

Lake County Schools

Fruitland Park Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

Fruitland Park Elementary School

304 W FOUNTAIN ST, Fruitland Park, FL 34731

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

Demographics

Principal: Dawn Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (42%) 2014-15: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

Fruitland Park Elementary School

304 W FOUNTAIN ST, Fruitland Park, FL 34731

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	51%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

MISSION:

At Fruitland Park Elementary, we are committed to encouraging and teaching all students in ways that promote wise decision-making, good citizenship, and a love for life-long learning. Fruitland Park Elementary, and the community we serve, strive to create an atmosphere of positive expectations in a safe and resource-filled learning environment.

BELIEFS:

Student learning is our chief priority. We believe that a commitment to continuous improvement and modeling life-long learning is imperative for producing confident, self-directed, life-long learners.

Families, teachers, administrators, and the community share the responsibility for producing responsible, trustworthy, productive, and respectful citizens.

Each student is a valued individual with unique physical, social, emotional, and intellectual needs.

An "inviting" school environment, that enhances mutual respect among students and staff, is essential for fostering healthy self-esteem and integrity.

A safe and physically comfortable environment promotes student learning.

Curriculum and instructional practices should incorporate activities which promote conceptual thinking and decision-making as essential skills.

A variety of instructional approaches and methods should be presented to support and facilitate learning for all in a meaningful context.

Provide the school's vision statement.

VISION:

Every Child a Success in a Global Society!

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Langley, Tammy	Principal	Instructional leader of the school. Provides strategic direction for the school through instructional leadership to increase student achievement based on data. Builds community by relationship building and communication between the community, teachers, parents, students, and stakeholders. Supports teacher instructional practice through Targeted Feedback and TEAM Evaluation.
Redding, Rebecca	Instructional Technology	Leads and supports Instructional Technology, ELL Lead and teacher/student support, and Testing Coordinator.
Blozis, Diane	School Counselor	Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Lead, Co-Lead English Language Learners (ELL), Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) Lead, Monitor Student Attendance, Social-Emotional support for students.
McKibben, Mary	Teacher, ESE	ESE School Specialist, Support Lead for ESE Teachers, Coordinates and Conducts IEP Meetings and Staffings for students, ESE Student Support
McCray, Tamara	Other	Provides restorative support to students who demonstrate the need for behavioral interventions. Positive Alternative to School Suspension (PASS) Lead.
Brown, Dawn	Assistant Principal	Assists Principal with leading direction of the school and providing instructional leadership support to teachers and students. Student Discipline and Behavior Support, Health Coordinator, Science Instruction Lead, STEAM Lead, Teacher Quality Retention (TQR) Lead, Targeted Feedback, TEAM Evaluations, Learning Walks Maintains communication with parents, teachers, students, community, and stakeholders.
Santos, Daniel	Dean	Student Discipline and Behavior Support, Math Lead, Math Interventionist Lead, support teachers through instructional leadership and targeted feedback, Safety Coordinator.
Distel, Denise	Instructional Coach	K-5 Literacy Coach, support teachers and students with literacy initiatives and needs, i-Ready Reading support, data analysis, provide MTSS interventions in small groups, coaching and mentoring support to teachers based on needs.
Sivek, Lorelei	Instructional Coach	Reading Intervention Specialist, coordinates and implements intervention efforts by leading a team of teachers through weekly PLC. Creates and implements reading intervention schedule to provide MTSS interventions to bottom quartile reading students based on reading skills needing remediation. Collects data and maintains data and fidelity records for students in MTSS Tier 2 or Tier 3.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	102	105	116	136	126	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	18	11	19	13	20	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	7	3	11	14	18	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	16	18	35	40	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	22	27	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	6	26	28	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	2	3	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

67

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/29/2019

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	5	19	11	11	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	2	5	12	14	5	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	5	5	4	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	18	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	10	36	39	56	57	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	268

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	5	19	11	11	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	2	5	12	14	5	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	5	5	4	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	18	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	10	36	39	56	57	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	268	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	49%	58%	57%	49%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	57%	58%	58%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	49%	53%	58%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	60%	63%	54%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	48%	56%	62%	60%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	39%	51%	48%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	54%	53%	30%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	102 (0)	105 (0)	116 (0)	136 (0)	126 (0)	135 (0)	720 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	18 (5)	11 (19)	19 (11)	13 (11)	20 (10)	25 (16)	106 (72)
One or more suspensions	7 (2)	3 (5)	11 (12)	14 (14)	18 (5)	23 (20)	76 (58)
Course failure in ELA or Math	10 (2)	16 (5)	18 (5)	35 (4)	40 (4)	33 (10)	152 (30)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	22 (8)	27 (18)	18 (36)	67 (62)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	45%	60%	-15%	58%	-13%
	2018	48%	61%	-13%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	60%	-13%	58%	-11%
	2018	45%	59%	-14%	56%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	51%	59%	-8%	56%	-5%
	2018	45%	55%	-10%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	62%	-10%	62%	-10%
	2018	50%	65%	-15%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	61%	-19%	64%	-22%
	2018	51%	60%	-9%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
	2018	44%	58%	-14%	61%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	56%	-7%	53%	-4%
	2018	39%	54%	-15%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	46	42	22	33	28	22				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ELL	50	56		36	56						
BLK	34	43	37	33	48	30	36				
HSP	51	50		48	40		55				
MUL	32	67		52	47						
PAC											
WHT	58	62	43	55	49	39	59				
FRL	42	53	48	43	43	31	48				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	38	34	25	39	34	16				
ELL	17	17		22	50						
ASN	50			50							
BLK	40	38	20	32	36	33	25				
HSP	50	47		57	53	50	44				
MUL	39	36		43	29						
WHT	54	52	41	59	56	36	46				
FRL	45	46	34	46	46	37	39				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	15	40	44	20	33	21	3				
ELL	10	31		24	56	64					
BLK	33	50	57	36	52	52	4				
HSP	43	54		55	58		33				
MUL	46	67		42	50		15				
WHT	57	61	54	63	64	36	42				
FRL	43	55	58	50	57	47	23				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	40
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	52
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Students with Disabilities showed the lowest performance in both English Language Arts (ELA) and Math proficiency. Traditionally Students with Disabilities demonstrate the lowest performance in all academic areas. The contributing factor are the learning gaps that these students develop throughout their academic career. These academic learning gaps alongside their disabilities are contributors to their low performance. In addition, teacher knowledge of differentiating instruction to meet the varied needs of Students with Disabilities is a factor.

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

The greatest decline from the previous year is in the areas of math Hispanic sub-group learning gains which demonstrated a decline of 13%, math achievement which was a decline of 3% and Math bottom quartile decline of 3%. The factor that contributed to this decline was teacher understanding of the full intent of the standards. There were a few teachers who were new to their grade levels. Instruction provided did not meet the expected rigor; therefore, students were not exposed to rigorous tasks that would have given them the opportunity to practice and demonstrate competence in the standard.

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

The greatest gap when compared to the state average is math bottom quartile with a gap of 16%. The greatest decline we experienced was in fourth grade math. The main contributing factor was teacher's

understanding of the standards. As a result, students opportunities to engage in rigorous instruction and tasks was not consistently administered.

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 English Language Arts lowest quartile with an increase of 13%. The new actions we took to improve in this area was the organization of an intervention team that work with under-performing students daily in the area of reading.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

One potential area of concern is Black students not meeting the 41% expected federal index. The second potential concern is our Students with Disabilities not meeting the expected federal index of 41% for the past two years.

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

1. To improve teachers instructional practices in order to increase student achievement in all subject areas.
2. Organize a math intervention team.
3. Provide support for the Black sub-group, Students with Disabilities and Pacific Islanders in order to meet the expected federal index of 41%
4. Increase math and reading learning gains.
5. Increase students reading and math proficiency.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Based on the Florida Standards Assessment and ESSA Federal Index standards based instruction with grade appropriate assignments is one of our most critical areas of focus.
Rationale	Standards based instruction with appropriate grade level assignments was identified as a critical area of need because the Florida State Assessment revealed that our English Language Arts student performance levels did not increase but remained stagnant. In addition, student performance in math declined by 3%. Focusing on standards based instruction with appropriate grade level assignments will improve student learning and success by ensuring students receive strong instruction.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By focusing on this area, we expect to see increased student performance in the areas of math, writing, reading and science as evidenced by at least a 7% increase on all indicators of the Florida Standards Assessment. Our ELA proficiency will increase from 49% to 56%, ELA Learning Gains will increase from 56% to 63%, ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains will increase from 46% to 53%, Math proficiency will increase from 48% to 55%, Math Learning Gains will increase 48% to 55%, Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains will increase from 35% to 42% and Science Proficiency will increase from 50% to 57%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tammy Langley (languet@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The Gradual Release of Responsibility will be used to increase our overall achievement on the Florida Standards Assessment from 47% to 54%. To monitor this strategy the school's classroom walk through data, the districts Lake Standards Assessments (LSA's), address teacher usage during common planning, and Early Warning Signs data will be analyzed monthly by the school's leadership team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we implement, monitor and support the Gradual Release of Responsibility, then there will be an increase in students academic performance as evidenced by the Florida Standards Assessment.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Principal, Assistant Principal and Dean will facilitate professional development using a book study on "Better Learning Through Structured Teaching" (Fisher & Frey 2014) for all instructional staff twice a month. Presentation materials and teacher work samples will be used to determine progress and completion. Using instructional strategies such as: focused instruction, guided instruction, collaborative learning, independent learning, and implementing the gradual release of responsibility. 2. The Principal, Assistant Principal and Dean will conduct weekly classroom learning walks with targeted feedback. The districts classroom learning walk tool will be used to collect instructional trend data. 3. As needed the Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean, and Instructional Coaches will model best practices for teachers when facilitating the coaching cycle. 4. The Principal, Assistant Principal and Dean will facilitate collaborative planning once a week. Teacher lesson plans, Instructional Focus Calendars, and collaborative planning meeting notes will serve as evidence. 5. The Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean, Instructional Coaches, Teachers and Students will engage in data chats to monitor student progress of standards. Data presentations, student data folders and teacher data folders will be used to monitor progress of completion.

Person Responsible Tammy Langley (languet@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Based on the 2019 ESSA Federal Index an area of focus is to provide differentiated instruction through interventions in math, ELA and Science.
Rationale	This area was identified as a critical area of need because Students with Disabilities, Black/African American students and Pacific Islander Students all scored below the Federal Index of 41%. This is the second year that Students with Disabilities have scored below the expected performance level. Focusing on differentiated instruction through interventions will help to close the academic achievement gaps of these learners and will improve their learning gains on the Florida Standards Assessment and the Florida Alternative Assessment.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students with Disabilities, Black/African American students and Pacific Islander students will demonstrate a 10% increase in learning gains and will increase their Federal Index score from SWD 31% to 41%, Black/AA from 37% to 47% and Pacific Islanders from 40% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tammy Langley (langleyt@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction with the use of data driven lessons through iReady Instructional Priorities, Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS), and Pearson Math Diagnosis and Intervention System. As a result of implementing this strategy all subgroups will meet or exceed the 41% Federal Index. To monitor this strategy school administration will use iReady progress monitoring data and classroom walkthrough data. Classroom learning walk data will be analyzed weekly and iReady progress monitoring data will be monitored quarterly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we implement, monitor, and support small group instruction, then all subgroups will meet the desired Federal Index of 41% and demonstrate learning gains on the Florida State Assessment.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Principal and Dean will develop, implement, support and monitor small group math intervention using iReady progress monitoring data, student FSA data when applicable and classroom assessment data. Small group instruction will be monitored by the Principal, Assistant Principal and Dean weekly. 2. The Dean will facilitate weekly collaborative planning sessions with the math intervention team to discuss student progress, data and lesson planning based on data. 3. The Principal, Literacy Coach and the Reading Content Area Coach will develop, implement, support and monitor small group ELA interventions. The expected outcome is the intervention team will implement daily reading skills groups which will produce increased student performance. 4. The Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean and Instructional Coaches will facilitate professional development to increase teacher capacity in providing small group instruction in their classrooms. Instructional Coaches will support teachers in the classroom with building appropriate intervention lessons. 5.

Person Responsible Tammy Langley (langleyt@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3

Title	Based on the Early Warning System data an area of focus is to enhance the opportunity of building a community of learners
Rationale	This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because of the level of EWS which impacts collaboration, attendance and classroom management.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By focusing on this area, we expect to see a decrease in EWS data from 123 to 95.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tammy Langley (langleyt@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Positive Behavior System, Restorative Practices, Positive Alternative to Suspension will be used to decrease from 123 to 95. To monitor this strategy EWS data will be analyzed monthly by administration,
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we implement monitor, and support Positive Behavior System, Restorative Practices, Positive Alternative to Suspension, then there will be an increase in collaboration, attendance and classroom management.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide professional development for faculty and staff on Positive Behavior System, Restorative Practices, Positive Alternative to Suspension on a weekly basis. 2. Creating an environment where all teacher will perform restorative circles at least once a week. 3. PBS weekly meetings to discuss the progress of students and fidelity of implementation at the school level. 4. Using PASS as means to build relationships between all stakeholders with students whom are at risk as defined by multiple EWS factors. 5.
Person Responsible	Tammy Langley (langleyt@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

Positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders will be built by following the Parent Family Engagement Plan attached below. In addition, mental health professionals are available to implement social emotional learning and support for students with mental health challenges.

PFEF Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEF), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Administration uses a collaborative approach to identifying the needs of the school and steps to meet those needs. The School Advisory Council which includes representation from all stakeholder groups meets monthly to review budgetary items, monitor program implementation, and review school data in order to create action plans for meeting the needs of all learners.

The MTSS Problem solving team assists with the identification of students who are possible candidates for interventions within the MTSS process. During weekly grade level common planning a review of student data is conducted in order to identify school wide and individual student trends. When school trends are identified, the SIP is reviewed to see if modifications are warranted. Core instruction, lesson delivery and school resources such as allocations, schedules, technology, remediation and enrichment support systems are also considered.

IDEA Funds: Two personnel positions are allocated to the school through IDEA funds, the schools ESE School Specialist and the ESE Clerk. Both positions serve to meet the needs of our ESE population in developing plans of action for students with disabilities. The ESE School Specialist also works with teachers to support school wide inclusion goals.

Title 1, Part A: Funds provide academic support to students to assist them in achieving the standards in the local curriculum and the Florida Standards. The opportunities may include before and after school programs and resource assistance during the school day. Title I provides a Literacy Coach, Teacher Assistants for Literacy K-1 and a Family School Liaison (FSL). Title I funds a Parent Resource Center where the FSL facilitates materials check-out, parent workshops and communication between teachers and parents.

Title IX, Homeless: The School Counselors and Social Worker assist to provide resources for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

We provide a variety of days and times for Kindergarten Round Up to provide information and resources for families through our Title I Family School Liaison. Our Guidance Counselor and ESE Specialist are in close contact with feeder schools to provide necessary support for students with special needs. In addition, we provide an informational session for the local daycare providers to attend to learn more about Kindergarten readiness.

Students who are transitioning to the middle school level are afforded opportunities to visit the schools that they are zoned to attend. During these visits they are exposed to the curricular offerings that they will be able to participate in, as well as the behavioral and social expectations that they will be expected to abide by. To introduce the extracurricular offerings at the middle school level the middle school band does a special performance for the 5th grade students with a small presentation in regards to the enrichment and extracurricular offerings at the school.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Leadership uses data from FSA, I-Ready diagnostic, and additional testing to help meet the needs of all students to maximize student outcomes. Our School Counselor works with our MTSS and ELL students to coordinate services to students. She meets daily with her team to discuss new and current students in either status to ensure the fidelity of the program. Our Content Area Coach and Literacy Coach coordinates the SIPP and I-ready ELA intervention team. They meet with their team 2 to 3 times a day to discuss the fidelity of the intervention. The ESE coordinator monitors the progress of our ESE interventions such as OT, PT, ST, and monitoring classroom accommodation for accuracy and fidelity. Her team meets daily with her team to discuss the needs of the students and ensuring proper support for students who are staffed or are in the process. The dean monitors and coordinates the I-Ready math intervention teams. Progress monitoring and coordinating with members of the school team to ensure fidelity of the program. Based on the data, the specific needs of the interventions are accumulated and the leader works with the bookkeeper to gather the supplies. All intervention teams have TA whom work with students in small groups or individually to address concerns based on testing results. Progress monitoring occurs on a weekly basis to better address immediate concerns and modify plan to problem solve issues. In addition, all coordinators report the leadership team at least once a week to report on the progress of the interventions and problem solve with resources or student progression.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

College and Career awareness is evident through a variety of activities present in the school. College awareness is showcased in the cafeteria, PASS, and administration offices. Teachers use college corners, college door information, and college talk to elaborate on their experience. We give students the chance to talk and ask questions about College as seen on lanyards, posters, and pennants. Career days showcase the local business to explore the fields in our community. Students have the opportunity to hear from guest speakers about their career and ask questions. In addition, Robotics and STEAM activities provide a partnership with local industries to provide materials and mentors with students at FPES to engage in College and Career talk.