

Lake County Schools

Lake Success Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	21

Lake Success Academy

525 N GEORGIA AVE, Howey II N The Hills, FL 34737

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

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.

To assist students in achieving their highest potential through a non-traditional setting which supports academic, behavioral and social emotional development.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lake Success creates an environment where adults build positive and professional relationships with students, to help them realize their full potential and prepare them for future success in college, career and community.

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
Sochocki, Eric	Principal	The role of the principal at Lake Success Academy is to establish and maintain a positive, effective learning environment, build a cohesive team, establish and monitor guidelines to meet the needs of individual students. Dr. Eric Sochocki: Conducts weekly administration and leadership team meetings to align instructional and operational priorities to school improvement goals; communicates school improvement goals to all stakeholders' works in conjunction with district and school staff to provide a safe, learning environment for all students. Dr. Sochocki also outlines programs and initiatives to support school improvement goals; meets daily with Instructional Dean, School Counselor, and Instructional Coach to monitor student's progress toward meeting the requirement for transition to their zone schools and implement plans for each student enrolled in Lake Success Academy. Conduct daily meetings with the instructional coach in accordance with school improvement goals; conduct frequent learning walks and observations to provide feedback to instructional personnel as well as compile data from these walks to identify instructional trends and determine professional development needs for the staff; conduct data chats with individual teachers
Sneed, Derrick	Other	Provide mentoring and counseling opportunities for all our students. Continual assessment of the emotional state of students and provide necessary interventions to ensure they are prepared to be successful academically. If students are not emotionally ready to be successful, Mr. Sneed will provide support and counseling including to a referral for outside counseling services. He also provides staff development and training on how to de-escalate upset students and warning signs of at risk students.
Pearson, Steven	Dean	Mr. Pearson provides restorative practices and circles to help mend student-student and student-teacher relationships. He provides professional development on classroom management to staff and ensures that SOPs are understood and used with fidelity school-wide. He is a mentor for staff and students and also provides behavior interventions and consequences when necessary.
Brickmeier, Kaleigh	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Brickmeier provides professional development school-wide to support literacy efforts that align with the school improvement goals. She facilitates planning in all core academic area with alignment to standards and site-based instructional initiatives. Mrs. Brickmeier conducts daily/weekly classroom learning walks to provide timely feedback and support to teachers; and collaborates with administration conducting professional development and coaching.
Reeney-Ranck, Jennifer	School Counselor	Ms. Feeney-Ranck establishes professional relationships with all our students. She meets daily with students to help them visually see their progress on credits and credit recovery. Together with the student and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		family, she outlines a plan for the student to get back on track to either meet, or exceed the grade level of their cohort.
Ramphal, Devandra	Staffing Specialist	Mr. Ramphal ensures that any new students who have previously been identified as having an IEP, have all their paperwork in order. This ensures that all accommodations are properly communicated with the teachers and the student receives said accommodations.

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.

Surveys were used to determine areas of need identified by students and staff. The leadership team then met and discussed the issues that the surveys identified, as well as those that data indicated needed to be addressed. Topics then were thoroughly explained/explored during leadership team meetings and then again, with the full staff at our weekly meetings. Situations were troubleshooted and SOPs were created to ensure fidelity across the school.

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 SIP goals are aligned with the vision and mission of our school. As such, they will be continuously monitored and evaluated/revised at the weekly admin and staff meetings. Summative data will be gathered via school-wide district testing to ensure that we are addressing the changing needs of our students. If it is determined that we need to change course, course correction will be completed at the subsequent weekly meetings and continuously monitored.

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)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	80%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No

ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	
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)	
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	11	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	11	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	11

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	0	0	0	0	1	3	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	9
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	21

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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*		62	53		64	55			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*		68	55		44	42			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		61	52		65	54			
Social Studies Achievement*		84	68		66	59			
Middle School Acceleration		73	70		54	51			
Graduation Rate		63	74		58	50			
College and Career Acceleration		35	53		82	70			
ELP Progress		59	55		64	70			

** 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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				

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%
WHT				
FRL				

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												

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
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												

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
FRL												

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
10	2023 - Spring	*	44%	*	50%	*
07	2023 - Spring	0%	43%	-43%	47%	-47%
08	2023 - Spring	0%	46%	-46%	47%	-47%
09	2023 - Spring	*	44%	*	48%	*
06	2023 - Spring	*	46%	*	47%	*

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	55%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	8%	47%	-39%	48%	-40%
08	2023 - Spring	10%	56%	-46%	55%	-45%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	0%	44%	-44%	44%	-44%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	8%	51%	-43%	50%	-42%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	49%	*	48%	*

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	60%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	7%	67%	-60%	66%	-59%

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.

Based on district data trends and the students currently enrolled at LSA, the trends that emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas indicate a deficiency in ELA and Math; specifically on the required FSAT math test. A contributing factor to poor student performance is that the vast majority of our students miss typically 15+ days of school in the transition from their sending school and LSA. While at our school, students also have attendance issues due to dealing with homelessness and living in Foster Care. If students are not in school, they are not given an opportunity to learn. Another large contributing factor is that our one math class has 5 different teachers (no including an additional two long term substitutes) throughout the year.

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

17% of students declined a level for FSA Math to FAST Math test scores from 2021-22 to 2022-23. The greatest factor that may have contributed to this decline is the vast majority of our students miss typically 15+ days of school in the transition from their sending school and LSA. We have close to 100% turnover in students between years. There are very few students who attend LSA for more than one calendar year. While at our school, students also have attendance issues due to dealing with homelessness and living in Foster Care. If students are not in school, they are not given an opportunity to learn. Another large contributing factor is that our one math class has 5 different teachers (no including an additional two long term substitutes) throughout the year.

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.

Lake Success Academy students are typically behind their peers in all areas of academic achievement and credits. They are sent from most of the middle and high schools in Lake County Schools. They are sent for Drop Out Prevention (DOP), or due to severe disciplinary infractions. Therefore, our students come to us with many of the Early Warning Signs/Indicators, ex: excessive absences, more than one out of school suspensions... and many are a grade level below their age level cohort.

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

We had many students improve their previous performance on state testing in a variety of areas. Due to the dynamic nature of our student population, with some students being alternatively placed at LSA for a period of 45 days; we typically do not have the same students the entire year. However, we did put plans in place to provide more intensive support for our students. One way we will do this is by allotting 30 minutes each morning for teachers to provide instructional repair to individual students.

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

1. For the 2022-2023 school year, we had two teachers teaching five different courses. One Math teacher taught: 6th, 7th, Pre-Algebra, Algebra and Geometry classes. One English Language Arts teacher taught: 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th grade classes. This caused them to split their focus and understandably struggle to provide rigorous lessons focused on the essential standards.
2. We did not have a specific time set aside daily for teachers to work closely with struggling students to close their knowledge gaps.
3. We didn't have a student reward system that gave students timely rewards to recognize their behavior and achievement.

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

1. Developing a community where behavioral and academic needs are met.
2. Rigorous instruction that is focused on the standards.
3. High expectations for student achievement academically and behaviorally, with support to achieve said results.
4. Helping students track their credits and progress towards graduation.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

When examining quantitative and qualitative data from student and staff surveys, we found that a trend appeared in how staff and students felt about the climate and culture of our school. They stated that clear communication was not always shared between team members and SOPs were not always followed with fidelity. Clear communication is not given between team members who do not feel part of the community. Our students will not be successful, unless their behavioral and academic needs are met. Their needs can only be met if their teachers truly care about their success. Our teachers will care about the students if they build professional relationships with them. By understanding the student and his/her story, teachers are able to alter their lessons to help connect content with student interest. Staff members are only able to build those relationships with students and with other staffers, if they are given opportunities to build community by the school's leadership. Teachers and students thrive in an environment where they feel important and that they matter. As a Restorative Practices school, building positive, professional relationships provides the foundation for everyone's success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Staff and student surveys will be examined during and at the end of the year to determine current culture and climate. Also, student referrals will be examined to determine if students are making better behavioral choices, due to the increase in feeling of community. We anticipate a 10% decrease in student OSS events and an increase in positive answers on staff/student surveys by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will examine referral utilize the surveys to determine what changes need to be made, or what aspects are working and need to be continued.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eric Sochocki (sochockie@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.)

1. Training staff on Restorative Practices and the behavior level system.
2. Creating SOPs to reinforce Restorative Practices, behavioral level system.
3. Staff community and team building events
4. Spending the first two days of instruction getting to know students and their interests, to build mutual trust/respect.
5. Initiation of a reward system that provides real-time rewards for students and monthly recognition for both students and staff. This system will also have a component for students to earn different behavioral levels and privileges based upon those levels.
6. Weekly school-wide staff meetings to discuss student progress and behavioral issues that need to be addressed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students and staff work more effectively in a setting where they feel safe, respected, understood and supported.

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.

Have welcome back team (community) building event at Principals home for all staff and their families.

Person Responsible: Eric Sochocki (sochockie@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Before students come back on August 10th, 2023.

Create a vision statement for our school that has buy-in from all staff members.

Person Responsible: Eric Sochocki (sochockie@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 10th, 2023.

Create a student reward system that provides tangible rewards for student positive behavioral choices.

Person Responsible: Eric Sochocki (sochockie@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 10th, 2023.

Training staff on Restorative Practices and the behavior level system.

Person Responsible: Eric Sochocki (sochockie@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: During pre-planning and follow-up trainings throughout the year.

Creating SOPs to reinforce Restorative Practices, behavioral level system.

Person Responsible: Eric Sochocki (sochockie@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: During pre-planning and then training students on SOPs for the first few days of school. Each new student will sit with the Dean, Mr. Pearson, to receive individual training.

Spending the first two days of instruction all teachers will use the first few days to go over SOPs and get to know students and their interests, to build mutual trust/respect.

Person Responsible: Kaleigh Brickmeier (brickmeierk@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: First two weeks of school.

Initiation of a reward system that provides real-time rewards for students and monthly recognition for both students and staff. This system will also have a component for students to earn different behavioral levels and privileges based upon those levels.

Person Responsible: Eric Sochocki (sochockie@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Initiation within the first few days of school and continuous monitoring daily throughout the year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**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.

Teachers are able to teach more effectively if they have less subjects to prepare lessons for. We took the positions we had and reallocated them to provide teachers with less different grade levels for direct instruction. Instead of having one math and one ELA teacher, each teaching five grade levels, we now have to math and two ELA teachers teaching only middle, or only high school grades. Students learn at higher rates when they are able to get individualized instruction and targeted interventions based upon their current level of understanding. Comparing how students performed on the State math assessment for the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years, we saw that there were 17% of students went down one math level and 8% went down for ELA test results.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student performance on formative and summative assessments (as well as state math FAST/BEST assessments) will increase in proficiency by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom formative and summative assessments, along with County and State assessments, will be used to determine student comprehension and proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kaleigh Brickmeier (brickmeierk@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.)

Teachers will provide daily targeted intervention during a 30 minute block of time four days a week.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our students come to us with gaps in their foundational understanding of subject area standards. Teachers will assess to find which standards the individual student is deficient in and then pull those student(s) for targeted lessons the following day during Flextime. These lessons will be based upon Focus Standards that have been determined to be essential areas of comprehension so that students are able to successful on subsequent lessons/grade. Providing targetted individualized support in small group, or even 1-1, is an evidence-based best practice.

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.

The Master Schedule will be built to have a reserved time for interventions 4 out of 5 days a week.

Person Responsible: Eric Sochocki (sochockie@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: 8/10/2023.

Teachers must understand how to create/utilize formative assessments to determine student academic need.

Person Responsible: Kaleigh Brickmeier (brickmeierk@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: 8/16/2023.

Teachers actively sign up students and provide targeted intervention.

Person Responsible: Kaleigh Brickmeier (brickmeierk@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Continuous throughout the year.

Tutoring services for individual students (focusing on students who performed at Level I and Level II on previous years State testing) to help fill in their knowledge voids, to enable them to better comprehend information. The tutor will also teach them to decode questions which will better prepare them for end of the year high stakes tests, as well as SAT/ACT testing.

Person Responsible: Eric Sochocki (sochockie@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: January through March, but there are students who will need additional support to prepare for SAT/ACT testing throughout the year.

Alter the classes offered and teaching lines to ensure that no teacher is teaching more than 3 different classes within the subject area. 2022-2023 LSA had two teachers who taught 5 different grade levels within one subject area.

Person Responsible: Eric Sochocki (sochockie@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: 8/10/2023.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$600.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	Incentives		9043 - Lake Success Academy	School Improvement Funds		\$600.00
			Notes: Part of the reward system to support the behavioral level advancement, requires tangible rewards given in real-time. Money will be spent to supply those rewards.			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention				\$600.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	Tutoring		9043 - Lake Success Academy	School Improvement Funds		\$600.00
Total:						\$1,200.00

Budget Approval

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

No