

Lake County Schools

Hope Forest 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
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	18

Hope Forest Academy

46821 JANE LANE, Paisley, FL 32767

[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.

Hope Forest Academy provides an education to students by maintaining the student's ability to achieve academically and providing instructional services and appropriate resources in the community. Hope Forest Academy embraces a broad spectrum of youth with targeted needs, so every young man feels like he belongs and can succeed. We will provide an academically sound learning environment for students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our goal, at Hope Forest Academy, is to make strong connections with students, parents, and all stakeholders to ensure they feel valued, accepted, and respected. We must see ourselves as "Compassionate Forward Thinkers", who strive to develop responsible citizens, by preparing them for tomorrow's opportunities by equipping them with the necessary tools for success.

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
Cole, Devon	Administrative Coordinator	Monitor academic services for students as well as the on-site teachers at Hope Forest Academy Department of Juvenile Justice facility. Enroll students in academic courses and monitor their progress. Participate in the enrollment and exit meetings for students.
Gatrell, Sandra	Lead Teacher	1. Student Discipline 2. Review behavior Reports 3. Edgenuity Weekly report 4. Testing - Proctor
Garretson, Dane		1. Monitor Student academic progress 2. Assist students in their academic classes 3. Monitor classroom discipline 4. Test students when they enter the facility

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.

Hope Forest sends out a monthly invite to Stakeholders to attend the board meetings. During the board meetings, we inquire about different careers that are available for students. Using the input from board members, action steps for the School Improvement Plan will be created.

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 School Improvement Plan will be talked about at monthly meetings to ensure that the needs of students are being met. Once data is disaggregated, the board will reconvene and discuss the next steps necessary to ensure continuous improvement in student achievement.

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 03-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	85%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	0%
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	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	2022-23: Commendable

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	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4
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	1	1

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	0	0	4	4

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	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	0	5

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	0	1

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
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				
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				

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				
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												
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												

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												
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												
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.

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.

Area of Planning a for Improvement

1. Increase the amount of assessments or give the assessment more than one time during the school year.
2. Have the students take the baseline assessment when they enter the program.

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

1st year being graded, No previous data has been captured.

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.

1. Level 1 (ELA)
2. Level 1 (Math)
3. 8th graders

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Edgenuity, The school spoke to the company to ensure they were accurately collecting data.

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

Being a Department of Juvenile Justice Facility, it difficult to get the students to understand how important their education is, even though they are in a facility at the moment

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

The highest priority for the up coming school year is to correct the behaviors that hinder the students from learning.

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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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.

Based on our data integrity percentage and the students that are counted in that data, we see a need to accelerate benchmark-aligned instruction. By improving the frequency of assessments, we are giving students an increased chance of success and a more in-depth look at their abilities within the different content areas that they are exposed to. With the amount of testing, we gave last year, there were students that were not able to master their standards, and that negatively impacted our achievement rates.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in data integrity percentage (the frequency of common assessments given to students with fidelity) from 70% to 75%.

Monitoring:

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

The School Improvement Plan will be talked about at monthly meetings to ensure that the needs of students are being met. Once data is disaggregated, the board will reconvene and discuss the next steps necessary to ensure continuous improvement in student achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Devon Cole (coled1@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 use small group instruction to ensure students are getting intensive support in reading. The small group instruction will be teacher-led with lessons that incorporate student-interest-based texts and chunked lessons. To monitor this intervention, the lead teacher will pull and disaggregate student reading data Bi-weekly and discuss it with the board.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students are exposed to multiple content areas; however, we have found through data analysis that a gap in reading comprehension is affecting their ability to succeed in the other content areas. If we begin to intervene on their gaps in reading comprehension, we will afford them the ability to be successful in the other content areas.

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.

1. The Board will analyze the data to identify the students that will benefit from small-group instruction.

Person Responsible: Sandra Gatrell (gatrells@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Start in September 2023 and ongoing monthly throughout the year

The Board will create a schedule for small-group instruction.

Person Responsible: Sandra Gatrell (gatrells@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Start in September 2023 and will change based on student needs

The Board will compile common assessments to assess the effectiveness of the teacher-led small-group instruction.

Person Responsible: Sandra Gatrell (gatrells@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Start in September 2023 and will continue as resources are needed

The Board will analyze the data from the common assessments to determine the next steps for students' instruction.

Person Responsible: Sandra Gatrell (gatrells@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Start in September 2023 and ongoing throughout the year.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Based on 2022-23 FAST assessment data, 100% of our eighth-grade students scored a Level 1 on reading and math. When analyzing our Early Warning Indicators, 25% of students have failed a math course. If we can focus on ensuring that we incorporate student interest-based math instruction, we will begin to motivate students to engage in instruction which will eliminate course failure and positively impact student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By focusing on this area, we expect to see a decrease in math course failures from 25% to 0%. There will also be a decrease in the number of students that score Level 1 on the FAST Math assessment from 100% to 75%.

Monitoring:

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

The School Improvement Plan will be talked about at monthly meetings to ensure that the needs of students are being met. Once data is disaggregated, the board will reconvene and discuss the next steps necessary to ensure continuous improvement in student achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Devon Cole (coled1@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 chose collaborative planning because, based on the quantitative and qualitative data, student engagement showed a decline which correlated to a decline in student proficiency in Math. Collaborative time allows for the Board to work with teachers to focus on effective differentiation and consider alternative approaches that student interest may bring to the lesson. By implementing, monitoring, and supporting collaborative planning weekly, the Board and teachers will select real-world tasks that are standards-aligned, use research-based instructional practices aligned with the District Instructional Framework, and address the needs of all of our students. Teachers will use a uniform approach to increase student achievement. For intentionality in selecting relatable math tasks for students, then there will be an increase in student engagement from 0% to 50%. To monitor this strategy, the Board will conduct learning walks, both qualitative and quantitative, on a monthly basis to monitor student engagement and proficiency in math.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on our data integrity percentage and the students that are counted in that data, we see a need to accelerate benchmark-aligned instruction. By improving the frequency of assessments (at the end of each unit), we are giving students an increased chance of success and a more in-depth look at their abilities within the different content areas that they are exposed to. With the amount of testing we gave last year, there were students that were not able to master their standards, and that negatively impacted our achievement rates.

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.

A schedule for planning will be created for the board and the teachers to collaborate on math task.

Person Responsible: Devon Cole (coled1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023 and ongoing throughout the school year.

Survey the students to inquire about student interest.

Person Responsible: Sandra Gatrell (gatrells@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 2023 and at mid-year to ensure interest has not changed.

Implement a time for the Board and teachers to collect benchmark-aligned student interest-based tasks.

Person Responsible: Sandra Gatrell (gatrells@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023 and ongoing throughout the school year.

The Board will create a learning walk schedule and conduct learning walks with explicit look-fors.

Person Responsible: Devon Cole (coled1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Begin in August 2023 and occurs weekly throughout the school year.

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: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$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