Lake Pointe Academy School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lake Pointe Academy

801 CAGAN VIEW RD, Clermont, FL 34714

[no web address on file]

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.

Lake Pointe Academy ensures to empower, equip, and prepare students who will overcome obstacles, achieve academic excellence, and reach new heights in a diverse and ever-changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lake Pointe Academy is committed to the safety and success of all students through embracing a culture of collaboration, fostering strong family connections, and cultivating an inclusive community of learners. Students will actively engage in equitable, authentic and innovative learning experiences that prepare them with the skills needed to excel in a diverse and ever-changing world.

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
Steenken, Andrea	Principal	Mrs. Steenken oversees the school improvement planning process, curriculum and instruction, school safety and daily management of the campus.
Torres, Daniel	Assistant Principal	Mr. Torres works closely with our 6th-8th grade students and teachers. He is also the ELL administrator, school safety contact and oversees the facilities.
Weiss, Natashia	Assistant Principal	Ms. Weiss works closely with our Kindergarten through 2nd grade students and teachers. She also oversees Title 1, testing, and the cafeteria.
Barr, Veda	Staffing Specialist	Ms. Barr is the ESE school specialist. She is the ESE contact on our campus, facilitates ESE meetings, maintains ESE records, delivers professional development, and assists with the placement of students.
Kane, Joseph	Instructional Coach	Mr. Kane helps oversee the MTSS process on campus. He analyzes data and facilitates problem solving team meetings. He also works with new teachers, is the school testing coordinator, textbook manager, and assists with Title 1.
Self, Katherine	Reading Coach	Ms. Self is our 3rd-8th grade Literacy Coach. She works closely with teachers to plan for standards based instruction and authentic learning experiences in ELA. She also oversees the reading endorsement program here on our campus.
Short, Shayna	Instructional Coach	Ms. Short is our K-2 Instructional Coach. She works closely with teachers to plan for standards based instruction and authentic learning experiences in ELA and Math.

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.

At the end of the 22-23 school year, we met with the school leadership team, the Guiding Coalition, and SAC to reflect on the 22-23 school improvement plan. We did this at the same time that we reflected on our Title 1 Plan. During this time some ideas arose. We also used stakeholder survey results to guide the development of the SIP.

Over the summer, we participated in a district leadership training and a smaller team of teachers, counselors, and administrators finalized the school improvement plan.

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 will be monitored on a quarterly basis as we review progress monitoring data. We will reflect on what is working and what may need to be adjusted to ensure all students are learning at high levels. This will include a focus on the ESE and ELL subgroup data.

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 PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	76%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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
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	55	37	54	48	40	38	45	47	55	419
One or more suspensions	2	3	3	2	7	4	12	16	19	68
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	3	3	3	1	2	0	2	9	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	6	2	2	6	4	0	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	42	43	49	48	46	52	280
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	38	51	54	31	29	28	231
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	42	43	49	48	46	52	280

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	10	12	18	57	46	71	56	72	75	417

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	10	1	0	0	0	12

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	33	43	61	42	44	32	34	3	7	299
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	1	5	4	9	10	32
Course failure in ELA	0	1	4	4	3	0	5	7	5	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	1	0	4	2	4	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	41	32	44	39	39	195
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	46	48	53	42	36	225
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	15	21	41	32	44	39	39	234

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	9	10	10	45	40	62	40	38	254

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	6	0	0	0	0	1	7
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	33	43	61	42	44	32	34	3	7	299
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	1	5	4	9	10	32
Course failure in ELA	0	1	4	4	3	0	5	7	5	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	1	0	4	2	4	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	41	32	44	39	39	195
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	46	48	53	42	36	225
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	15	21	41	32	44	39	39	234

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	9	10	10	45	40	62	40	38	254

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	6	0	0	0	0	1	7
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*	43	62	53	43	64	55			
ELA Learning Gains				51					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47					
Math Achievement*	49	68	55	40	44	42			
Math Learning Gains				50					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52					
Science Achievement*	40	61	52	28	65	54			
Social Studies Achievement*	71	84	68	69	66	59			
Middle School Acceleration	57	73	70	25	54	51			
Graduation Rate		63	74		58	50			
College and Career Acceleration		35	53		82	70			
ELP Progress	48	59	55	76	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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	353
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48

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	481
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	22	Yes	2	1
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	68			
BLK	34	Yes	2	
HSP	49			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	43			

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	33	Yes	1	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	50			

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	45			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	45			

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	43			49			40	71	57			48
SWD	11			21			3	37			6	43
ELL	24			34			22	67			5	48
AMI												
ASN	65			71							2	
BLK	34			33			20	57			5	
HSP	39			47			35	69	62		7	47
MUL	54			57			50				3	
PAC												
WHT	55			62			57	82	55		6	
FRL	34			41			34	62	46		7	49

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	43	51	47	40	50	52	28	69	25			76
SWD	13	37	42	11	37	45	18	40				55
ELL	30	54	57	35	55	59	26	55				76
AMI												
ASN	67	70		58	90							

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	37	43	39	29	38	39	23	58				
HSP	40	51	55	39	52	53	23	66				74
MUL	43	44		52	39							
PAC												
WHT	53	56	43	47	52	67	50	81				
FRL	36	43	44	35	44	48	20	61				73

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												
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
05	2023 - Spring	42%	52%	-10%	54%	-12%
07	2023 - Spring	33%	43%	-10%	47%	-14%

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	41%	46%	-5%	47%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	41%	54%	-13%	58%	-17%
06	2023 - Spring	41%	46%	-5%	47%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	38%	50%	-12%	50%	-12%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	42%	55%	-13%	54%	-12%
07	2023 - Spring	59%	47%	12%	48%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	48%	62%	-14%	59%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	47%	59%	-12%	61%	-14%
08	2023 - Spring	43%	56%	-13%	55%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	41%	55%	-14%	55%	-14%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	36%	44%	-8%	44%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	39%	52%	-13%	51%	-12%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	51%	31%	50%	32%

GEOMETRY

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

CIVICS

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	67%	1%	66%	2%

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.

According to the data, ELA had the lowest performance across the board. Upon reflection, we noted that students did not have enough time engaged in collaborative and independent learning. Once released to work on the ELA assessment, many students lacked the perseverance and stamina to process through the complex text.

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

The data increased in all areas, while staying the same in ELA. The amount of text that students were expected to read independently throughout the year was not as lengthy so students did not build the stamina or perseverance to read and comprehend grade level text.

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.

7th Grade ELA had one of the greatest gaps in ELA when compared to the state average. Time spent reading and analyzing complex text independently was limited within the grade level.

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

The Algebra 1 scores that contribute to acceleration had the greatest growth. We provided targeted feedback for best instructional practices, analyzed assessment data and used the data to pull intervention groups.

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

Attendance is an area of concern. If students are not in attendance, they are going to continue to have gaps in their understanding.

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

1. Closing the gap in our K-2 grades with a strong focus on phonics.
2. Increasing the amount of time students spend in the collaborative and independent phases of our instructional framework across all content areas. (Tier 1)
3. Utilizing our intervention/acceleration block to meet the needs of students based on common formative assessment data. (Tier 2, 3)

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 Collaborative Planning

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.

Instructional staff will intentionally plan for the collaborative and independent learning phases within the framework for gradual release. This will increase the time students spend consolidating and applying new learning.

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

Students will move from 43% proficient in ELA to 52% proficient.
Students will move from 54% proficient in math to 62% proficient.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through FAST and STAR progress monitoring data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrea Steenken (steenkena@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.)

We will be using Fundations and Geodes to explicitly teach and intervene on phonics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When reflecting on the school year looking at student data, the learning walk data, and talking with teacher leaders, it was noted that students struggled with applying new learning in different ways. This was due to limited time spent in the collaborative learning and independent learning phases of the gradual release framework. By intentionally planning for the these phases, students will learn to persevere, build stamina to attain to a task, and apply new learning.

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.

Instructional coaches will provide professional development, resources, and strategies for collaborative and independent learning within the content areas. This will include specific learning around independent reading and conferring.

Person Responsible: Katherine Self (selfk@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will take place on August 7th during pre-planning, September 2 on PD day, and throughout the year during collaborative planning.

Instructional coaches and peer teachers will model and share strategies for collaboration and independent learning throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Shayna Short (shorts@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will take place once a week during collaborative planning time throughout the school year.

Feedback and next steps will be provided through using the quality indicators for collaborative learning and independent learning from the book Better Learning Through Structured Teaching.

Person Responsible: Andrea Steenken (steenkena@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will take place on a regular basis as we conduct learning walks throughout the school year.

Instructional coaches will provide professional development, resources, and strategies for collaborative and independent learning within the content areas.

Person Responsible: Katherine Self (selfk@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will take place on August 7th during pre-planning, September 2 on PD day, and throughout the year during collaborative planning.

Instructional coaches and peer teachers will model and share strategies for collaboration and independent learning throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Shayna Short (shorts@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will take place once a week during collaborative planning time throughout the school year.

Feedback and next steps will be provided through using the quality indicators for collaborative learning and independent learning from the book Better Learning Through Structured Teaching.

Person Responsible: Andrea Steenken (steenkena@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will take place on a regular basis as we conduct learning walks throughout the school year.

#2. 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.

Collaborative teams, with the support of instructional coaches, will embrace the four critical questions of a professional learning community, determine essential standards and use them to inform intervention and enrichment opportunities for all students. Students with IEPs will be a part of the intervention and enrichment opportunities based on the grade level standards and not pulled out to work on their individual goals during this time. This will allow them to close gaps while addressing grade level content.

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

By intervening on a timely basis for the essential standards, we should see fewer students receiving tier 3 interventions and closing learning gaps in ELA and Math. We aim to move from 43% proficient to 53% proficient in ELA. We aim to move from 54% proficient in math to 62% proficient.

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

We will monitor data through analysis of common formative assessments and progress monitoring data (FAST, STAR.)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natashia Weiss (weissn@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.)

We will be using small group explicit instruction, Amira Learning, and i-Ready during this time.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We are using the professional learning communities four questions to help guide the work. We cannot intervene on every standard with every kid, but we will intervene on the most critical ones and ensure all students learn them. This was identified as a need based on the percent proficient in ELA and Math.

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 teams, with the support of the instructional coaches, will analyze the B.E.S.T standards in ELA and math. They will determine the essential standards that all students must learn and be able to do by the end of the school year.

Person Responsible: Shayna Short (shorts@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: The essential standards work began over the summer and will continue throughout the school year during the weekly collaborative planning.

Teacher teams will develop and deliver common formative assessments aligned to the agreed upon essential standards to all students. These assessments and student work will then be analyzed by the team and used to determine the best next steps to meet the needs of all learners. .

Person Responsible: Katherine Self (selfk@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: The formative assessments will be reviewed and analyzed at minimum once a month to inform intervention and enrichment based on essential grade level standards.

Grade level teams will have a thirty minute acceleration block, four times a week, to intervene and/or accelerate student learning of the agreed upon essential standards. The site intervention team will support students based on need from common formative assessments during the intervention block.

Person Responsible: Natashia Weiss (weissn@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Interventions will begin by September 10th and continue four times a week through the end of the school year.

#3. 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.

Teachers and staff will implement a positive behavior intervention support system that ensures the safety and success of all students. This was noted as an area of need based on referral and attendance data.

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

By implementing a positive behavior intervention support system, we should see an increase in attendance and a decrease in student behavior referrals.

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

We will monitor student data for behavior and attendance on a monthly basis during the problem solving team meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katherine Vanbeek (vanbeekk@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 is the intervention system we will be using to reinforce positive behavior and attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We have noticed a need to address attendance and behavior in a more structured and systematic way. This was noticed in the survey results as well as during our SIP planning meetings.

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.

Teachers and staff will receive training on the school wide expectations for student behavior (Be Responsible, Be Respectful, Be Safe), what this looks like in all common areas of the campus and how they connect to the seven habits of highly effective people.

Person Responsible: Katherine Vanbeek (vanbeekk@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: The training will be held by August 10th.

Instructional staff will use the school wide expectations for student behavior and seven habits to collaboratively develop classroom expectations and a classroom mission statement. Teachers will continue to build positive relationships and reinforce classroom expectations through morning meetings and community circles.

Person Responsible: Daniel Torres (torresd4@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Classroom expectations and community circles will be in place by August 21st.

School wide expectations, the seven habits, attendance, and academics will be reinforced through Blue Jay Bucks and the Blue Jay of the Month program.

Person Responsible: Shivone Alphonso (alphonsos@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Blue Jay Bucks and the Blue Jay of the Month program will begin by September 1st.

Interventions will be provided by the intervention support team to address areas of concern with attendance, health, and behavior through the use of restorative circles and groups.

Person Responsible: Katherine Vanbeek (vanbeekk@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Interventions will be in place by September 10th.

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).

Each year we analyze our student data to determine areas of strengths and areas of concern. This is completed alongside the leadership team and with our guiding coalition. School improvement funding is then based on the data we are seeing and how we can use those funds to improve proficiency with our students. We receive additional input through student and staff surveys. These are then reviewed and approved by the school advisory council each year.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

Students in grades K-2 will focus on phonics instruction through the use of Fundations and Geodes. We are working closely with the district program specialist and our K-2 literacy coach through participating in a year-long lesson study and book study, "Shifting the Balance."

Students will increase in each grade level by the following:

1st: 56% to 66%
2nd: 46% to 56%

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

Grades 3-5 will primarily focus on comprehension of information and literary text. As they utilize their grade level curriculum, the will intentionally plan for more collaborative and independent learning experiences. This will increase the amount of time students spend reading and applying new learning, which in turn will increase their stamina and perseverance through a more complex text.

Students will increase in each grade level by the following:
3rd: 38% to 50%
4th: 41% to 51%
5th: 42% to 52%

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

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Progress monitoring data from i-Ready and STAR will be used to determine progress across the grade levels and aligned to reaching our school-wide goal of 53% proficient in ELA. Each grade level will also create a team SMART goal that we will use to determine progress toward these measurable outcomes.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Progress monitoring data from i-Ready and FAST will be used to determine progress across the grade levels and aligned to reaching our school-wide goal of 53% proficient in ELA. Each grade level will also create a team SMART goal that we will use to determine progress toward these measurable outcomes.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

K-2 teachers will be using the common formative assessment checks that come with the Fundations Curriculum. The will come together to analyze the assessment data and us that to form intervention and enrichment groups across the grade level.

3rd-5th grade teachers will be analyzing common formative assessment data based on their grade level essential standards. This assessment data will inform intervention and enrichment groups across the grade level. They will also use information from FAST and i-ready.

This will also be monitored through classroom observations and progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Steenken, Andrea, steenkena@lake.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Students in grades K-2 will focus on phonics instruction through the use of Fundations and Geodes. We are working closely with the district program specialist and our K-2 literacy coach through participating in a year-long lesson study and book study, "Shifting the Balance." The curriculum is aligned to the BEST ELA standards and addresses the following skills.

Phonemic awareness
Phonics/word study
High frequency word study
Reading Fluency
Vocabulary
Comprehension strategies
Handwriting
Spelling

Grades 3-5 will primarily focus on comprehension of information and literary text. As they utilize their grade level curriculum, the will intentionally plan for more collaborative and independent learning experiences. This will increase the amount of time students spend reading and applying new learning, which in turn will increase their stamina and perseverance through a more complex text.

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

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

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

If we focus on a strong phonics program in K-2 coupled with an intense focus on comprehension in 3-5, we will begin to close gaps in ELA.

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

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Kindergarten-second grade teachers will participate in a book study for the book "Balanced Literacy." This will be facilitated through a partnership with the literacy team and Lake County Schools curriculum department.	Short, Shayna, shorts@lake.k12.fl.us
Kindergarten through 2nd grade teachers will participate in a lesson study cycle focused on core phonics instruction. By focusing on Core phonics instruction in the early grades, we will increase reading proficiency overall.	Short, Shayna, shorts@lake.k12.fl.us
3rd-5th grade teachers along with the literacy coach will meet collaboratively to plan instruction aligned to the reading BEST standards and instructional best practices. The focus will be to plan more collaborative and independent learning activities where students can transfer learning and apply it independently. This will help increase their time spent actively reading and build their reading stamina.	Self, Katherine, selfk@lake.k12.fl.us

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.

School administration collaborates with our SAC and PTSA to help promote a positive school culture and environment. Our PTSA holds monthly events that engage families and students of all ages. Our SAC helps with decision making for Title 1, School events, and the monitoring of the school improvement plan.

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))

Lake Pointe Academy sends monthly newsletters to families that provide information about family engagement events, curriculum, and positive news about our school. We also communicate with a weekly call-out and through social media.

Families are invited to attend our SAC, PTSA, and other evening events (Orientation, Math Nights, STEAM Night, Literacy Night, Heritage Night..etc),

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)

Embracing the four critical questions of a professional learning community will help us maintain a clear focus on student learning and results. The collaborative culture in which teachers learn and plan together will provide equity across the grade levels with high levels of student learning for all. The master schedule is developed to ensure quality learning time is provided for each subject and intervention/enrichment opportunities are embedded four days a week.

The district instructional framework and the district adopted high quality curriculum provides a guide for authentic learning experiences across campus.

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))

This plan is developed in coordination with parents, community partners, staff, and students. To gather input, we will send an end-of-the-year survey to parents, community partners, staff, and students. Stakeholders also give input during SAC meetings and parent events held at the school.

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: Collaborative Planning				$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0431 - Lake Pointe Academy	Other		$10,000.00
			Notes: This money will be used to purchase books for our classroom libraries and help support the independent learning phase of the framework through independent reading and conferring.			
			0431 - Lake Pointe Academy	Title, I Part A		$0.00
			Notes: IXL will be used by ELA and Math as a supplement for students to apply their understanding of the standards independently.			

2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
		Total:	$10,000.00

Budget Approval

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

No