

Lake County Schools

Lost Lake Elementary 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 | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 22 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 22 |

Lost Lake Elementary School

1901 JOHNS LAKE RD, Clermont, FL 34711

<https://loe.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.

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, 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 |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Gomez, Frank | Principal | Vision and Mission Casting; Leading a culture of excellence via collaboration and teamwork from the top down. Day-to-day management of the school. Teacher Coaching and Mentoring, Teacher Feedback Coordinator, PRIDE Block Coordinator; Kindergarten and 3rd Grade Curriculum expert; Leadership Team and Grade Chair Coordinator; School Budget Oversight; PLC Coordinator, Field Trip Oversight; Fundraising and Community Outreach Coordinator |
| Hart, Karen | Assistant Principal | Master Schedule; SAI Budget, Duties and Supervision Schedule, Textbook ordering and support, New Teacher Support, 2nd, 5th, and Enrichment Curriculum Expert, 2nd grade, 5th grade, and bus discipline, organizing the quarterly data chats, and coordinating our School Advisory Council meetings |
| Clark, Scott | Assistant Principal | Health and Safety Coordinator, 1st Grade, 4th Grade, and ESE curriculum expert; Kindergarten, 1st Grade, 3rd Grade, and 4th Grade discipline, PTO Meeting Coordinator, Webpage expert, Handbook creator/editor, Technology Contact, Facilities and Work Order administrator, ELC administrator |
| Rohleder, Lauren | Reading Coach | Spellin Bee Coordinator; Tropicana Speech Coordinator; Literacy Week Coordinator; Breakfast Buddies Tutoring Program; PLC Support; Summer Reading Camp Coordinator and Contact; Reading Endorsement Contact; NEHS Sponsor, Literacy Committee Chairperson, other duties as assigned... |
| Pinkston, Katherine | Curriculum Resource Teacher | STEAM Night and Science Fair; Meet the Teacher event coordinator; Red Ribbon Week contact and coordinator; Growing to Green Program; Kinder Cub Camp coordinator; PLC Support; IReady Support; New Teacher Support; EOY Retention Meetings; NEHS co-sponsor; STEAM Committee Chairperson; other duties as assigned |
| Tuesca, Stephanie | Other | Breakfast Buddies Tutoring; Fifth Grade Clap Out Coordinator; Student Recognition Coordinator; PBIS Coordinator; Lunchroom Positive Behavior Management; PBIS Awards and Celebration; Safety Patrol Sponsor; PBIS Committee Chairperson; other duties as assigned... |

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.

Our School Advisory Council and Parent-Teacher Organization are very active with the school. Lost Lake Elementary has many parents and community members who come in and help the school. The School Improvement Plan will be submitted for review before being finalized.

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))

As a leadership team and SAC, we will relate all of our success and growth areas back to our School Improvement Plan. We will revise the plan if necessary during the year to ensure our continuous improvement. We will not rest on our laurels if we hit any goals mid-year.

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 | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 57% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 57% |
| 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) Asian Students (ASN) 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: C 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B |
| 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 | 12 | 44 | 40 | 44 | 47 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 223 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 17 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 17 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | |

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 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

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 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 10 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 17 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 18 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | |

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

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 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 10 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 17 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 18 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | |

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

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* | 65 | | | 66 | 50 | 56 | 66 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 56 | 54 | 61 | 44 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 45 | 48 | 52 | 33 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 68 | | | 65 | 52 | 60 | 66 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 45 | 52 | 64 | 37 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 40 | 41 | 55 | 18 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 71 | | | 51 | 45 | 51 | 57 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 0 | 50 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | | | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | | | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | | | | |
| ELP Progress | 62 | | | | | | 38 | | |

* 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 | 68 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 338 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 53 |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 368 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| 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 | 32 | Yes | 2 | |
| ELL | 57 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 71 | | | |
| BLK | 66 | | | |
| HSP | 63 | | | |
| MUL | 71 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 75 | | | |
| FRL | 62 | | | |

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 | 28 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| ELL | 47 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 63 | | | |
| BLK | 39 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 49 | | | |

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% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| MUL | 53 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | | | |
| FRL | 42 | | | |

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 | 65 | | | 68 | | | 71 | | | | | 62 |
| SWD | 31 | | | 24 | | | 43 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 43 | | | 56 | | | 65 | | | | 4 | 62 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 67 | | | 70 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| BLK | 62 | | | 65 | | | 67 | | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 58 | | | 63 | | | 66 | | | | 5 | 62 |
| MUL | 64 | | | 68 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 71 | | | 73 | | | 79 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 55 | | | 61 | | | 74 | | | | 5 | 62 |

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 | 66 | 56 | 45 | 65 | 45 | 40 | 51 | | | | | |
| SWD | 25 | 33 | 33 | 14 | 31 | 39 | 21 | | | | | |
| ELL | 45 | 56 | 50 | 38 | 56 | 62 | 20 | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 70 | 44 | | 74 | 53 | | 73 | | | | | |

| 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 |
| BLK | 52 | 47 | 31 | 57 | 42 | 31 | 13 | | | | | |
| HSP | 59 | 50 | 38 | 55 | 43 | 50 | 47 | | | | | |
| MUL | 57 | 54 | | 62 | 38 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 76 | 65 | 70 | 73 | 48 | 24 | 64 | | | | | |
| FRL | 57 | 41 | 36 | 59 | 36 | 35 | 30 | | | | | |

| 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 | 66 | 44 | 33 | 66 | 37 | 18 | 57 | | | | | 38 |
| SWD | 23 | 22 | 23 | 26 | 29 | 27 | 22 | | | | | |
| ELL | 48 | 60 | | 45 | 13 | | 36 | | | | | 38 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 68 | | | 64 | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 47 | | 44 | 21 | 30 | 29 | | | | | |
| HSP | 62 | 46 | 50 | 57 | 32 | 9 | 50 | | | | | 36 |
| MUL | 50 | | | 72 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 76 | 46 | 20 | 77 | 47 | | 69 | | | | | |
| FRL | 59 | 41 | 38 | 59 | 36 | 27 | 47 | | | | | 40 |

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 | 67% | 52% | 15% | 54% | 13% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 59% | 54% | 5% | 58% | 1% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 68% | 50% | 18% | 50% | 18% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 76% | 62% | 14% | 59% | 17% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 66% | 59% | 7% | 61% | 5% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 68% | 55% | 13% | 55% | 13% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 68% | 52% | 16% | 51% | 17% |

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 lowest component of student performance according to the data was 4th grade Reading which showed that 58 percent of our fourth grade students performed at grade level proficiency or higher. This was in line with the state average for 4th graders, also 58 percent and just four points above the district 4th grade average of 54 percent. Last year in 4th grade ELA, we had two teacher positions that were vacant for periods of time during the school year. The transitions from one teacher to another and then to another and the time in between with substitutes or split classes definitely has a negative impact on student learning outcomes. John Hattie's meta-analysis shows "mobility" has a major negative effect and this was a mobility that impacted almost half of our fourth grade students last school year.

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

The only decline Lost Lake Elementary suffered was those 4th grade reading scores. When taken in isolation as a grade level the decline was 11 points from 69 to 58. When taken as a cohort, those 4th graders had shown 65% proficiency as a cohort the year before so that is a seven point drop. Again, the teacher attrition in those 4th Grade ELA classrooms, no doubt, had an impact.

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.

While Lost Lake Elementary did not under-perform the state average in any component, the greatest gap was in 5th grade Reading where Lost Lake was +18 points compared to the state average. Our group of four 5th grade ELA teachers worked well together, one of them worked extremely hard on creating a plan, faithfully using the curriculum, that they all could follow, making the curriculum even more guaranteed and viable.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was 5th grade math moving up from 51% proficient in 2021-2022 to 70% proficient in 2022-2023. The students represented in that data also showed improvement of 3 percentage points, from 67% percent proficient as 4th graders to being 70% proficient as 5th graders. The team of teachers was brand new to 5th grade math. They also worked well together as a PLT, focusing on essential standards, designing and giving common assessments, and then planning intervention and extension activities for their students utilization their 30 minute intervention/ acceleration block at least two days per week.

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

The reading deficiencies and course failures in ELA are two potential areas of concern. As these early warning signs grow, our work must intensify. We must identify essential reading standards in each grade level, design or make use of already made common formative assessments based on those standards, make plans based on the results of those common formative assessments for students to receive intervention if needed, or extension if earned.

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

1. The students in 5th Grade - ELA especially but Math as well - that cohort produced the lowest proficiency averages in our school last year in both Reading and Math. Now they have Science on their plates as well.
2. The teachers in 4th Grade ELA - they had a rough year last year, the performance data was the lowest ever in Reading at Lost Lake Elementary.
3. Teacher retention and student discipline

How we will prioritize this:

1. Sharpening the PLC cycles in each grade level to include purposeful intervention and extension to the right students at the right time in the right areas of need.
2. Supporting the teachers and staff with a strong Tier 1 of behavior supports.
3. Coaching our new teachers - new to teaching, new to content, new to grade level, new to Lost Lake Elementary

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**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.

We identified instructional practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities because of the number of students (37) that show two or more early warning signs and number of students showing at least one early warning sign. Also, our 4th Grade reading was the only tested area that was even with state average. All other areas were at least 5 percentage points better than the state average, and that one was 4th grade math. All other tested areas were at least 13 percentage points higher than the state average. Our culture needs to be one that recognizes students who need intervention or acceleration before the end of the school year. Have a culture that is positive about Professional Learning Communities will keep this from happening. Our culture of professionalism and collaboration amongst same content and same grade level teachers will allow for early detection of warning signs and the teachers will be able to plan for just-in-time support before it's too late. Our PLCs will particularly plan for how they can support the learning needs of our students with disabilities as one of our main goals as a school is to have greater than 41% of our students with disabilities perform up to grade level proficiency standards on PM3 of the FAST tests.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The outcome we will measure will be ELA, Math, and Science Achievement. Lost Lake Elementary will grow at least three percentage points in overall achievement in each area by the end of the school year. Lost Lake Elementary will have greater than 41% of our students with disabilities perform up to grade level proficiency standards on PM3 of the FAST Tests.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored through PLC agendas, MTSS Committee agendas, and ELA, Math, and Science Achievement throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Frank Gomez (gomezf@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.)

iReady practice outside of normal instruction time will be implemented. Students will be able to practice benchmarks and skills during computer lab time and designation intervention time.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

More practice with the benchmarks and skills will create greater fluency and skill for the students. iReady will also create paths to ensure any knowledge gaps are filled in for new knowledge to build on top of it.

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.

Create and implement a master schedule that makes time for this.

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

By When: First week of school.

Assign staff to monitor computer labs and train them to monitor the computer labs

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

By When: First full week of school

Review intervention block expectations with teachers

Person Responsible: Frank Gomez (gomezf@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: First week of school

Techers, coaches, and admin will identify students in need of extra support from level 1s, level 2s, students with disabilities, and students with multiple warning signs.

Person Responsible: Frank Gomez (gomezf@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Lists completed by December 19th.

Small group instruction through during the school day tutoring program. Tutors and supplies for tutoring provided through SAI budget. Supplies will include books, notebooks, writing utensils, and student incentives for our lowest quartile, level 1s and level 2s, and students with disabilities.

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

By When: Program completion date by April 30th

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**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.

Our ESSA Subgroup of Students with Disabilities was a low performing subgroup of 2021-2022 with only 23% of our students with disabilities showing grade level achievement in ELA. In 2022-2023 it looks like 28% of our students with disabilities showed they have achieved grade level expectations. An improvement, but work must continue with this subgroup. We must ensure that the students are receiving their accommodations and making use of their accommodations. Students who are in the general education population must be exposed to their current grade level standards just as frequently as their peers. A schedule for their support services must not interrupt their exposure to grade level standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan to have 42% of our students with disabilities show that they have achieved grade level expectations by FAST PM3 in May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor the growth of students with disabilities throughout the year on PM1 and PM2 of the FAST test.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Frank Gomez (gomezf@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.)

Our students with disabilities will be included in our Intervention block, known as PRIDE block. They will be working to fill any gaps in knowledge or getting just-in-time support on grade level standards that they are falling short of.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By ensuring that our students with disabilities are included in a PRIDE Block rotation, we are making sure that they continue to be exposed to grade-level standards and are not continually taught below grade level.

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.

Small group instruction through during the school day tutoring program. Tutors and supplies for tutoring provided through SAI budget. Supplies will include books, notebooks, writing utensils, and student incentives for our lowest quartile, level 1s and level 2s, and students with disabilities.

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

By When: Completion of tutoring program by April 30th.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

Being that the whole nation is suffering through a teacher shortage and teacher turnover impacts every school, one of our areas of focus must be a positive culture and environment that will specifically increase our chances at teacher retention and recruitment. Lost Lake Elementary has a tremendous reputation within the county and within the community. One of the slogans found throughout Lost Lake Elementary literature is "The Pride of Clermont". In recent years, it has been increasingly difficult to find and rare to hear that slogan. That will no longer be so. When the school was opened, before PBIS existed, it was decided that Lost Lake Lions would be responsible, reliable, respectful, and ready. Like the slogan, those signs had faded and kids could no longer recite them when asked. That will no longer be so. We will have a strong PBIS system that is tied to our early warning signs and behavior MTSS. This will allow teachers to focus on the positive, reward the positive, and proudly claim that we are the pride of Clermont. Another reason for teacher attrition is inattentive and unsupportive administration and instructional coaches. This leadership team will ensure that we are attuned to the needs of our teachers through consistent learning walks, attendance at grade level meetings, and PLT meetings, showing ourselves to be caring, sincere, reliable, and competent.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As a school, we will have 10% less out of school suspensions, 10% less discipline referrals, and 50% less staff attrition. That would make our goals dropping from 229 discipline referrals to 206, 16 out of school suspension to 14 out of school suspensions, and having to replace 12 teachers to only having to replace 6 teachers.

Monitoring:

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

We will continually monitor PBIS rewards, discipline referrals, and suspension events. Administration will monitor teacher feedback google docs and check in with instructional coaches regarding coaching cycles and support needed

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Frank Gomez (gomezf@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.)

PBIS will be the main evidence based intervention being implemented for this area of focus. Having a clear positive culture around the phrase "The Pride of Clermont" and the four R's of Responsible, Reliable, Respectful, and Ready will lead teachers to having a better feeling about coming to work every day and lead students to be more respectful and responsible in the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers and students already expect a PBIS system, as it has been in place for more than a decade at Lost Lake Elementary. Just bringing it all together with the original mission and vision for the school will create and foster a more positive environment at Lost Lake Elementary.

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.

Meet with PASS Teacher, Stephanie Tuesca who will help to create and implement and monitor the plan throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Frank Gomez (gomezf@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Before the start of school

We will support teachers through specific actionable learning walk feedback, strengths and areas for growth and next steps.

Person Responsible: Frank Gomez (gomezf@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly throughout the school year

Admin and instructional coaches will attend PLT meetings each week

Person Responsible: Frank Gomez (gomezf@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Each Thursday during the school year

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).

Our SAI Budget is reviewed and approved by our SAC committee.

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: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |

Budget Approval

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

No