

Lake County Schools

The Villages Elementary Of Lady Lake School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 20 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 20 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 21 |

The Villages Elementary Of Lady Lake School

695 ROLLING ACRES RD, Lady Lake, FL 32159

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/23/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Dudley, Gregg | Principal | Oversight, supervision, and implementation. |
| Sachs, Laura | Assistant Principal | Implementation |
| Shumate, Rheda Gail | School Counselor | Implementation and teamwork |
| Carroll, Lori | School Counselor | Implementation and teamwork |
| Sapp, Shannon | Other | Implementation and teamwork |
| Kertz, Kelly Lynne | Curriculum Resource Teacher | Implementation and teamwork |
| Rayment, Susan | Teacher, ESE | Implementation and teamwork |
| Sheppard, Larah | Other | student management, interventions, proactive |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholders are surveyed annually for input that is used in the development of the School Improvement Plan. Leadership members, teachers, parents, and community members are included in the process. Stakeholder input is sought in a variety of ways, including climate surveys and need assessments. Stakeholders are also involved in the process of dis-aggregating data and determining areas of focus for instructional improvement. An essential component of this work is the allocation of available resources to align to the school improvement plan. The School Advisory Council takes the lead in aligning resources to actions.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The leadership team will regularly review school-wide progress towards goals that are listed in the School Improvement Plan. Progress will be reported to the School Advisory Council on a quarterly basis. The goals and action steps included in the School Improvement Plan will be aligned to other measures that include regular monitoring. Professional Development Plans for teachers (TEAM) and leaders (LEADS) will include goals, actions, and benchmarks aligned to those in the SIP. Revisions to action steps and strategies will be made based on available progress monitoring indicators. Indicators may include mid year results for statewide assessments and locally adopted programs like iReady.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|--|---|
| 2023-24 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 |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 50% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: B 2019-20: A |

| | |
|--|------------|
| | 2018-19: A |
| | 2017-18: A |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 21 | 68 | 61 | 38 | 51 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 287 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 1 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 7 | 16 | 17 | 56 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 17 | 54 | 37 | 44 | 34 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 217 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 17 | 54 | 37 | 44 | 34 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 217 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 58 | 47 | 53 | 60 | 50 | 56 | 63 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 63 | | | 62 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 54 | | | 48 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 61 | 55 | 59 | 61 | 46 | 50 | 65 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 59 | | | 48 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 46 | | | 35 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 62 | 52 | 54 | 53 | 52 | 59 | 61 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 52 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 42 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 45 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 71 | 61 | 59 | 72 | | | 71 | | |

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 62 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 310 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 59 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 468 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 40 | Yes | 2 | |
| ELL | 41 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 57 | | | |
| HSP | 55 | | | |
| MUL | 71 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | | | |

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| FRL | 60 | | | |

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD | 38 | Yes | 1 | |
| ELL | 59 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 54 | | | |
| HSP | 54 | | | |
| MUL | 57 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | | | |
| FRL | 52 | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| All Students | 58 | | | 61 | | | 62 | | | | | 71 |
| SWD | 41 | | | 27 | | | 40 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 28 | | | 45 | | | 50 | | | | 5 | 71 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 57 | | | 39 | | | 56 | | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 49 | | | 58 | | | 52 | | | | 5 | 67 |
| MUL | 74 | | | 67 | | | | | | | 3 | |

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | | | 68 | | | 68 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 56 | | | 57 | | | 56 | | | | 5 | 72 |

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
|--------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| All Students | 60 | 63 | 54 | 61 | 59 | 46 | 53 | | | | | 72 |
| SWD | 34 | 51 | 36 | 39 | 46 | 32 | 26 | | | | | |
| ELL | 52 | 64 | | 63 | 71 | | 33 | | | | | 72 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | 66 | 65 | 45 | 47 | 53 | 48 | | | | | |
| HSP | 53 | 60 | 33 | 58 | 64 | 38 | 42 | | | | | 82 |
| MUL | 54 | 39 | | 67 | 67 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 66 | 67 | 63 | 67 | 59 | 42 | 61 | | | | | |
| FRL | 54 | 58 | 48 | 57 | 60 | 46 | 39 | | | | | |

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
|--------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| All Students | 63 | 62 | 48 | 65 | 48 | 35 | 61 | | | | | 71 |
| SWD | 31 | 44 | 45 | 33 | 20 | 20 | 13 | | | | | |
| ELL | 49 | 58 | | 68 | 33 | | 42 | | | | | 71 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | 50 | | 47 | 33 | | 29 | | | | | |
| HSP | 56 | 67 | 54 | 64 | 43 | 27 | 45 | | | | | 75 |
| MUL | 63 | | | 53 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 71 | 62 | | 71 | 56 | | 78 | | | | | |
| FRL | 58 | 58 | 52 | 57 | 42 | 35 | 53 | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 60% | 52% | 8% | 54% | 6% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 58% | 54% | 4% | 58% | 0% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 51% | 50% | 1% | 50% | 1% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 69% | 62% | 7% | 59% | 10% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 57% | 59% | -2% | 61% | -4% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 53% | 55% | -2% | 55% | -2% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 58% | 52% | 6% | 51% | 7% |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The 2023 data indicated our lowest performance was in Math Grade 4, we scored 3 points below the state mean of 315. In 5th grade, math, we scored 1 point below the state mean of 321. Contributing factors may have been the new version of the exams, implementation of computer based testing in all grades instead of paper and pencil administration. Other factors contributing to relatively low performance include task alignment to the rigor and intent of standards.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The greatest decline was 4th grade math. Factors that contributed were a change of personnel in grade 4 math instruction, as well as the implementation of the computer based testing.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap was 4th grade math, with a 3 point difference in our VELL's mean of 312 versus state's mean of 315 for 4th graders. Factors that contributed were a change of personnel in grade 4 math instruction as well as the implementation of the computer based testing.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We showed a decrease in the number of students who scored a Level 1 in third grade reading. There were 5% fewer students who scored a level 1. Fifth grade also showed an 8% gain in proficiency in both Reading and Math. Our school focused on research based instructional practices following the district's instructional framework.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

We had too many students who scored a level 1 in 4th grade math.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Students with disabilities will close the gap between the VELL mean proficiency and the state's mean proficiency.
2. Math scores in grades 4 and 5 will close the gap between the VELL Mean proficiency and the state's mean proficiency.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teacher were surveyed for their professional needs regarding " Building student capacity for metacognition" . Per survey results inservices will be provided. Teachers requested connections between standards, curriculum and state assessments.

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

By When: September 7, 2023 district instructional review will be held and training dates will be scheduled according to specific teacher requests regarding connections between the standards, curriculum and state assessments.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

VELL is working toward a learning environment in which all students are expected to "Be Responsible, Be Respectful, Be ready to Learn." With our expectation for all students to achieve at high levels, it is important for VELL to target a high standard for student behavior. Many of the students that struggle with managing their own behavior are students who are also a part of our lowest quartile. According to data, this number frequently includes our Students With Disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

80% of students who fall within the lowest quartile of our student body will demonstrate growth on district and/or state assessments. Additionally, it is our goal to have 80% of students in grades 4 and 5 demonstrate learning gains as measured by state assessments in ELA and Math.

Monitoring:

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

Discipline data will be monitored and discussed throughout the school year between leadership, teachers, and students, with a special focus on the students who fall within the lowest quartile and/or are a student with a disability. This data will be discussed weekly by the VELL Leadership Team, monthly by the VELL Behavior Threat Management Team and quarterly by the VELL Behavior Team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Interventions to support a Positive Culture and Learning Environment include the clarification and communication of high levels of expectations and supports for student behavior. If we implement, monitor and support the School Based Management Program and Character Education Curriculum, then student performance objectives will be reached.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Well-communicated standards for behavior and supports to all stakeholders will promote ownership and success toward creating and maintaining a positive learning environment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Development of Google Slides by the Behavior Team to communicate the high expectations of our School Based Management Program and Character Education Curriculum , supporting resources and discipline ladder to share during pre planning of the 2023-2024 school year.

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

By When: Begun in June 2023 to be presented on August 3, 2023

Communicating expectations for behavior to students is done through Villages Service Announcements (VSAs) shown during the students' morning news show (closed circuit). The VSAs, featuring our VELL students, focus on our expectations for behavior and Core Essentials character traits

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

By When: The first VSA was presented on August 10 and 11, 2023.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Data indicates that students with disabilities (FAST) is a targeted underperforming sub group based on 2022-2023 testing data. The expectation is for all students to learn at high levels as measured by state assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency levels for student will move from 38% to 41% as measured by state assessments on FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Data chats facilitated by administration will include targeted questions that focus on the performance of students in the ESE subgroup AT PM1, PM2, and PM3. The ESE team will monitor progress through the PLC process to improve instructional strategies of teachers working with students with disabilities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Susan Rayment (rayments@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Research based instructional best practices will include, guided practice in small group settings, provide sentence stems, ask academic questions, allow for productive struggle, and build resiliency. Additionally, programs that provide remediation and enrichment opportunities such as IXL and Accelerated Reader will be used to support instruction. Writing Teams will be utilized to plan a deep dive into standards alignment and produce grade-level lessons to support students with disabilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teacher were surveyed for their professional needs regarding " Building student capacity for metacognition" . Per survey results inservice will be provided.

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

By When: Survey date: August 9, 2023 Professional inservice day: September 1, 2023

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

ATSI - All schools in our district utilize a survey at the end of the previous school year in order to gain an understanding of what is important to parents/families. Additionally, a school wide review of what resources are on hand versus what is needed is conducted. During advertised meetings, in the spring, our SAC has frequent opportunities for input into our School wide program. A review of our school's personnel allocations, resources available, and schedules were also included in our Comprehensive Needs Assessment.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Our SIP is posted on our school's website. We also post on social media to let them know the SIP is available on line. We do announcements at SAC meetings to make sure our stakeholders are aware of what is available and ask for their input.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We have planned meetings throughout the school year. We have a Title I Annual Meeting in the first week of September. We have a report card night after the first quarter to discuss student progress and the student parent compact. We also have a literacy night as well as math night. Our principal sends regular call out announcements to all families. Social media platforms as well as the website are updated regularly.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Our school strengthens our academic program by academic tutoring, a strong MTSS program, and strong CORE academic instructional practices. Additionally, we are focusing on our district's Instructional Framework, which includes research based best practice strategies such as Modeling; Developing connections to prior knowledge; Guided practice in small groups settings; the use of Anchor Charts; Providing sentence stems; Establishing patterns and routines that support learning; Asking academic

questions; allowing for productive struggles; Building resiliency; Maintaining high expectations; offering opportunities for success; Goal planning and student growth tracking of progress.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The SIP is supported by the Title I funds allocated to our school. Through our title I funds, we purchase additional personnel such as two reading teachers and 39 hours of teaching assistants. We also purchase supplemental instructional materials such as Reading books and IXL programs. Additionally, planned parent involvement events help keep our parents involved and support our school. We also incorporate ESE funding to support our ESE classrooms and instructional needs for our students with disabilities. Considerations are given to Homeless, Migrant, Neglected & Delinquent programs.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------|---|---|--------------------------|-----|---------|
| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: -- Select below --: | | | | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | | | | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | | | | \$0.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 |
| | 5100 | 3690 | 0119 - The Villages Elem Of Lady Lake | School Improvement Funds | | \$0.00 |
| | | | Notes: Accelerated Reader is a scientifically based reading program that supports wide reading with accountability measures. | | | |
| | 5100 | 3690 | 0119 - The Villages Elem Of Lady Lake | Title, I Part A | | \$0.00 |
| | | | Notes: IXL is a scientifically researched web-based program that allows for remediation and enrichment for math, science, and ELA skills. | | | |
| | 6300 | 1930 | 0119 - The Villages Elem Of Lady Lake | Other | | \$0.00 |
| | | | Notes: Salaries for Writing Teams. Teacher Writing teams will dissect standards and plan lessons that are aligned to state standards with the appropriate level of rigor and will provide scaffolding for students with disabilities. | | | |
| | 6300 | 2100 | 0119 - The Villages Elem Of Lady Lake | Other | | \$0.00 |
| | | | Notes: Retirement for Writing Teams. Teacher Writing teams will dissect standards and plan lessons that are aligned to state standards with the appropriate level of rigor and will provide scaffolding for students with disabilities. | | | |
| | 6300 | 2200 | 0119 - The Villages Elem Of Lady Lake | Other | | \$0.00 |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|------|------|---|-------|--|---------------|
| | | | <i>Notes: Social Security for Writing Teams. Teacher Writing teams will dissect standards and plan lessons that are aligned to state standards with the appropriate level of rigor and will provide scaffolding for students with disabilities.</i> | | | |
| | 6300 | 2400 | 0119 - The Villages Elem Of Lady Lake | Other | | \$0.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Workers Comp for Writing Teams. Teacher Writing teams will dissect standards and plan lessons that are aligned to state standards with the appropriate level of rigor and will provide scaffolding for students with disabilities.</i> | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | \$0.00 |

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No