

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Lake - 9031 - Imagine Schools At South Lake - 2021-22 SIP

Imagine Schools At South Lake

2750 HARTWOOD MARSH RD, Clermont, FL 34711

www.imaginesouthlake.org

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Wesner

Start Date for this Principal: 5/2/2024

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	26%
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 (71%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (70%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Inf	ormation*
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

- 1. have a school grade of D or F
- 2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
- 3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

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	9
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Lake - 9031 - Imagine Schools At South Lake - 2021-22 SIP

Imagine Schools At South Lake

2750 HARTWOOD MARSH RD, Clermont, FL 34711

www.imaginesouthlake.org

School Demographics

School Type and Gr (per MSID F		2020-21 Title I School	Disadvant	Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)
Combination S KG-8	School	No		19%
Primary Servic (per MSID F		Charter School	(Reporte	Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)
K-12 General Ec	ducation	Yes		37%
School Grades Histo	ry			
Year Grade	2020-21	2019-20 A	2018-19 A	2017-18 A
School Board Approv	val			

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Pending, Jennifer Wesner

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

Total number of students enrolled at the school

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

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

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Tota
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency		
The number of students with two or more early warning ind	licators:	
Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		
The number of students identified as retainees:		
Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		
Date this data was collected or last updated Pending		
Date this data was collected or last updated	rly warning indicator:	
Date this data was collected or last updated Pending 20-21 - As Reported	rly warning indicator: Grade Level	Total
Date this data was collected or last updated Pending 20-21 - As Reported The number of students by grade level that exhibit each ear		Tota
Date this data was collected or last updated Pending 20-21 - As Reported The number of students by grade level that exhibit each ear Indicator		Tota
Date this data was collected or last updated Pending 20-21 - As Reported The number of students by grade level that exhibit each ear Indicator Number of students enrolled		Total
Date this data was collected or last updated Pending 20-21 - As Reported The number of students by grade level that exhibit each ear Indicator Number of students enrolled Attendance below 90 percent		Total
Date this data was collected or last updated Pending 20-21 - As Reported The number of students by grade level that exhibit each ear Indicator Number of students enrolled Attendance below 90 percent One or more suspensions		Total
Date this data was collected or last updated Pending 20-21 - As Reported The number of students by grade level that exhibit each ear Indicator Number of students enrolled Attendance below 90 percent One or more suspensions Course failure in ELA		Total
Date this data was collected or last updated Pending 20-21 - As Reported The number of students by grade level that exhibit each ear Indicator Number of students enrolled Attendance below 90 percent One or more suspensions Course failure in ELA Course failure in Math		Tota
Date this data was collected or last updated Pending 20-21 - As Reported The number of students by grade level that exhibit each ear Indicator Number of students enrolled Attendance below 90 percent One or more suspensions Course failure in ELA Course failure in Math Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	Grade Level	Total
Date this data was collected or last updated Pending 20-21 - As Reported The number of students by grade level that exhibit each ear Indicator Number of students enrolled Attendance below 90 percent One or more suspensions Course failure in ELA Course failure in Math Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	Grade Level	Total
Date this data was collected or last updated Pending 20-21 - As Reported The number of students by grade level that exhibit each ear Indicator Number of students enrolled Attendance below 90 percent One or more suspensions Course failure in ELA Course failure in Math Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	Grade Level	
Date this data was collected or last updated Pending 20-21 - As Reported The number of students by grade level that exhibit each ear Indicator Number of students enrolled Attendance below 90 percent One or more suspensions Course failure in ELA Course failure in Math Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment The number of students with two or more early warning ind Indicator	Grade Level	
Date this data was collected or last updated Pending 20-21 - As Reported The number of students by grade level that exhibit each ear Indicator Number of students enrolled Attendance below 90 percent One or more suspensions Course failure in ELA Course failure in Math Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment The number of students with two or more early warning ind Indicator Students with two or more indicators	Grade Level	
Date this data was collected or last updated Pending 20-21 - As Reported The number of students by grade level that exhibit each ear Indicator Number of students enrolled Attendance below 90 percent One or more suspensions Course failure in ELA Course failure in Math Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment The number of students with two or more early warning ind Indicator Students with two or more indicators The number of students identified as retainees:	Grade Level licators: Grade Level	Total

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment		
The number of students with two or more early warning	indicators:	
Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		
The number of students identified as retainees:		
Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		

Students retained two or more times

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).

Sahaal Crada Component	2021		2019			2018			
School Grade Component	School District St		State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				77%	68%	61%	69%	67%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	63%	59%	57%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	56%	54%	49%	46%	52%
Math Achievement				82%	70%	62%	78%	69%	61%
Math Learning Gains				70%	65%	59%	63%	60%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	54%	52%	53%	51%	52%
Science Achievement				67%	59%	56%	71%	65%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				90%	83%	78%	92%	77%	77%

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	84%	60%	24%	58%	26%
Cohort Co	mparison				•	
04	2021					
	2019	83%	60%	23%	58%	25%
Cohort Co	mparison	-84%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	59%	14%	56%	17%
Cohort Co	mparison	-83%				
06	2021					
	2019	78%	52%	26%	54%	24%
Cohort Co	mparison	-73%				
07	2021					
	2019	71%	49%	22%	52%	19%
Cohort Co	mparison	-78%			· ·	
08	2021					
	2019	71%	54%	17%	56%	15%
Cohort Co	mparison	-71%				

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparisor
03	2021			-		-
	2019	77%	62%	15%	62%	15%
Cohort Co	mparison				•	
04	2021					
	2019	77%	61%	16%	64%	13%
Cohort Co	mparison	-77%			•	
05	2021					
	2019	90%	57%	33%	60%	30%
Cohort Co	mparison	-77%				
06	2021					
	2019	83%	53%	30%	55%	28%
Cohort Co	mparison	-90%				
07	2021					
	2019	80%	58%	22%	54%	26%
Cohort Co	mparison	-83%				
08	2021					
	2019	80%	39%	41%	46%	34%
Cohort Co	mparison	-80%			I	

SCIENCE								
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison		
05	2021							

	SCIENCE								
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison			
	2019	72%	56%	16%	53%	19%			
Cohort Con	nparison								
08	2021								
	2019	59%	49%	10%	48%	11%			
Cohort Con	nparison	-72%			· ·				

		BIOLO	GY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus State District		School Minus State
2021					
2019					
		CIVIC	S EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	90%	71%	19%	71%	19%
		HISTO	RY EOC	· · ·	
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
		ALGEB	RA EOC	· · ·	
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	96%	52%	44%	61%	35%
		GEOME	TRY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

		Grade 1		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
		Grade 2		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

		Grade 3		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
		Grade 4		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

		Grade 5		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
		Grade 6		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

		Grade 7		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

		Grade 8		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	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	39	47	38	57	70	70	53	67			
ELL	67			92							
ASN	71			79							
BLK	77	71	67	71	79	77	63	91			
HSP	70	61	52	83	82	80	55	80	77		
MUL	50	36		68	57		30				
WHT	80	67	50	87	80	74	83	98	81		
FRL	72	63	44	82	81	72	57	87	81		
		2019	SCHOO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	32	45	40	50	55	45	29	50			
ASN	76	61		81	78						

	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
BLK	71	57	36	77	75	50	54				
HSP	66	56	43	72	60	50	59	80	60		
MUL	65	27		75	87						
WHT	82	71	74	87	71	60	71	91	75		
FRL	72	60	53	78	67	64	56	80	90		
		2018	SCHOO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	27	38	42	42	43	36	35	73			
ASN	73	65		91	65						
BLK	63	50	47	72	61	50	57	100			
HSP	62	54	50	66	57	49	68	88	76		
MUL	56	47		61	53						
			4.0		00		75	90	55		
WHT	72	58	48	82	66	53	75	90	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	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	676
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
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	80
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	75
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	75
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	71
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	48
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	78
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	71
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?

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

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

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

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

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

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.

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

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.

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

Part V: Budget

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

Total:

\$0.00