Grassy Lake Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Grassy Lake Elementary School

1100 FOSGATE RD, Minneola, FL 34715

https://gle.lake.k12.fl.us/

Demographics

Principal: Julie Tucker

Start Date for this Principal: 11/1/2015

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (51%) 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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.](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

Grassy Lake Elementary School

1100 FOSGATE RD, Minneola, FL 34715

https://gle.lake.k12.fl.us/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	57%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		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.

Through the dedication and commitment of staff, parents, and the community, Grassy Lake Elementary provides a safe learning environment that challenges all students to strive for excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a happy, caring and academically focused environment where all students can reach their full potential and grow to be productive, respectful members of the community.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Tucker, Julie	Principal	Campus safety, curriculum, learning walks, teacher evaluation, leadership team, budget, evaluation of office staff, SAC, PTO, school data, school improvement, discipline, MTSS, ELC, behavior committee, remediation/acceleration
Shaffer, Natalie	Assistant Principal	Student supervision, curriculum, learning walks, evaluation of teachers, SAC, SAI funds, school data, school improvement, discipline, MTSS, teaching assistants, new teacher induction, vertical articulation, instructional leadership, remediation/acceleration
Croft, Aundrea	Assistant Principal	Student supervision, curriculum, learning walks, evaluation of teachers, PTO, custodians, school data, school improvement, discipline, MTSS, health coordinator, vertical articulation, instructional leadership, remediation/acceleration
McCray, Tamara	Assistant Principal	Student supervision, curriculum, learning walks, evaluation of teachers, PTO, food service, school data, school improvement, discipline, MTSS, safety coordinator, vertical articulation, instructional leadership, remediation/acceleration
Coleman, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Provide instructional support to teachers, mentoring, modeling in the classroom, professional development for teachers, remediation/acceleration
Bruener, Marie	Instructional Coach	Provide instructional support to teachers, mentoring, modeling in the classroom, professional development for teachers, remediation/acceleration, literacy support
Wells, Beth	Teacher, ESE	ESE School Specialist, team leader for ESE, point of contact for all ESE meetings, documentation, IEPs, services, etc, behavior, remediation/acceleration
Ardizone, Jennifer	School Counselor	Student supervision, scheduling, counseling students, mental health referrals, MTSS, 504, support, buses and backpacks program, VPK, Kindergarten Star Search
Halsey, Jennifer	School Counselor	Student supervision, scheduling, counseling students, mental health referrals, MTSS, ELL, support
Stinson, Bridgette	Other	Mental Health Liaison, build positive rapport with students proactively, provide support for students needing mental health resources/intervention, behavior committee, remediation/acceleration

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bidwell, Lori	Dean	Positive behavior planning and support, student discipline, build positive rapport with students proactively, provide support for teachers regarding behavior, behavior committee, remediation/acceleration,
Thompson, Valarie	Teacher, K-12	PASS teacher, build positive rapport with students proactively, provide support for teachers regarding behavior, behavior committee, remediation/acceleration, discipline

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 11/1/2015, Julie Tucker

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
77

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,234

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
12

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	174	209	190	209	213	188	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1183
Attendance below 90 percent	14	46	38	30	30	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	2	2	1	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	26	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	27	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	15	23	16	65	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/23/2022

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	193	146	181	189	159	196	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1064
Attendance below 90 percent	3	21	10	18	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	3	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	2	4	26	17	10	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Course failure in Math	2	4	26	17	10	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	29	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	25	28	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	4	11	12	21	28	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

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	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	2	1	6	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	193	146	181	189	159	196	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1064
Attendance below 90 percent	3	21	10	18	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	3	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	2	4	26	17	10	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Course failure in Math	2	4	26	17	10	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	29	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	25	28	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	4	11	12	21	28	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

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	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	2	1	6	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	65%	50%	56%				71%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%						66%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						48%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	60%	46%	50%				69%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	46%						69%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%						48%	39%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	52%	59%				68%	54%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	72%	60%	12%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	60%	5%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	71%	59%	12%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	69%	62%	7%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	61%	5%	64%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					
	2019	68%	57%	11%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	67%	56%	11%	53%	14%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	25	41	39	21	36	25	15				
ELL	52	45	33	56	53	42	14				
ASN	83	79		92	86		50				
BLK	57	60	29	45	40	23	53				
HSP	59	55	34	56	42	36	42				
MUL	53	67		47	42						
WHT	70	66	46	65	47	18	52				
FRL	50	57	38	48	44	29	44				

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	17	24	21	16	12	11	12				
ELL	45	58		44	50		31				
ASN	75			67							
BLK	63	38		50	23		55				
HSP	58	63	54	52	33	17	46				
MUL	60			55							
WHT	67	49	13	64	38	21	62				
FRL	50	49	40	45	25	11	39				

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	28	46	38	25	45	41	19				
ELL	45	49	29	54	54	38	25				
ASN	88	68		79	68		85				
BLK	49	55	43	46	45	47	37				
HSP	66	57	42	67	69	50	61				
MUL	78	67		78	73		64				
WHT	76	73	53	73	72	43	78				
FRL	58	61	48	57	59	43	53				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
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	29
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	384
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

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%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	52
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	52
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Based on 21-22 data, our FSA ELA achievement scores in 3rd grade remained at 63% (although in 2019 we were at 72%). Our 4th grade increased by 5 percentage points (to 65%) and 5th grade ELA remained consistent at 65%. Our 3rd grade FSA Math achievement remained consistent at 69%, 4th grade Math increased by 3 percentage points (to 66%), and 5th grade Math achievement remained at 44% from the previous year. Seeing as how our 5th grade Math achievement was at 68% in 2019, we know we need to have a strong focus in that area. Our 5th grade science is also a strong area of focus as we decreased by 6 percentage points from 2021.

Our overall learning gains in ELA and Math both increased by 10 percentage points, although we still have significant ground to make up compared to our 2019 scores, especially in Math learning gains, which was a 69% back in 2019. Our learning gains of the lower quartile in ELA increased by 10 percentage points and Math increased by 12 percentage points, but again we still have a ways to go as our 2019 Math learning gains of the lower quartile was 48% compared to our 30% in 2022.

All subgroups increased in achievement and learning gains, except for ELA achievement in Black students which decreased by 6 percentage points. Although we made gains in our SWD subgroup, we still have more improvement needed in that area.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the data stated above, our 5th grade Math and Science achievement remained at 44% from the previous year, making it an area of greatest need for improvement. Our overall learning gains in ELA and Math both increased by 10 percentage points, although we still have significant ground to make up compared to our 2019 scores, especially in Math learning gains, which was a 69% back in 2019. Our learning gains of the lower quartile in ELA increased by 10 percentage points and Math increased by 12 percentage points, but again we still have a ways to go as our 2019 Math learning gains of the lower quartile was 48% compared to our 30% in 2022. Therefore, our learning gains in both ELA and Math, and learning gains of the lower quartile in ELA and Math are in need of the most need for improvement as well. We also need to improve our Black subgroup in ELA achievement (63% in 2021 compared to 57% in 2022), and continue to improve our SWD subgroup in achievement (ELA achievement 25%, Math achievement 21%),and learning gains (ELA LG 41%, Math LG 36%). All of these areas are our top priorities 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?

Regarding learning gains, we encountered challenges in fully staffing classrooms (and remediation block), as we had staffing shortages and staff absences due to Covid. We were unable to host after school tutoring, and our 5th grade math remediation teacher was pulled to cover a class for the remainder of the school year.

Regarding 5th grade, we had to adjust our schedule and increase our ELA block which took valuable minutes from 5th math and science instruction. We previously made instructional decisions to place teachers in areas of strengths, but the new schedule altered that, restricting our flexibility in those instructional decisions. As a result, 5th grade Math/Science did not score as well as expected.

As a school we also needed to narrow the focus and be more explicit regarding expectations and outcomes for our team collaboration time.

Moving forward, this year we're fully staffed with remediation block assistance. We've adjusted the 5th grade schedule to accommodate ELA and increase time in math. We have more leadership support personnel in place to run the school, which allows for instructional coaches to take on more of an active role in providing coaching and support to our students/teachers, including during collaborative time. We'll be utilizing SAC funds to bring back after-school tutoring and SAI funds to increase math remediation in 3rd - 5th grades. We have also added teaching assistants in 2nd through 5th grades to assist struggling students, which will in turn help our learning gains, especially in the lower quartile.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Ironically, our learning gains (and learning gains of the lowest quartile) in both ELA and Math showed the most improvement from 2021. We still have considerable ground to make up to get us back to our 2019 data in these areas. We also increased in almost all subgroup data from 2021, although again, we still have increases that need to be made to get us to our 2019 pre-Covid baseline.

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

Despite staffing shortages and challenges, we still spent every resource, every available staff member, and every available moment devoted to remediating our struggling students. We also put a program in place to help accelerate our highest students in 3rd and 5th grades during that block.

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

GLES implemented an ELA/Math remediation block in 2018-19, but each grade level was able to independently choose the resources to serve the needs of those students. In 2019-20 we made improvements by serving the lowest 25th percentile with a restructured remediation block, utilizing LLI. Our progress monitoring data showed significant growth at midyear, and then we all left for distance learning due to Covid. Upon returning in 20-21, and Covid still being a factor, we continue to use LLI, but structured the group differently to avoid additional exposure to more children in the school. In 2021-22, we went back to the original structure but often found ourselves extremely short-handed with our remediation teachers having to cover classes at a bare minimum. We are now fully-staffed in 2022-23 and will be fully implementing the original plan for our remediation/acceleration block.

In addition, we will utilize our STEM teacher to integrate advance literacy/STEM to our 3rd - 5th grade students who are gifted and/or needing acceleration during our remediation/acceleration block. We will continue to function as a strong PLC this year, focusing on the our major PLC learnings from the district.

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.

Based on our summer learning at Lake County Schools, we will institute continued school-wide professional development on working effectively as a PLC. This will be provided by administration, our leadership team, and teacher leaders who participated in the district level PD. In addition to the school-wide PD, our leadership team will continue to push in to all collaborative meetings to provide direction, guidance, and support. We will add specific vertical articulation sessions for our teachers, as well as mentoring and teacher-to-teacher best practice observations. Our instructional coaches will be doing specific coaching and modeling to meet the needs of all teachers.

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

We will continue to utilize our LLI program as well as our new STEM/literacy acceleration group during remediation/acceleration block. We will continue to utilize SAI funds to provide a tutor during school hours to support our lowest quartile as they strive to make greater learning gains. We will continue to utilize our SAC and/or PTO funds to help support after school tutoring initiatives to again provide extra support for our students in ELA and math.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Through common planning (and by utilizing the PLC professional development we have received) teachers will better understand, plan, deliver, and differentiate standards-based instruction in all content areas for all students. Students at GLES will know what they are learning, why/how they are learning it, and how they know they have learned it (focus on "purpose"). During this time our teachers will also focus on how to enhance curriculum-based instruction within the district's instructional framework. This area of focus is key as we transition to the BEST standards as well. Rationale: If we implement, monitor, and support common planning, then we will have a scheduled time for teachers to plan for and evaluate formative assessments and work products. If we have common planning, then teachers will also have an opportunity to observe best practices in facilitating reading, writing, thinking, and talking, incorporate those ideas into their own lessons, and ensure that students will be able to understand and articulate a clear purpose: what they are learning and how they know if they have learned it.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By utilizing common planning with additional support to help teachers collaborate on the instructional framework, then teachers will be able to plan for and evaluate formative assessments and work products, observe best practices in facilitating reading, writing, thinking, and talking, incorporate those ideas in their own lessons, and ensure that students will be able to understand and articulate a clear purpose: what they are learning and how they know if they have learned it. As evidenced by the FSA, we plan to increase student achievement in ELA/Math by at least 3%, increase learning gains in all content areas by at least 3%, and increase learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile in all content areas by at least 3%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Administration and instructional coaches will be present in all collaborative sessions to provide guidance and support. The school's leadership team will continue to review data quarterly and provide guidance on how to adjust instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy	Teachers will have scheduled time to common plan with their team on standards-based instruction in all content areas, to include collaboration on assessments, work products, best teaching practices, authentic literacy (reading, writing, thinking, talking) and the instructional framework. Part of the instructional framework includes a focus on purpose, that students will understand what they are learning, why/how they are learning it, and how they will know if they've learned it.

being implemented for this Area of Focus.	During these common planning sessions, our two instructional coaches will attend to share best practices and offer resources and guidance. Administration will also provide further support to each team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	If we implement, monitor, and support common planning with additional support to help teachers collaborate on the instructional framework, then teachers will have better quality instruction that incorporates best practices in facilitating reading, writing, thinking, and talking, use those ideas into their own lessons, and ensure that students will be able to understand and articulate a clear purpose: what they are learning and how they know if they have learned it. By examining the data, they will work collaboratively to determine how to meet the needs of the students not demonstrating mastery or needing remediation (or those in need of acceleration). Therefore, we will ensure improvement in student learning and success by increasing the outcome measures listed above.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Create and establish a common planning/collaboration schedule with clearly identified protocols and expected products.

Who: Administration and Teachers, Instructional Coaches
Frequency: Weekly
When: Start August 5, 2022
Evidence: Schedule, List of Expectations/Protocols, Learning Walk Data

Person Responsible	Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Monitor through observation of collaborative time, review of expected products, and actual implementation in the classrooms, including learning walks.

Who: Administration and Teachers, Instructional Coaches
Frequency: Weekly
When: Start August 10, 2022
Evidence: Schedule, List of Expectations/Protocols, Learning Walk Data

Person Responsible	Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Signs	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	By utilizing Early Warning Signs (EWS) data, GLES will increase student attendance, positive student behaviors, and maintain a safe and supportive school environment for all students.This is a critical need area because if we develop and implement a system of motivational supports and behavior interventions/supports/incentives for our students, then we will foster a more welcoming and engaging environment/culture for our students with fewer undesirable behaviors, high expectations, and a collective commitment for success.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Based on EWS data, we will decrease students absent (10% or more of the time) by at least 5%. We will decrease the amount of 1 (or more) out of school suspensions by 30%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Administration and school leadership team will monitor EWS data quarterly and make adjustments to our approach. Our core team, including teacher leaders, also addresses this area of focus at each of our bi-monthly meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	The Dean and PASS teacher will implement and monitor the use of an attendance incentive system for all grade levels, minus Covid circumstances. Non-load bearing personnel will also proactively build rapport and offer support to students through regular meetings with students who are on the verge of having attendance concerns. We started a new behavior support committee with representation from each grade level where we collectively came up with a new school-wide behavior incentive system to increase positive behaviors based on the 7 Covey Habits. The PASS teacher will work with behaviorally at-risk students, meeting with them regularly to proactively address concerns and provide

implemented for this Area of Focus.	behavior strategies/restorative practices prior to needing interventions such as suspensions. Every teacher plays an active role in both the attendance incentive program and the positive behavior incentive program. This strategy's effectiveness, based on EWS data, will be monitored quarterly by the Leadership Team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	If we implement, monitor, and support an attendance incentive program and a positive behavior incentive program, students and teachers will share a collective commitment to maintaining a safe and supportive school environment for all students. If we develop and implement a system of motivational supports and behavior interventions/supports/ incentives for our students, then we will foster a more welcoming and engaging environment/culture for our students with fewer undesirable behaviors, high expectations, and a collective commitment for success. We will ensure to improve student learning and success by increasing the outcome measures listed above.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Create a schedule of meetings and list of expectations for the attendance incentive program and behavior incentive program.

Who: Administration, Leadership Team, Teachers
Frequency: Quarterly
When: Start August 10, 2022
Evidence: Schedule, List of Expectations/Protocols, EWS Data

Person Responsible	Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Create a list of expectations and protocols for each of these programs.

Who: Administration, Leadership Team, Teachers
Frequency: Quarterly
When: Start August 10, 2022
Evidence: Schedule, List of Expectations/Protocols, EWS Data

Person Responsible	Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@lake.k12.fl.us)

3. Implement the programs and progress monitor effectiveness, making necessary adjustments quarterly.

Who: Administration, Leadership Team, Teachers
Frequency: Quarterly
When: Start August 10, 2022
Evidence: Schedule, List of Expectations/Protocols, EWS Data

Person Responsible	Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	GLES will implement, monitor, and support quality interventions for struggling students as well as implement opportunities for acceleration for students already showing mastery of grade level standards. This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because by holding a daily remediation/acceleration time will ensure students will receive targeted interventions aligned to their remediation/acceleration needs. This will ensure the measurable outcomes (see below) to improve learning and success. This area of focus will also address our SWD subgroup, which had a Federal Index at 29% (below the 41% threshold).
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	This area of focus will reduce the number of students failing Math or ELA at the end of the year to 5% or less. As evidenced by the FSA, we plan to increase student achievement in ELA and Math by at least 3%, ELA/Math learning gains by at least 3%, and bottom quartile ELA/Math learning gains by at least 3%. We also plan to increase ELA/Math achievement and learning gains in the SWD subgroup by at least 3%. We also plan to increase ELA achievement in the African-American subgroup by 6%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This will be monitored by Administration and the leadership team by progress monitoring iReady assessment data, FAST, and course data. The data will be reviewed quarterly through leadership team led data chats with each teacher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will hold a daily remediation/acceleration block to provide interventions to the lowest quartile of students in ELA (all grades) through utilization of the LLI program. In addition, based on SAI funding, a certified teacher will be hired as a tutor (extra duty pay) to pull students during the day to provide remediation to the lowest quartile in Math in grades 4-5. We will also provide after school tutoring (funded through SAC) for struggling students in ELA and Math. These intervention strategies will also include the SWD subgroup. The measurable outcomes are listed above, including raising achievement in all categories by at least 3%.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for	If we implement, monitor, and support quality interventions (remediation block/LLI/SAI math tutoring) for struggling students as well as implement opportunities for acceleration for students already showing mastery of grade level standard, then we will ensure to improve student learning and success by increasing the outcome measures listed above.

selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Create and establish a schedule for a school-wide remediation/acceleration block. Administration will establish and communicate clearly defined expectations to teachers for this block, including any additional training to utilize the LLI system. A schedule will be established for SAI math tutoring.

Who: Administration and Teachers
Frequency: Reevaluate Quarterly
When: Start August 10, 2022
Evidence: Schedule, Lesson Plans, List of Protocols/Expectations, Progress Monitoring

Person Responsible	Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Teachers will group the students according to mastery of the standards and placement in the correct level of the LLI system to ensure targeted remediation to meet the unique needs of each student.

Who: Administration and Teachers
Frequency: Reevaluate Quarterly
When: Start August 10, 2022
Evidence: Schedule, Lesson Plans, List of Protocols/Expectations, Progress Monitoring

Person Responsible	Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@lake.k12.fl.us)

3. Teachers will continue to monitor and adjust remediation/acceleration strategies as students progress with their skills.

Who: Administration and Teachers
Frequency: Reevaluate Quarterly
When: Start August 10, 2022
Evidence: Schedule, Lesson Plans, List of Protocols/Expectations, Progress Monitoring

Person Responsible	Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@lake.k12.fl.us)

4. Our school secretary and bookkeeper will ensure that SAI funds are being distributed according to the approved plan (tutoring/supplies).

Who: Administration and Teachers
Frequency: Reevaluate Quarterly
When: Start August 10, 2022
Evidence: Schedule, Lesson Plans, List of Protocols/Expectations, Progress Monitoring

Person Responsible	Julie Tucker (tuckerj3@lake.k12.fl.us)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Grassy Lake incorporates an estimated 50%+ parent involvement with activities on campus. We would like to continue to see an increase in attendance for our academic-based family activities. Academically, we have meet the teacher, curriculum nights for each grade level, designated parent conference nights in October, other parent conference nights throughout the year, awards ceremonies, reading carnival (2nd grade), STEAM night, art night, etc. We also have a Winter Wonderland festival, PTO and SAC meetings, family bingo night, family movie night, multiple dances (in which all parents attend), Mother's Day activities, classroom holiday parties, etc.

Our volunteer program has grown in that our volunteers now clock around 10,000 hours each year. They help us with field trips, classroom needs, STEAM activities, Wonderful Wednesdays, media center needs, front office help, etc. We have always received the Golden School Award for volunteerism at our school based on this criteria.

In addition to our successful volunteer program, we participate in "Dads Take Your Child to School Day" where we had 700+ dads (out of 1000 students) participate previously. The intent of the initiative is to highlight the significant difference father figures can make in their child's education.

We have implemented the "Remind App" for increased communication with our families in addition to using School Messenger, Class Dojo, and two GLES Facebook pages (one public and one private just for our parents).

We are continuing to work to invigorate our PTO and SAC to increase parent involvement. We currently have community stakeholders within our SAC that assist with the direction of the school. We work with Kiwanis and other community groups to promote academics and good character within our schools.

In light of Covid, many of these activities had transitioned to virtual and we are excited to now welcome more families back into our building for more in-person events. We already had parent involvement with "Meet the Teacher" and Curriculum Nights, and will continue to seek out safe new ways to continue to involve our stakeholders.

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

We encourage parent and community involvement at all levels, and have adjusted for safety within Covid protocols. Our parents communicate through our two Facebook pages, PTO, SAC, and continue to participate in school events such as meet the teacher, curriculum nights for each grade level, designated parent conference nights in October, other parent conference nights throughout the year, awards ceremonies, reading carnival (2nd grade), STEAM night, art night, Winter Wonderland festival, PTO and

SAC meetings, family bingo night, family movie night, multiple dances (in which all parents attend), Mother's Day activities, classroom holiday parties, etc. We have community members such as the Kiwanis who have partnered with us for the Terrific Kid program. We have various organizations such as churches and clubs that provide resources, school supplies, and other needs to our students and families. We also have several community members who continue to take part in our SAC and as volunteers in the school.