

Broward County Public Schools

Lake Forest Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Lake Forest Elementary School

3550 SW 48TH AVE, Pembroke Park, FL 33023

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Denise Dopico Lizano

Start Date for this Principal: 10/4/2011

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 Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Broward 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	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Lake Forest Elementary School

3550 SW 48TH AVE, Pembroke Park, FL 33023

[no web address on file]

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	81%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	97%

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 Broward 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.

To provide all students with equitable learning opportunities through engaging instruction, high expectations and relevant content while cultivating the well-being of students and staff in a safe learning environment

Provide the school's vision statement.

To empower students to pursue their aspirations and equitably prepare them to contribute to society by practicing the core values of the school: Respect, Ownership and Determination

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
Boyd, Sharon	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Assist coaches and teachers in reflecting on and analyzing their practice and reviewing student work to inform instruction and enhance student achievement. *Monitor and analyze data to inform high quality instruction leading to improved student achievement. *Maintain accurate budget to assign human capital and appropriate resources within the school * Maintain safe and secure learning environment for students.
Rodriguez, Cristina	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Assist coaches and teachers in reflecting on and analyzing their practice and reviewing student work to inform instruction and enhance student achievement. *Monitor and analyze data to inform high quality instruction leading to improved student achievement. * Maintain safe and secure learning environment for students.- *Scheduling in of Tier 2 Tier 3 students (additional Response to Intervention (RtI) contact)
Delorme, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	<p>4th Grade teacher</p> <p>Title I & Equity Liaison, Union Steward, Debate Coach</p> <p>Contact between school and Title I Department, document and maintain records for all Title I activities</p> <p>Disseminate information to all stakeholders regarding Title I requirements and maintain programmatic and budget deadlines for all related programs (Title I, Equity, Debate).</p>
Hamilton, Shelly Ann	Reading Coach	<p>The Literacy Coach will provide personalized support based on identified needs of individual teachers and differentiated supports that foster the growth and development of teachers. In addition to strategic literacy-focused mentoring, coaches will support teachers to develop skills in analyzing student work, differentiating instruction, supporting English Language learners and students with special needs. Also, coaches will work collaboratively, build skills, analyze data, examine needs related to professional practice and engage in peer coaching with teachers.</p>
Clark, Angela	Math Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * School Advisory Co-Chair, Math Coach * Assist teachers in reflecting and analyzing their practice and reviewing student work to inform instruction and enhance student achievement. * Communicate math expectations and academic results to all stakeholders, while providing support and strategic intervention when needed.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 10/4/2011, Denise Dopico Lizano

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.*

11

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.*

41

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

573

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.

1

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	89	73	82	101	94	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	526
Attendance below 90 percent	6	4	4	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	4	12	21	19	29	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

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	4	10	9	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	1	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/10/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	74	78	108	96	88	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	536
Attendance below 90 percent	25	10	22	12	18	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	2	4	1	6	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	89	82	114	102	95	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	37	18	39	17	26	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	2	4	1	6	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				45%	59%	57%	42%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	60%	58%	49%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	54%	53%	53%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	65%	63%	51%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	66%	62%	51%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	53%	51%	53%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				41%	46%	53%	22%	49%	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	47%	60%	-13%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	41%	62%	-21%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	59%	-15%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	62%	65%	-3%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	67%	-11%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	64%	-8%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	42%	49%	-7%	53%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Progress monitoring program was used K-5 in the 20/21 school year. 5th Grade science was monitored using School city assessments, Mastery Connect, Beginning of the Year assessment, BSA and FSA End of Year state assessment..

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20/27.8	18/25.4	26/35.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/29.5	16/26.2	24/37.5
	Students With Disabilities	6/26.1	4/18.2	2/8.7
	English Language Learners	1/12.50	1/16.7	2/28.6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17/24.3	17/23.3	27/37
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/23.7	14/22.6	24/37.5
	Students With Disabilities	5/22.7	3/13	6/27.3
	English Language Learners	1/14.3	0/0	2/28.6
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19/18.8	32/31.1	40/40
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/18.9	30/33	36/40.4
	Students With Disabilities	3/15	9/47.4	9/47.4
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/7.1	3/21.4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10/10.2	19/18.4	20/19.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/11.4	17/18.7	18/20.2
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	3/15	4/20
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/7.1	1/6.7

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39/41.1	43/44.3	49/51
	Economically Disadvantaged	33/43.4	36/46.8	39/52
	Students With Disabilities	4/18.2	5/22.7	4/18.2
	English Language Learners	1/7.7	1/6.7	3/18.8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11/11.7	19/20	24/25.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/12	17/22.7	22/29.7
	Students With Disabilities	1/4.5	5/22.7	3/13.6
	English Language Learners	2/15.4	0/0	2/12.5
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10/12	22/25.9	25/28.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/12.9	20/27.8	24/32.4
	Students With Disabilities	2/12.5	2/12.5	1/6.7
	English Language Learners	1/7.7	0/0	4/25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10/12	20/23.3	29/33.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/13	19/26.4	27/37.5
	Students With Disabilities	1/6.3	1/6.3	3/20
	English Language Learners	1/7.1	2/13.3	3/20

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20/22.7	19/21.6	28/32.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/22.5	16/20	25/31.6
	Students With Disabilities	1/5.6	3/16.7	2/11.1
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16/18.2	22/24.4	44/49.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/16.3	20/24.4	40/49.4
	Students With Disabilities	1/5.6	4/22.2	4/22.2
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/9.4	7/8	32/36
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/5	6/8	28/35
	Students With Disabilities	1/5	2/11	2/28
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

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	19	19		17	31		20				
ELL	32	60		39	42		58				
BLK	27	37	43	30	42	62	30				
HSP	37	61		38	35		50				
FRL	34	45	41	37	42	59	33				
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	25	36	42	33	52	56	27				
ELL	44	49	53	64	66	42	38				
BLK	40	45	44	56	57	53	37				
HSP	49	55	63	65	67	44	42				
FRL	45	49	50	59	61	49	39				

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	15	38	42	25	35	38	7				
ELL	35	55	67	62	55	40	30				
BLK	39	47	49	46	47	47	18				
HSP	47	56	73	64	58	64	36				
FRL	41	50	53	51	50	53	22				

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	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	26
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	300
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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	43
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	39
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	41
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

Due to inconsistent learning platforms and attendance issues there was a drop in all academic content areas with the exception of learning gains in our lowest 25%ile in math in comparison to 2019 FSA scores. Analyzing Fall, Winter and Spring progress monitoring assessments there were consistent drops from Fall to Winter. We believe this was due to the fact that all students completed Fall assessments virtually. Winter assessments were mixed and 70% of our students had returned to school and completed the Spring assessments face to face. We noticed the same trends in Students w/Disabilities. With the exception of 5th grade students, all ELL learners increased level of proficiency by years end. All grade levels showed growth from Fall to Spring based on progress monitoring assessments.

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

Our Students with Disabilities showed a decrease in all grade levels on all assessments.

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

As stated before, inconsistent learning platforms throughout the school year. Attendance due to COVID relates issues posed a problem from the first day of school.

Provide on level grade appropriate assignments while remediating in small groups. Focus on time on task and targeted questioning. Compact lesson planning to better align instruction and filling learning gaps.

Provide push,in and pull out through the ESSER teachers.

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

Learning gains in our lowest 25%ile in math based on 2021 FSA results. This group of students include a mixture of ELL and ESE students. Our ELL students in all grade levels except 5th, (based on iReady) all showed improvement from Fall to Spring.

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

Strategic data analysis by leadership team and individual teachers, targeted grouping of students, additional Extended learning opportunities for select students and engagement activities to enhance basic skills (Math fluency Challenge, Bolt Bucks [iReady lesson challenge])

We plan to continue these strategies, identify teachers successful in teaching these students last year and provide Best Practice sessions to build capacity within the school. This will be accompanied by Instructional Round walkthroughs conducted by Administration and coaches and providing timely feedback to teachers.

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

Teachers will continue to implement TLAC (Teach like a Champion) strategies for student engagement. Grade level appropriate assignments while providing remediation in small groups accompanied by high expectations and strong instruction. Instructional Round walkthroughs conducted by Administration and coaches and providing timely feedback to teachers. Ongoing data

analysis and data chats with both teachers and students to provide support and suggestions on improving their instructional practice.

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.

Staff development is being provided on new instructional programs (Benchmark Advanced, Reading Horizons (K-2), Acaletics (3-5, math) Touch Math (K-2).

Refresher training are being provided in house for instructional planning, writing, effective questioning techniques.

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

3 years of additional staff (ESSER teachers) to provide additional pushin/pull out tutoring during the school day. Extended learning opportunities (before school 30 min online structures lessons, after school 90 min skill/standards based instruction, Saturday camps- monthly review sessions of lessons taught during that month)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our ESSA subgroup of Students with Disabilities (SWD) scored lower than the identified 41% Federal Index. We scored 39%. Our students receive pull out for intensive small group instruction. Our goal is to close the gap in their learning and accelerate their learning now that they are learning on a consistent instructional platform.

Measurable Outcome: By May 2022, the Students with Disabilities subgroup will perform at or above the 41% Federal Index based on the 2022 FSA.

Monitoring: Students will be progress monitored through iReady Fall, Winter and Spring diagnostics, School City assessments and daily exit tickets. Instruction will be adjusted to meet the needs of students based on their progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sharon Boyd (sharon.boyd@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: A variety of evidence based strategies will be addressed based on the individual needs of the students. This includes but is not limited to effective feedback, group work, questioning, and summarizing new learning to name a few. General education and ESE support facilitators will collaborate on a weekly basis to discuss how to remove barriers that impeded student achievement, how to effectively align standards with individualized goals and objectives of the students' IEP, analyze data, and share resources and strategies that can be used to meet student needs and increase student achievement. Adjustments to using virtual learning will be made by teachers to ensure the most consistent instruction possible.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: General education teachers do not always know how to effectively address the individual needs of various ESE students with respects to differentiating content and tasks. In addition, they need the assistance and guidance of the support facilitator to properly align instruction to meet student needs. FSA data indicates SWD were close but did not meet the Federal Index standard of 41% or higher.

Action Steps to Implement

Analyze student EOY 2021 data in alignment with BOY 2022 data to target specific deficiencies of students and prescribe a plan to improve foundational skills that are lacking.

Person Responsible Cristina Rodriguez (cristina.rodriguez-torres@browardschools.com)

Progress monitor all SWD and conduct appropriate data chats with teachers and students to inform instruction and help motivate student effort towards performance.

Person Responsible Sharon Boyd (sharon.boyd@browardschools.com)

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

Being identified for the RAISE program, Lake Forest will focus on ELA in all grades. The program establishes criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through five, where 50 percent or more of its students, in any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment. The criteria also includes students in grades Kindergarten through three, identified using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, who are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment. Our overall ELA proficiency was 31% on the 2021 FSA, and a range from 25-40% in K-2 depending on the measurement used (BAS or Primary EOY assessment)

Measurable Outcome:

By May 2022, the % of proficient students will be at or above 45% in grades 3-5 on the FSA ELA assessment and 50% of students in K-2 will score at or above the proficient based on End of Year Primary Reading test.

Monitoring:

Students will be progress monitored through iReady Fall, Winter and Spring diagnostics, School City assessments and daily exit tickets. Instruction will be adjusted to meet the needs of students based on their progress. Instructional Rounds will be conducted by administration and instructional coaches and will provide timely feedback to teachers to inform and improve their practice. Data will be reviewed and discussed at data chats with teachers and students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sharon Boyd (sharon.boyd@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Benchmark Advanced, along with Reading Horizons (for interventions) will be the resources used to instruct and monitor specific ELA standards. iReady Toolbox will be utilized to strategically target students in shared reading lessons by using materials that challenge them.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Remediation is not the only answer to closing the gap in lost learning due to the pandemic. Teachers will be focusing on accelerating learning, lesson planning compacting, and targeted questioning to improve functional skills and increase overall reading performance.

Action Steps to Implement

Teams will meet and plan with instructional coach to plan lessons that utilize the most of the allotted instructional time. They will combine lessons (compacting) and ensure spiral reviews that touch on all areas of literacy learning. Conversations will include integration of Social Studies and Science. IFCs will be adjusted to include appropriate reviews of standards taught.

Person Responsible

Shelly Ann Hamilton (shelly-annmelecia.hamilton@browardschools.com)

Progress monitor students in the area of ELA and conduct appropriate data chats with teachers and students to inform instruction and help motivate student effort towards performance. Teams will meet monthly with administration to review data and plan for adjustments to their instruction. Trends and patterns observed in Instructional Rounds (class visits) will be shared by administration and instructional coaches as they will provide timely feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible

Sharon Boyd (sharon.boyd@browardschools.com)

ESSER teacher for reading will provide push in and/or pull out small group instruction in grades 3-5. Struggling students not already being provided additional services will be targeted. Groups will be monitored and reviewed quarterly.

Person Responsible Shelly Ann Hamilton (shelly-annmelecia.hamilton@browardschools.com)

Extended learning opportunities will be provided in the following formats
 Before School - 7:00-7:30 online lessons, providing additional practice
 After school - 2:30-4:00 standards/skill based tutoring
 Saturday Camps - 4 hrs 1x/month reviewing skills taught the previous month.

Person Responsible Angela Clark (angela.clark@browardschools.com)

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.

Historically, Lake Forest's most reoccurring infraction is disobedience/insubordination. We started the school year with grade level assemblies addressing bullying, school wide expectations (core values of Respect, Ownership & Determination). Now that we are all back face to face learning, teachers must teach behavioral lessons through LEAPS at the beginning of the year and review quarterly or as needed. We will be monitoring our ODRs (Office Discipline Referrals) regularly. Students with repeated ODR will be discussed at the monthly Positive Behavior meetings for possible behavior strategies and supports. These students are provided opportunities for mentorship with a trusted adult of their choosing to foster appropriate behavior and a positive mindset.

Staff and students will celebrate adherence to schoolwide expectations (R.O.D.) through monthly celebrations which reward them for consistent positive behavior.

In regards to teacher effectiveness, administration and credentialed coaches regularly schedule classroom visits/observations, data chats, team meetings to provide feedback on instructional practices and to improve monitoring of student data. Teachers will be assisted in digging deeper into student data to identify sources of deficiencies and outline specific strategies to remediate those deficiencies through differentiation. Information will be shared in team meetings, staff meetings, Nearpod or Teams virtual meetings and through weekly Flash staff newsletters. Additional training will be provided to teachers throughout the year as needed.

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.

- * In keeping with Character Education we are implementing an additional component to help alleviate stress and increase the level of self worth during this pandemic. The Initiative, "Struck by Kindness" allows all staff and students to receive positive affirmations from their peers throughout the year.
- * Hero program provides monthly celebrations for students who adhere to the school's core values of Respect, Ownership & Determination.
- * Academic incentives and challenges regardless of performance level are offered to all students to enhance motivation and increase their level of effort applied to learning.
- * Peer Pals - grouping of general education students paired with students with autism who complete projects and activities together to foster a sense of community within the school.
- * Grade level classes adopt a garden plot and work together to create a sustainable garden that integrates science and math concepts all the while providing edible results.
- * Provide professional development on Positive mindset strategies for teachers to use in the class, promoting safe risk taking and the benefits from learning from failure.
- * Guidance provides monthly affirmations for everyone to recite in class daily. The statements, when possible, align with the monthly character traits.
- * Provide open communication with parents to share concerns and successes throughout the year. This is accomplished through Class Dodo, ClassApp, Remind, Parentlink, school website, marquee and flyers.

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

The tone for the school is set by administration. Weekly staff newsletters (Flash) are accompanied by a positive statement (Be Positive, Be Encouraging...) and sayings/quotes associated with the topic. Teachers are recognized through a "Shout Out" on the AM announcements, in the Flash, at staff meetings for helping to maintain a positive atmosphere and going above and beyond for everyone in the Lake Forest learning community.

Students are expected to adhere to the school's core values of Respect, Ownership & Determination. These concepts are taught using LEAPS lessons at the beginning of the school year and reviewed quarterly or as needed.

Mindfulness videos/sessions are provided daily in the cafeteria for the last 10 minutes of each lunch block. Students and assigned staff all participate in these activities. Guidance Counselor and teachers provide students with resources to deal with frustration, anger and sadness.

Besides instructional staff, Health and safety are addressed daily by facilities and security staff. Staff is regularly reminded of their beginning of the year training on safety procedures. These trainings along with

scheduled processes for sanitizing, monitoring safety protocols and adhering to proposed engaging student instruction, provide for a positive culture and learning environment.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00