Lake Forest Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Forest Elementary School

4401 SE 4TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32641

https://www.sbac.edu/lakeforest

Demographics

Principal: Elizabeth Leclear

Start Date for this Principal: 8/11/2022

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	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: F (29%) 2018-19: D (32%) 2017-18: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 2
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
ESSA Status	CSI
* 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 Alachua 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

Lake Forest Elementary School

4401 SE 4TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32641

https://www.sbac.edu/lakeforest

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	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	90%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	F		D	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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.

Lake Forest's mission is to promote academic excellence and maintain high expectations for all students in an environment that is centered around students, directed by teachers, and supported by home and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lake Forest Elementary School is a place where students will learn how to utilize the knowledge and tools necessary to confidently meet challenges. Our students will be empowered to reach their potential, as well as become respectful and responsible leaders of the 21st century

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
Le Clear, Elizabeth	Principal	Principal: Provide opportunities for teacher collaboration; Facilitate implementation of RTI; communicate and reinforce expectations for data-based decision making; conduct walk-throughs to monitor fidelity and integrity of the core curriculum and intervention implementation; monitor teacher effectiveness; communicates with all shareholders information regarding school data and student achievement progress, implements and monitors behavior intervention. Provides opportunities for teacher professional development in effective teaching strategies and best practices.
Mosley, Eliscia	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal: Provides instructional support and coordinate professional development/coaching support for instructors; Coordinate school wide assessments, conduct walkthroughs to monitor implementation of SIP strategies, implements and monitors behavior intervention, monitor student achievement through analyzing school-wide data, assist with the development of intervention and differentiated instruction
Negron, Rolando	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal: Provides instructional support and coordinate professional development/coaching support for instructors; Coordinate school wide assessments, conduct walkthroughs to monitor implementation of SIP strategies, implements and monitors behavior intervention, monitor student achievement through analyzing school-wide data, assist with the development of intervention and differentiated instruction
Ellis, Carolyn	Math Coach	Facilitates and supports data collection and analysis in math and supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plans; provides instructional support and professional development for instructors. Work with instructors through the coaching cycle. Supports instructors with instructional planning
Crews, Emily	Instructional Coach	Title 1 compliance, coaching math and ELA, mentoring new teachers. Facilitates and supports data collection and analysis in math, ELA, and Science; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans; provides instructional support and professional development for instructors. Work with instructors through the coaching cycle. Supports instructors with instructional planning
Polly, Edward	Behavior Specialist	Provide support for teachers in the area of classroom management, PBIS point of contact.
Robertson, David	School Counselor	Provide teacher and student support for mental health. Participate in level 2 and level 3 diagnostic and implementation. Parent resource.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/11/2022, Elizabeth Leclear

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

29

Total number of students enrolled at the school

326

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

8

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

8

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	50	55	49	54	52	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	307
Attendance below 90 percent	1	28	28	39	35	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	3	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	1	18	15	21	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	1	12	14	22	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	19	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	25	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	19	21	25	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	1	20	22	35	29	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138

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	1	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/11/2022

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	49	56	47	70	42	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	310
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
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	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	12	3	20	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	49	56	47	70	42	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	310
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
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	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	12	3	20	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	25%	53%	56%				23%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	27%						31%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%						56%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	19%	40%	50%				26%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	31%						32%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						37%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	21%	54%	59%				18%	57%	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	30%	57%	-27%	58%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	14%	55%	-41%	58%	-44%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
05	2022					
	2019	18%	55%	-37%	56%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

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	27%	58%	-31%	62%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	15%	60%	-45%	64%	-49%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
05	2022					
	2019	27%	57%	-30%	60%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	20%	55%	-35%	53%	-33%
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	14	16	20	8	28	45					
BLK	24	29	37	18	32	48	21				
WHT	17			25							
FRL	25	26	29	19	31	43	23				

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	35		24	58		24				
BLK	21	35	50	24	33	64	17				
WHT	23			40							
FRL	19	27	33	22	38	67	16				

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	21	30	27	17	34	42					
BLK	23	31	52	26	32	39	19				
WHT	29			21	30						
FRL	23	33	56	24	33	38	18				

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	29
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	200
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	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	21
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	28
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

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?

ELA proficiency increased by 2% to 25%, ELA learning gains decreased by 7% to 27%, ELA lowest quartile decreased by 13% to 32%. Science decreased by 1% to 21%. Math proficiency decreased 6% to 19%, and Math learning gains decreased by 9% to 31%. Math's lowest quartile decreased by 26% to 45.

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

ELA profciency is 25%, ELA learning gains 27%, ELA Lowest Quartile 32%, math proficiency 19%, and math learning gains 31%. Math Lowest Quartile 31% Science proficiency 21%

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

Teacher attendance, attrition, a lack of certified and qualified teachers, a lack of substitutes, intervention paras, and coaches pulled to substitute.

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

ELA increased by 2% to 25%. The 3rd grade had 26% proficiency and the 5th grade 28%.

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

We started collaborative planning and changing acceleration groups, so they were more fluid with progress monitoring.

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

Common planning along with collaborative planning in content areas. Coaching and identifying trends with the coaching data. Monthly data chats with administrators and weekly with teams.

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.

Collaborative planning, Training in both math and ELA Best standards, new curriculum, Conscious discipline, and AVID.

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

District support with ELA and math coaches will participate in collaborative planning. Continual progress monitoring of teacher instruction and student data.

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 Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on test scores, instruction needed to be improved as well as improving teacher attendance. Tutoring and accelerated groups need to be targeted and explicit.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Test scores should improve to 41% in ELA. Science and Math proficiency and 60% for learning gains and Lowest Quartile in math and ELA. We also stated a stretch goal of 45% in ELA, science, and math. Teacher attendance needs to improve to no more than 15% of the 10 days maximum given by the district per semester.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will use F.A.S.T., I Ready, and teacher assessment in our database Illuminate, aligned to the benchmarks for progress monitoring. Teacher attendance reports.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Le Clear (lecleaea@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Collaborative and common planning is monitored by coaches and admin, focusing on differentiation, student accountability, rigor, and benchmark alignment. Frequent walk-throughs, ongoing progress monitoring, acceleration groups that are pulled out and pushed, coaching to build capacity, and after-school tutoring that is targeted and explicit.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Collaborative and common planning with a structured system is both research and both evidenced-based strategies that have been proven to increase student achievement and rigor in the classroom.

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.

Master schedule built with common planning.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Le Clear (lecleaea@gm.sbac.edu)

Collaborative planning training

Person Responsible	Eliscia Mosley (mosleyej@gm.sbac.edu)

Teachers identify 3 collaborative planning addressing ELA, Math and data. The focus is alignment to the benchmarks, differentiation, student accountability, and rigor.

Person Responsible	Eliscia Mosley (mosleyej@gm.sbac.edu)

Collaborative planning checks admin attends each planning and coaches.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Le Clear (lecleaea@gm.sbac.edu)

Students identified for tutoring based on standards

| **Person Responsible** | Eliscia Mosley (mosleyej@gm.sbac.edu) |

Monitoring of the instruction during tutoring.

| **Person Responsible** | Rolando Negron (negrongonzalezra@gm.sbac.edu) |

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Absences and behavior

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Positive culture and the environment were identified with the teacher and student absences and referrals.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Decrease teacher absences by 10%, decrease student absences by 10% and decrease referrals by 10%
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The data will be reviewed monthly to compare with the 2021/22 data. Administrative walk-throughs, dean support, and guidance support in lieu of referrals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Le Clear (lecleaea@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The school is being trained in Conscious discipline. Teachers have numerous coaches working with them to provide support. A stipend will be given per semester for teachers who miss less than 5 days. Parents are called on the first tardy and absence.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Conscious Disciple has been successful in other schools, which is a positive behavior management system and addresses the classroom culture.

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.

Summer Training and follow-up during the year. Behavior referrals will decrease by 10%.

| **Person Responsible** | Emily Crews (crewsee@gm.sbac.edu) |

MOU signed that provides a bonus for teachers who miss less than 5 days this strategy shows support for teachers. Focusing on teacher efficacy, a positive culture, and support of teachers.

| **Person Responsible** | Elizabeth Le Clear (lecleaea@gm.sbac.edu) |

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

DIBELS K 26%, 1st 54%, and 2nd 49% at risk need intensive support. This will be approached with UFLI Foundations, SRD support with collaborative planning, and coaching from district literacy specialists, EDI, Title 1 pullout, push-in models, standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction, and Beyond the Bell tutoring.

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

IReady 51% at risk, 4th grade 39% and 5th grade 53%.
DIBELS 3rd 53% , 4th 48%, 5th 53% at risk.
This will be approached with UFLI Foundations, SRD support with collaborative planning, and coaching from district literacy specialists, EDI, Title 1 pullout, push-in models, standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction, and Beyond the Bell tutoring.

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)

k-2 35% will be proficient
I ready, DIBEL, Istation

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

3-5 35% will score on F.A.S.T. as proficient.
IReady, Station, and DIBELS

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.

IReady progress monitoring, which standards assessment, DIBEL progress monitoring quarterly, and teacher assessments weekly or biweekly. Acceleration and tutoring groups will be monitored monthly based on standards and IReady data to monitor impact.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Crews, Emily, crewsee@gm.sbac.edu

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. §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?

Tutoring will use Achieve 3000, and IReady. Acceleration groups will use IReady and Iexcel. and they align with BEST.

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?

IReadyand Achieve 3000 is approved by the state becaseu it is an evidence-based program and has a proven record for effectiveness.

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
Implementation of the district literacy team and school-based literacy team. Literacy coaches based at schools.	Mosley, Eliscia, mosleyej@gm.sbac.edu
Professional devlopment for the coaches and AP's literacy institute and then PD with the techers, On going literacy coaching provided by the district.	Mosley, Eliscia, mosleyej@gm.sbac.edu
IReady reading, DIBELS and progress monitoring by the state	Le Clear, Elizabeth, lecleaea@gm.sbac.edu
Summer institiute, state regional literacy director proving PD for admin, coaches and teachers.	Mosley, Eliscia, mosleyej@gm.sbac.edu

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.

Through interactions, such as Open House, Parent Conferences, and parent involvement activities, we are provided opportunities to learn about students' cultures, thus building relationships between teachers and students. The school has business and faith-based partnerships that are supportive of the needs of students, staff, and families. The school builds and sustains partnerships with the local community for the purpose of securing and utilizing resources to support the school and student achievement through community members' and parents involved in the School Advisory Council (SAC). Several businesses support our PBS implementation through donations and goods and services. Local churches and organizations provide supplies for teachers and students, support our weekend backpack program (food for the weekend) and mentor and volunteer at the school.

Lake Forest has a full-time guidance counselor, Social Worker, and Mental Health Coordinator that provide both whole group, small group, and individual counseling and assists families who are in need. A Home-School Liaison assists faculty and staff in contacting families and supports families. We have partnered with several groups from the University of Florida and the community to provide mentors to students needing additional emotional and social support. Our district has selected our school to participate in the "System of Care" program that connects families in need with community resources.In addition, Caring School Community, a social-emotional curriculum, is implemented daily at all grade levels by instructors.

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

Elizabeth Le Clear, Principal. Dr. LeCear works with SAC, reaching out to parents to provide a welcoming school culture.
Eliscia Mosley, AP Ms. Mosley works with coaches, SAC and parents to provide a welcoming culture that is academically focused.
Rolando Negron AP. Mr. Negron works with SAC, migrant families and coaches to provide a welcoming culture that is academically focused.
Emily Crews, Instructional Intervention Coach and Title 1 lead teacher. Ms. Crews reaches out to parents with title 1 initiatives, math night, science night and parent information nights.
Carolyn Ellis , Instructional Coach. Ms. Ellis provides instruction and monitoring in math and participates in teacher data chats and parent data chats.
Edward Polly BRT. Ms. Jenkins runs PBIS program, Citizen of the month, reaches out to teachers to work with classroom management, and reaches out to parents to encourage positive behavior.