

Lake County Schools

Lost Lake Elementary School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lost Lake Elementary School

1901 JOHNS LAKE RD, Clermont, FL 34711

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

Demographics

Principal: Frank Gomez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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 (53%) 2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: B (61%)
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.

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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lost Lake Elementary School

1901 JOHNS LAKE RD, Clermont, FL 34711

<https://loe.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	57%

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.

Lost Lake Elementary School inspires, nurtures and facilitates students in becoming critical and global thinkers, leaders and problem solvers of tomorrow.

The mission and vision statements were created in 2014-15 with input from stakeholders at Lost Lake Elementary School.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Investing in our future, one child at a time!

The mission and vision statements were created in 2014-15 with input from stakeholders at Lost Lake Elementary School.

Lost Lake Elementary School will become a destination school with continued growth for all students, and especially students in our lowest quartile.

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
Cousineau, Kelly	Principal	
Clark, Scott	Assistant Principal	
Hart, Karen	Assistant Principal	
Pinkston, Katherine	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Gault, Bonnie	School Counselor	
Rohleder, Lauren	Instructional Coach	
Hansen, Daniel	Attendance/Social Work	
Parisi, Marta M.	Staffing Specialist	ESE School Specialist

Estro, Amber L.	Teacher, K-12	PASS Teacher
-----------------	---------------	--------------

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Frank Gomez

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.*

3

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

54

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,132

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

4

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

9

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	135	162	189	206	193	198	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1083
Attendance below 90 percent	3	4	5	3	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	36	10	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	24	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	20	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	28	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	4	4	7	34	19	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

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	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/23/2022

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	139	162	167	166	159	159	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	952
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	2	4	8	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	6	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	139	162	167	166	159	159	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	952
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	2	4	8	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	6	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	66%	50%	56%				79%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						69%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						66%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	65%	46%	50%				78%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	45%						63%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						47%	39%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	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	80%	60%	20%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	83%	60%	23%	58%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2022					
	2019	71%	59%	12%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

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	86%	62%	24%	62%	24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	76%	61%	15%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
05	2022					
	2019	69%	57%	12%	60%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	66%	56%	10%	53%	13%
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	33	33	14	31	39	21				
ELL	45	56	50	38	56	62	20				
ASN	70	44		74	53		73				
BLK	52	47	31	57	42	31	13				
HSP	59	50	38	55	43	50	47				
MUL	57	54		62	38						
WHT	76	65	70	73	48	24	64				
FRL	57	41	36	59	36	35	30				
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	23	22	23	26	29	27	22				
ELL	48	60		45	13		36				
ASN	68			64							
BLK	43	47		44	21	30	29				
HSP	62	46	50	57	32	9	50				
MUL	50			72							
WHT	76	46	20	77	47		69				
FRL	59	41	38	59	36	27	47				
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	45	58	68	57	56	38	45				
ELL	68	68	40	79	77		71				
AMI	85			69							
ASN	86	71		89	79		77				
BLK	62	60	50	62	53	42	60				
HSP	80	73	68	75	63	56	61				
MUL	75	71		75	48						
WHT	83	68	75	85	67	50	73				
FRL	73	68	67	69	59	44	56				

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	368
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	47
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	63
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	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	53

Multiracial Students	
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	60
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	42
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?

Our 2022 data reveals many areas opportunities for improvement. Fifth grade Math remains our most critical area, as evidenced by low proficiency at 51%, lowest quartile learning gains at 31%, and all student learning gains at 36%. Additionally, 14% of students with disabilities scored proficient on Math FSA. This is down 12% from 2021 and 43% from 2019. Science proficiency also presents itself as a critical need area. While proficiency for all students was 51% in Science, only 13% of black students scored a 3 or higher on the Science FSA.

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

Math learning gains is our most critical area, however, proficiency in Math also reveals we are losing ground each year. Intentional focus on improving Math instruction must be part of our plan 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?

2022 was not a great year for Math for LLE as evidenced by the results in all Math scoring categories. We have identified a few contributing factors to this need for improvement which include:

Students not receiving a full hour of Math instruction daily
Intervention blocks not being implemented with fidelity
Teachers not aware of and/or not using strategies that work for kids

Actions we need to take to address this need for improvement:

Ensure the master schedule provides one hour (minimum) of Math instruction daily
Administration monitoring each grade level to ensure one hour of Math instruction is happening daily
Working with teams to ensure students are placed in the Math intervention they need
Teachers implementing strategies that work for student success in Math intervention
Providing professional learning to teachers around best practices in Math instruction

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

Black students improved 9% in ELA and 13% in Math. Additionally, low quartile learning gains in Math grew from 18% to 33%.

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

Throughout the 2020-21 school year, our leadership team hosted an equity coalition. The goal of the coalition was specific to addressing gaps in achievement among student groups, specifically, we discussed the gaps in performance of black students and white students. The principal shared historical data of these two subgroups- both during the meetings and through mass distributed Smore updates. So even those not part of the work of the equity coalition had an awareness of the gaps in performance. This was a start for us, we believe, in focusing on the academic needs of every student to ensure all students have an opportunity to learn.

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

Our first strategy will be to consider intervention placement for students with disabilities and black students. Being intentional in where they go and the skills support they receive will contribute to growth in both of these subcategories. Professional learning around Math best practices will ensure every student has the opportunity to grow and achieve proficiency in Math. Additionally, we need to look at Science instruction and develop a plan for how we will support students that are underperforming in this area.

Consistent monitoring through classroom walks of intervention block will be the strongest indicator of whether we are closing the gaps in these areas. We will continue walking classrooms during regular instruction time, however, a sharper lens on intervention block is needed because we know, based on last year's data, the children who are underperforming. We need to see the remediation provided to them to know if they are receiving what they need.

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.

Math- LOTS of Math professional learning opportunities centered on problem based learning, a high yield strategy that is a student-centered approach in which students learn about a subject by working in groups to solve an open-ended problem. Science professional learning may be needed as well.

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

We need to grow our leadership team. We cannot lead what we do not know, and being intentional in learning and growing together will help us be better leaders of our school. Learning strategies that support students from our Literacy Coach and CRT will make us better able to spot instruction in the classroom that is working and instruction that is not. Leaning on our district partners in Math (Tracy Wood), intervention (Courtney Franklin), and students with disabilities (Stacey Johnston) will be a high priority as our team becomes better at supporting teachers in these areas. We will read together the book Learning by Doing by DuFour, Eaker, Many, and Mattos, which will shape our work with a guiding coalition to grow PLCs and teacher learning.

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.

We will continue to be intentional in providing professional learning to staff around the Lake County Schools (LCS) instructional framework, while aligning our work to the Florida Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) Standards with the new McGraw Hill Reveal math curriculum and in English Language Arts. Reading with comprehension will affect scores in math and science. We know that strong instruction starts with ensuring focused planning around the purpose for learning, modeling thinking for children, using collaboration strategies that work for kids, thinking forward on how independent learning achievement, and guiding instruction as a way of leading learners to new understanding. As a school, the classroom visit feedback from last school year provides evidence that the implementation of this strategy is an opportunity for growth on our campus as well as needing better alignment of math tasks. Our goal is to improve teacher practice around guided instruction and better align math tasks to the new B.E.S.T. standards.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We expect proficiency and learning gains to increase in Math results by supporting teachers in leading their students to new understanding through guided instruction. Specifically, third grade students will increase from 68% to 71%, fourth grade students from 67% to 70%, and fifth grade from 51%-54%. For the school, overall math proficiency will increase from 62% proficient to 65%.

Additionally, in Math we will see the proficiency level of students with disabilities grow from 14% to 30%.

Thirteen percent of our African American students scored a two or below on the Next Generation Sunshine State Science Standards. Skills in reading and math will directly affect these scores. For this school sub group, overall science proficiency will increase from 13% proficient to 16% proficient.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored through walkthrough data and feedback provided in OneNote, Professional Learning Communities (PLC) around standards alignment. Additionally, leadership will participate in monthly data chats to identify teachers needing support with guided instruction and/or tasks aligned to the B.E.S.T. Math and English Language Arts (ELA) Standards. Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT) will provide support to the identified teachers through professional development, coaching, and modeling lessons. Data will be collected specifically on our six African American students in 5th grade who scored a two or below on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in ELA during the previous year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Hart (hartk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

Guided Instruction is a time for teachers to question, prompt and cue students while working on a standard aligned task, often in collaborative groups. Guided Instruction is a component of Lake County Schools Instructional Framework, which also includes setting a purpose, modeling thinking, collaboration, and independent practice. Through professional learning around guided instruction, targeted feedback practices, and PLCs focused on planning for tasks aligned to B.E.S.T. Math and ELA Standards, we will see proficiency increase in Math.

implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Our students will benefit from consistent monitoring and support from their teachers if we implement, monitor and support instructional practice grounded in guided instruction. Guided instruction will help scaffold student learning towards mastery of B.E.S.T Math and ELA Standards.

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.

Our action step to ensure teachers are receiving professional development will include training during grade level PLCs and professional development days on September 2 and December 19 to ensure that the teachers receive training on how to implement our Lake County School's District Framework and B.E.S.T. Math and ELA standards into their lesson plans. Our Curriculum Resource Teacher and teacher experts on campus will provide the trainings. The administrators will collect data during Classroom Walkthroughs using OneNote to provide feedback to each teacher. Mrs. Cousineau will create the schedule for the Walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Kelly Cousineau (cousineauk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Professional Development: District Instructional Framework, B.E.S.T. Math Standards, McGraw Hill Reveal

Person Responsible Katherine Pinkston (pinkstonk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Intentional standards based planning in PLCs

Person Responsible Kelly Cousineau (cousineauk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Coaches will support teachers in planning and implementing best practices

Person Responsible Katherine Pinkston (pinkstonk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Quarterly data chats with teachers and their administrator
The conversation will be specific to how teachers are meeting the needs of students with disabilities and black students.

Person Responsible Kelly Cousineau (cousineauk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Mentor the 6 African American students who scored level 2 and below in ELA. Conversations with the student bi-monthly to review grades, Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) scores, and iReady Scores.

Person Responsible Karen Hart (hartk@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

As a campus with dozens of high performing teachers, we recognize the importance of ensuring we provide support and coaching to all teachers, especially our new teachers, to grow them to become high performing. New this year is a teacher mentorship support group that will meet monthly to share the successes and trouble shoot the challenges of this special group of teachers. We want all of our teachers to feel supported in this work, and teacher focus groups conducted throughout the school year will ensure their voices are heard when it comes to student and workplace concerns. Finally, our professional learning communities (PLCs) will continue with its focus of growing teachers. Through the process of the lesson study cycle, teachers will have an opportunity to collaboratively plan a lesson, implement it in the classroom, and share feedback with each other. This will improve teacher practice to improve student outcomes.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By placing a focus on supporting new teachers and those new to Lake County, we will reach our goal of retaining 75% of those new teachers for the 23-24 school year. This evidence will be measured at the end of the 22-23 school year via intent to return forms.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will consistently monitor our progress towards 75% retention of new teachers by:

- conducting monthly new teacher support groups
- conducting teacher focus groups
- conducting weekly PLCs
- coordinating lesson study cycles

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Cousineau (cousineauk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

The evidence-based strategies being implemented for this area of focus are PLCs and lesson study cycles.

**implemented
for this Area
of Focus.**

**Rationale for
Evidence-
based**

Strategy:

**Explain the
rationale for
selecting
this specific
strategy.**

Lesson study cycle supports teachers to experiment, observe, and improve their practice. As teachers work together to study student learning, they become better and more capable of growing children.

**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.

- Chris Garcia will host and conduct the new teacher support group
- The Literacy Coach and the CRT (curriculum resource teacher) will work with teachers during dedicated PLC times
- The CRT and the Literacy Coach will work with teachers to conduct lesson study cycles to plan, implement, and reflect on target lessons.
- The leadership team will develop a guiding coalition around the work being done in PLCs. This group will launch with a book study on the resource, Learning by Doing.

Person

Responsible

Kelly Cousineau (cousineauk@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.

Our most striving students in Math, for two years in a row, are not meeting our learning gains goals. Students in our ESE subgroup are striving in this area as well, with only 14% of students scoring proficient. We think this may be happening for a few reasons:
 Students are not receiving a minimum of 60 minutes of Math instruction daily.
 Students are not receiving the level of Math intervention support they need.
 Teachers are not receiving professional learning support around Math best practices.

In an effort to remove these potential barriers to learning, we have crafted a school master schedule that ensures each grade level has 60 minutes of Math instruction daily. When it comes to our intervention block, students striving in one subject and not the other will receive 4-30 minute interventions/weekly in the subject in which data shows they need the most help. Students will not be restricted by a 2 days of ELA/2 days of Math intervention block system. And finally, all teachers teaching Math will learn problem based learning strategies for Math learning.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By ensuring teachers utilize the 60 minutes of math instruction with purpose and our intervention time is intentional in supporting this group, we expect to see an increase in Math proficiency of 65% based on school-level assessment data.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This focus area will be monitored through classroom visit feedback, walkthroughs made by our leadership team, student assessment progress, iReady data, and monthly data dives in PLC.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber L. Estro (estroa@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

By providing all students with 60 minutes of daily math instruction and 30 minutes of remediation and acceleration four days per week, we will increase learning gains in Math. Learning gains for all students will meet 60% learning gains for our most striving learners will meet 50% in Math. School data will be analyzed quarterly with teachers and leadership team data dives to monitor this strategy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this

If we monitor and support teachers as they facilitate effective remediation and acceleration learning opportunities for students, both in the 60-minute math instruction and intervention block, then we will increase academic achievement for all learners, including those performing in our lowest 25% of their class.

**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.

- Staff will provide students with 30 minutes of uninterrupted intervention time four days per week to remediate and accelerate student academics.
- Teachers will provide whole group and small group for 60 minutes of math instruction daily.
- Leadership and teachers will hold monthly data dives during PLC to see trends in student academic performance.
- MTSS progress monitoring data
- Classroom walkthroughs by the leadership team with immediate feedback via OneNote.
- Tutoring options for students who score a 1 or 2 on FSA.

Person Responsible Amber L. Estro (estroa@lake.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

We do not need to complete this section.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

N/A

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.

A positive school culture and environment is a high priority at Lost Lake ES. We take pride in making every effort to do things with teachers and not to teachers. Our teachers are well experienced and respected above all else. We include teacher voice in most decision making, as evidenced by our participation in the Inclusive Scheduling process in May 2022, our decision to implement school-wide Wednesday tutoring four times this school year, and crafting teacher led PD for teachers.

Our parents are amazing partners in this work and deserve a voice around many practices in our school. At least four times per year, we ask parents for specific feedback on events we host on campus. Each quarter, the principal hosts Coffee with the Principal, an open invitation to every LLE parent to get one hour of face time with the principal to share concerns, ideas on how we can improve, and get to know other parents in

the school. We are a large school (1132+ students currently) and staying connected in small ways is important. We do invite parents onto campus for lunch three days/week. We are a Lion family- students, staff, parents, family, and community.

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

All of Lost Lake Elementary School's (LLES) stakeholders play an important role in fostering a positive culture and environment. Our School Advisory Council (SAC) consists of parents, teachers, and educational support partners who work together to strengthen the student experience and promote student achievement and growth. Our Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) includes parents and teachers that host family events throughout the year to promote a positive culture. Together, they fundraise to support our staff and students with instructional materials and motivational tools. We have a significant number of parent volunteers, which includes families, high schoolers, college interns, and business partners that come to campus and work from home to assist staff with various duties. In addition to volunteering, our business partners promote a positive culture when donating school supplies, snacks and luncheons, or monetary gifts. Our students have a voice as stakeholders by participating in safety patrol, chorus, Lion Beats, and National Elementary Honor Society. Lost Lake also promotes Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS) by recognizing positive reinforcement that creates and maintains a positive school climate for students and teachers. School leadership promotes a positive school culture by modeling transparent communication with all stakeholders through weekly phone calls, daily social media updates, and staff Smore updates from the principal. The leaders of the school strive to be active listeners, relationship builders, and problem solvers.