Math learning gains and math lowest quartile.

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 unfinished learning and closing learning gaps. Address specific unfinished learning in Math.

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

ELA learning gains.

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

Targeted MTSS and intervention support for all students.

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

WIN acceleration groups for Math and ELA for all grade levels.

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.

Enrichment strategies and resources. Identifying students for acceleration.

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

Targeted MTSS, regular progress monitoring, additional instructional coaching/support for instructional staff. Additional support groups for students for remediation/intervention.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to ELA Learning Proficiency

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need based on the previous achievement levels on the 18-19 FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome with this area of focus is to increase the number of students who score a level 3 or higher on the 21-22 ELA FSA. During the 21-22 school year, the percentage of students scoring as proficient will increase 2% from (53%) to (55%).
Monitoring:	Ongoing progress monitoring (including PLC's, Stocktake, classroom walk throughs) with district wide and state data (iReady, Baseline, FSA)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Baker (bakerj1@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Aligned curriculum, Authentic Literacy, Effective Instruction to ensure high levels of learning for all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidences suggests that high quality curriculum and effective instruction align to best practices promote students achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementing curriculum with fidelity with use of district curriculum maps, models of effective instruction, and increased time in text.

Person Responsible Jennifer Baker (bakerj1@highlands.k12.fl.us)

2. Differentiated support for students in ELA including (W.I.N. Groups, MTSS, individual support).

Person Responsible Jennifer Baker (bakerj1@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#2. Other specifically relating to ELA Math Proficiency

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need based on the previous achievement levels on the 18-19 FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome with this area of focus is to increase the number of students who score a level 3 or higher on the 21-22 Math FSA. During the 21-22 school year, the percentage of students scoring as proficient will increase 3% from (56 %) to (59%).
Monitoring:	Ongoing progress monitoring (including PLC's, Stocktake, classroom walk throughs) with district wide and state data (iReady, Baseline, FSA)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laura Halloran (halloral@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Aligned curriculum, Authentic Literacy, Effective Instruction to ensure high levels of learning for all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidences suggests that high quality curriculum and effective instruction align to best practices promote students achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementing curriculum with fidelity with use of district curriculum maps, models of effective instruction, and increased time in text.

Person Responsible Laura Halloran (halloral@highlands.k12.fl.us)

2. Differentiated support for students in Math including (W.I.N. Groups, MTSS, individual support).

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Other specifically relating to Science Proficiency

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need based on the previous achievement levels on the 18-19 NGSSS.

Measurable Outcome: The intended outcome with this area of focus is to increase the number of students who score a level 3 or higher on the 21-22 Science NGSSS. During the 21-22 school year, the percentage of students scoring as proficient will increase 3% from (40 %) to (43%).

Monitoring: Ongoing progress monitoring (including PLC's, Stocktake, classroom walk throughs) with district wide and state data (Baseline, NGSSS)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christine Gilbert (gilbertc@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Aligned curriculum, Authentic Literacy, Effective Instruction to ensure high levels of learning for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Evidences suggests that high quality curriculum and effective instruction align to best practices promote students achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementing curriculum with fidelity with use of district curriculum maps, models of effective instruction, and increased time in text.

Person Responsible Christine Gilbert (gilbertc@highlands.k12.fl.us)

2. Increase student engagement with STEM Lab special for all students weekly.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. Other specifically relating to ELA Learning Gains

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need based on the previous achievement levels on the 18-19 FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome with this area of focus is to increase the learning gains of the lowest quartile on the 21-22 ELA FSA. During the 21-22 school year, the percentage of students scoring as proficient will increase 2% from (48 %) to (50%).
Monitoring:	Ongoing progress monitoring (including PLC's, Stocktake, classroom walk throughs) with district wide and state data (iReady, Baseline, FSA)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Baker (bakerj1@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Aligned curriculum, Authentic Literacy, Effective Instruction to ensure high levels of learning for all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidences suggests that high quality curriculum and effective instruction align to best practices promote students achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementing curriculum with fidelity with use of district curriculum maps, models of effective instruction, and increased time in text.

Person Responsible Jennifer Baker (bakerj1@highlands.k12.fl.us)

2. Differentiated support for students in ELA including (W.I.N. Groups, MTSS, individual support).

Person Responsible Jennifer Baker (bakerj1@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#5. Other specifically relating to Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Student attendance impacts student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

Decrease number of students who's attendance is below 90% from (86%) to (90%).

Monitoring:

Student attendance will be regularly monitored through Skyward and the SARC Process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Halloran (halloral@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Monthly SARC Attendance Monitoring with admin, teachers, School Social Worker, Data Operator

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

High number of students less then 90% attendance.
Students not making academic growth due to absenteeism.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Communication between parents, school, and student support services

Person Responsible

Laura Halloran (halloral@highlands.k12.fl.us)

2. Incentives for students to promote increased attendance

Person Responsible

Laura Halloran (halloral@highlands.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.

School wide discipline data below state and district average. We will continue character education for all students using "Character Counts" program. Positive behavior interventions and supports continued. Continued professional development and support for staff for incentives/ interventions, prevention, and support.

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.

Lake Country has built a positive school culture through the AVID program, Character Counts, providing monthly class meetings focused on social-emotional skills through our guidance/school counselor; student mentoring programs, along with team building activities, monthly habit boosters and pep rallies, students of the month, staff of the month spotlights.

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

LCE holds parent meetings, workshops and quarterly parent/ teacher conferences. We will be working closely with our community partners to have guest speakers on campus in order to entice students to think about years past elementary. Leadership luncheons will occur where the administration will take students into the community to visit local businesses and build relationships within our community. We will be working with LPMS AVID in order to have student leaders and speakers teach our students about the benefits of AVID.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: ELA Learning Proficiency	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: ELA Math Proficiency	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Science Proficiency	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: ELA Learning Gains	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00