

Lake County Schools

The Villages Elementary Of Lady Lake 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 | 21 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

The Villages Elementary Of Lady Lake School

695 ROLLING ACRES RD, Lady Lake, FL 32159

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

Demographics

Principal: Gregory Dudley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (63%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

The Villages Elementary Of Lady Lake School

695 ROLLING ACRES RD, Lady Lake, FL 32159

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

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Elementary School PK-5 | 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 | 48% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Villages Elementary of Lady Lake will work hand in hand with the community to instill a lifelong love of learning in our students. We will strive to provide a safe, stimulating environment in which all children can reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Villages Elementary of Lady Lake is building a thriving society by preparing our diverse student population for success at all levels and vocations. Together We Can!

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 |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Dudley, Gregg | Principal | |
| Sachs, Laura | Assistant Principal | |
| Shumate, Rheda Gail | School Counselor | |
| Carroll, Lori | School Counselor | |
| Sapp, Shannon | Other | |
| Holmes, Lindsey | Other | |
| Kertz, Kelly Lynne | Curriculum Resource Teacher | |
| Culbreath, Heather | Other | |
| Rayment, Susan | Other | |
| | | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Gregory Dudley

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

5

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

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

Total number of students enrolled at the school

741

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 | 99 | 112 | 123 | 114 | 142 | 136 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 726 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 31 | 31 | 34 | 36 | 42 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 201 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Course failure in ELA | 5 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Course failure in Math | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 20 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 25 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 20 | 67 | 78 | 40 | 20 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 241 |

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 | 9 | 16 | 25 | 40 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 |

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 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/16/2021

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 | 128 | 144 | 110 | 148 | 161 | 149 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 840 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 15 | 12 | 5 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA | 8 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Course failure in Math | 7 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |

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 | 40 | 48 | 29 | 57 | 56 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 293 |

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 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 128 | 144 | 110 | 148 | 161 | 149 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 840 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 15 | 12 | 5 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA | 8 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Course failure in Math | 7 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |

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 | 40 | 48 | 29 | 57 | 56 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 293 |

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 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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

| School Grade Component | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 69% | 58% | 57% | 73% | 59% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 62% | 57% | 58% | 67% | 54% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 52% | 49% | 53% | 63% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 74% | 60% | 63% | 75% | 63% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 69% | 56% | 62% | 63% | 54% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 40% | 39% | 51% | 34% | 41% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 68% | 54% | 53% | 62% | 55% | 55% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 66% | 60% | 6% | 58% | 8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 65% | 60% | 5% | 58% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -66% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 70% | 59% | 11% | 56% | 14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -65% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 79% | 62% | 17% | 62% | 17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 65% | 61% | 4% | 64% | 1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -79% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 68% | 57% | 11% | 60% | 8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -65% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 66% | 56% | 10% | 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.

We use i-Ready as our progress monitoring tool for grades K-5. In addition, we use FSA for Spring in grades 4-5.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 11% | 38% | 68% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 11% | 18% | 36% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 14% | 38% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 8% | 32% | 53% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 10% | 0% | 18% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 25% |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 24% | 50% | 60% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 20% | 27% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 11% | 29% | 63% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6% | 15% | 25% |
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 47% | 68% | 82% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 53% | 71% | 83% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 8% | 30% | 73% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6% | 41% | 67% |
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 29% | 57% | 100% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0% | 14% | 86% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 34% | 50% | 52% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15% | 15% | 11% |
| | English Language Learners | 29% | 25% | 50% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 14% | 45% | 50% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 11% | 30% | 26% |
| | English Language Learners | 17% | 50% | 57% |
| Grade 5 | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 41% | 56% | 65% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 33% | 50% | 63% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | 54% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 31 | 44 | 45 | 33 | 20 | 20 | 13 | | | | |
| ELL | 49 | 58 | | 68 | 33 | | 42 | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | 50 | | 47 | 33 | | 29 | | | | |
| HSP | 56 | 67 | 54 | 64 | 43 | 27 | 45 | | | | |
| MUL | 63 | | | 53 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 71 | 62 | | 71 | 56 | | 78 | | | | |
| FRL | 58 | 58 | 52 | 57 | 42 | 35 | 53 | | | | |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 40 | 59 | 50 | 40 | 56 | 48 | 28 | | | | |
| ELL | 54 | 47 | 36 | 67 | 70 | 50 | 50 | | | | |
| ASN | 82 | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | 54 | 40 | 66 | 72 | 50 | 57 | | | | |
| HSP | 63 | 56 | 40 | 67 | 71 | 52 | 62 | | | | |
| MUL | 47 | 50 | | 47 | 55 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 77 | 66 | 61 | 79 | 67 | 24 | 72 | | | | |
| FRL | 64 | 61 | 53 | 71 | 68 | 43 | 63 | | | | |
| 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 | 40 | 53 | 52 | 36 | 32 | 7 | 21 | | | | |
| ELL | 67 | 90 | | 78 | 58 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 93 | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 58 | 61 | 64 | 53 | 45 | 38 | 43 | | | | |
| HSP | 70 | 82 | 78 | 75 | 61 | 27 | 65 | | | | |
| MUL | 70 | 73 | | 57 | 45 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 76 | 61 | 56 | 79 | 67 | 38 | 65 | | | | |
| FRL | 70 | 66 | 65 | 71 | 60 | 33 | 54 | | | | |

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 | 57 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 71 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 453 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 29 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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 | 41 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 54 |
| 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 | 58 |

| Multiracial Students | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 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 | 68 |
| 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 | 51 |
| 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?

On the 2021 test administration, students at VELL demonstrated lower proficiency in grades 4 and 5 for both ELA and math as compared to performance in previous years. Students in our lowest quartile performed significantly below their peers, across all grade levels in all content areas.

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

Based on the available data components, our greatest needs for improvement are in the area of our lowest quartile (all content areas) and our 4th and 5th grade students (all content areas).

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

Beginning of the year data demonstrated achievement gaps that were greater than in previous years. These gaps reflect the sudden and unexpected transition to virtual learning required by the global pandemic during the fourth quarter of the 2019-2020 school year. In addition, chronic attendance issues and the inability to monitor interventions with fidelity due to the continuing world-wide pandemic and COVID restrictions were contributing factors to final performance which was short of our usual expectations. While there was noticeable improvement between BOY scores and EOY scores that narrowed the performance difference, the results were still below school norms. The new

actions for 2021-2022 will include targeted intervention and enrichment time and flexible grouping to address specific needs for individual students across all grade levels. Implementation of new supplemental curriculum, including LLI, will help to better address reading comprehension deficits.

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

Third grade reading and math scores were high performing, based on progress monitoring and state assessments. Proficiency continued to increase throughout the year in grades K-3, based on i-Ready progress monitoring, in both ELA and Math.

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

Teachers on the third grade team collaborated effectively in all areas of planning and assessment, to include standards alignment, rigorous activities, and common assessments. Teachers in K-3 implemented i-Ready Lessons with fidelity.

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

In 2021-2022, VELL will implement the PLC process with fidelity in all grade levels and all subject areas to ensure standards alignment, rigorous learning, common assessments, and appropriate reteaching and enrichment opportunities. VELL will also ensure that every grade level implements the 30 minute targeted "walk to" intervention/enrichment block with fidelity.

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.

VELL will focus its school-wide professional development on the PLC process, and teachers will begin to use the PLC process during collaborative planning meetings. Teachers will continue to receive training and support on effectively using the i-Ready program and resources. Teachers and TAs will receive ongoing professional development in supplemental reading programs (LLI) as needed.

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

Each member of the leadership team is assigned a specific grade level. Members of the leadership team will support their grade levels as they implement the PLC process and will actively monitor and assist with flexible grouping for targeted "walk to" intervention and enrichment.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: VELL expects all students to learn at high levels, as evidenced by high levels of proficiency and solid learning gains on iReady and FSA assessments. Recent data identifies this as an area of improvement. The Professional Learning Community (PLC) process focuses on a commitment to the learning of each student.

Measurable Outcome: 80% of students will learn at high levels, as demonstrated by proficiency and typical growth learning gains on iReady (from BOY to MOY and EOY) and FSA assessments.

Monitoring: Members of the leadership team will provide professional development on the PLC process and will actively participate in grade level meetings to ensure the implementation of the PLC process during collaborative planning sessions. Leadership will analyze data throughout the year to monitor its effectiveness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Gregg Dudley (dudleyg@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The Professional Learning Community (PLC) process exists to ensure high levels of learning for all students by focusing on learning, a collaborative culture, collective responsibility, and results.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: When a school engages in the PLC process, educators embrace high levels of learning for all students. VELL is dedicated to this and has made a collective commitment to work together to ensure the success of each student. In order to be effective in helping all students learn, teachers must be continually learning as well. Structures are created within the PLC process to ensure all members engage in job-embedded learning.

Action Steps to Implement

The principal will provide Professional Development on the PLC process during Pre-Planning. The principal will also arrange opportunities for teacher leaders to observe the PLC process in place at locations acknowledged as proficient practitioners of the process.

Person Responsible Gregg Dudley (dudleyg@lake.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will meet regularly with their grade level teams and will implement the PLC process as they collaborate on essential knowledge and skills (clarifying exactly what each student must learn), monitor each student's learning, and provide systematic interventions to reteach or extend learning.

Members of leadership will actively participate in these meetings to ensure that teachers are working collaboratively to guarantee a viable curriculum, develop common formative assessments, create a system of interventions and extensions, and then using evidence of student learning to inform and improve the individual and collective practice of its members.

Person Responsible Gregg Dudley (dudleyg@lake.k12.fl.us)

Ongoing professional development in the PLC process as directed and led by the district.

Ongoing professional development at the school level for all stakeholders

Person Responsible Gregg Dudley (dudleyg@lake.k12.fl.us)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: VELL expects all students to learn at high levels, as evidenced by high levels of proficiency and solid learning gains on iReady and FSA assessments. Recent data identifies this as an area of improvement. Targeted "walk to" intervention and/or enrichment groups will focus on specific needs of individual learners.

Measurable Outcome: 80% of students will learn at high levels, as demonstrated by proficiency and typical growth learning gains on iReady (from BOY to MOY and EOY) and FSA assessments.

Monitoring: Members of the leadership team will actively participate in grade level meetings to ensure the implementation of targeted and flexible "walk to" intervention/enrichment groups. Leadership will analyze data throughout the year to monitor their effectiveness and make regular modifications to groups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lindsey Holmes (holmesl@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiation provides targeted instruction to meet students' individual needs. Small targeted groups will provide the opportunity to address needs by differentiating content, process, product and/or learning environment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: VELL is committed to high levels of learning for all students and is taking collective responsibility for the success of each individual student.

Action Steps to Implement

VELL will analyze BOY iReady data to create targeted groups for intervention and/or enrichment. Members of leadership will be responsible for establishing and monitoring the flexible groups for their assigned grade level.

Person Responsible Gregg Dudley (dudleyg@lake.k12.fl.us)

Classroom teachers, ESE teachers, Title One Intervention teachers, and trained TAs will each be assigned a small group and will be responsible for targeted instruction (intervention or enrichment) during a set 30 minute Intervention block four days each week.

Person Responsible Gregg Dudley (dudleyg@lake.k12.fl.us)

Teachers and TAs will receive ongoing professional development in LLI and/or SIPPS (or another district approved literacy intervention/enrichment program) as needed throughout the year.

Person Responsible Lindsey Holmes (holmesl@lake.k12.fl.us)

Leadership, along with grade level teachers, will monitor data on an ongoing basis to ensure small groups are appropriately addressing individual student needs. Modifications to groups will be made as needed.

Person Responsible Lindsey Holmes (holmesl@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | VELL expects all students to learn at high levels, as evidenced by high levels of proficiency and solid learning gains on iReady and FSA assessments. Recent data identifies this as an area of improvement, especially for students in the lowest quartile. |
| Measurable Outcome: | 80% of students in the lowest quartile will demonstrate typical annual growth and 60% will demonstrate stretch growth on iReady spring assessments. 80% of 4th and 5th grade students will demonstrate annual learning gains on FSA. |
| Monitoring: | Leadership will analyze data throughout the year to monitor learning gains of the lowest quartile. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | [no one identified] |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | The Professional Learning Community (PLC) process exists to ensure high levels of learning for students in the lowest quartile by focusing on learning, a collaborative culture, collective responsibility, and results. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | When a school engages in the PLC process, educators embrace high levels of learning for all students, especially students in the lowest quartile. VELL is dedicated to this and has made a collective commitment to work together to ensure the success of each and every student. In order to be effective in helping all students learn, teachers must be continually learning as well. Structures are created within the PLC process to ensure all members engage in job-embedded learning. This process, as it positively impacts collective teacher efficacy, will have a direct correlation to the recruitment and retention of highly effective staff, which in turn benefits students in the lowest quartile. |

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will meet regularly with their grade level teams and will implement the PLC process as they collaborate on essential knowledge and skills (clarifying exactly what each student must learn), monitor each student's learning, and provide systematic interventions to reteach or extend learning.

Members of leadership will actively participate in these meetings to ensure that teachers are working collaboratively to guarantee a viable curriculum, develop common formative assessments, create a system of interventions and extensions, and then using evidence of student learning to inform and improve the individual and collective practice of its members. Interventions will be planned, targeted, and monitored to ensure mastery of all students, especially students in the lowest quartile.

Person Responsible Gregg Dudley (dudleyg@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

VELL is concerned about student behavior and safety while riding the school bus. We will continue to educate our students on proper bus procedures that ensure their safety, and we will monitor bus referrals to determine effectiveness.

VELL will continue to rely on its PASS teacher and Mental Health Liaison to provide positive behavior support and/or interventions.

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.

VELL is dedicated to providing a safe and supportive environment for all and is committed to maintaining a positive school culture. Individuals have different roles but take collective responsibility for the success of our school. Stakeholders understand this school's focus is on the pursuit of high levels of learning for all, with a heightened focus on students in the lowest quartile. The PLC process will be instrumental in developing a collective teacher efficacy, which will directly impact the recruitment and retention of highly qualified staff.

Our school is dedicated to strong parent/teacher communication, family involvement, community partnerships, and to character education. All of these contribute to a positive school culture and environment.

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

Our school counselors lead a program called Core Essentials, which focuses on and celebrates character education. Our Enrichment teachers collaborate to teach all students about respect and kindness through "Bucket Filling" and Bullying Prevention. By implementing these programs school-wide through these groups, students all receive the same message and we have common language and expectations.

In addition to two School Counselors, our school has a Family School Liaison, a Mental Health Liaison, and a PASS teacher (to focus on positive behavior choices) who are all focused on promoting positive relationships at the school.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|--------|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----|-------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | | | | \$5,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | | | 0119 - The Villages Elem Of Lady Lake | | | \$5,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Substitute teachers will be utilized when instructional personnel visit off campus model sites. They will also be used to provide teachers the opportunity for grade level collaboration and learning teams. | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | | | | \$16,693.80 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 5100 | 500-Materials and Supplies | 0119 - The Villages Elem Of Lady Lake | Title, I Part A | | \$10,035.00 |
| | | | Notes: Leveled Literacy Instructional materials (LLI) Fountas and Pinnell \$10, 035.18 | | | |
| | 5100 | 500-Materials and Supplies | 0119 - The Villages Elem Of Lady Lake | Title, I Part A | | \$5,250.00 |
| | | | Notes: SIPPS, grade level phonics and decoding, beginning level \$5, 250.00 | | | |
| | 5100 | 500-Materials and Supplies | 0119 - The Villages Elem Of Lady Lake | Title, I Part A | | \$1,408.80 |
| | | | Notes: iReady PHONICS, Curriculum Associates, Grade level 1, 2 and 3 to support explicit phonics instruction \$1,408.80 | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems | | | | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | | | | \$21,693.80 |