

Lake County Schools

Sorrento Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Sorrento Elementary

24605 WALLICK RD, Sorrento, FL 32776

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

Demographics

Principal: Nicole Brouhard

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	91%
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 (53%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (51%) 2014-15: B (56%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Sorrento Elementary

24605 WALLICK RD, Sorrento, FL 32776

<https://sel.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	No	68%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

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

The mission of Sorrento Elementary School is to ensure that all students are provided a challenging and enriching learning experience which builds the necessary knowledge and skills to be college and career ready; as well as, life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe all children are capable of success and we commit to: foster each child's full academic potential; build each child's self-esteem; and empower each child to become a responsible, respectful, and productive citizen.

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
Burkhead, Brenna	Principal	<p>To administer the coordination and management of Sorrento Elementary' s campus and academic activities. Responsible for developing, administering, and monitoring educational programs, optimizing academic opportunities, and promoting safe and successful development of each student.</p> <p>Accountable for enforcing and ensuring academic integrity, compliance with the faculty contract, appropriate credentials of teaching faculty, and the achievement of academic objectives through instructional programs, and accomplishes such in coordination with Schools Board goals and initiatives.</p>
Edwards, Heidi	Instructional Coach	<p>Model enthusiasm, commitment and intensity for focused reading instruction. Visit classrooms to:</p> <p>a. Encourage and support teachers in their efforts to implement targeted reading instruction using data analysis in order to shape instruction. b. Demonstrate strategies teachers can be using in order to shape instruction. c. Observe and problem solve with teachers on how to overcome student literacy learning obstacles. d. Model Scientific Based Reading Research. e. Work directly with students. Organize and lead staff development programs which are needs-based and focused on the accomplishments of the established reading benchmarks. Provide for screening and follow-up assessment as needed and organize the assessment of the reading benchmarks. Facilitate grade level or team meetings focusing on the accomplishment of the reading benchmarks. Continually upgrade literacy and instructional knowledge and skills. Provide coordination by assisting with scheduling and orientation of new teachers to reading instruction . Report student assessment data to the principal, the central office Reading Program Specialist, the Testing and Evaluation Office and others as designated. Ensure effective communication with the Principal, Asst. Principal, and central office Reading Program Specialist. Assist teachers with analysis and instructional use of student formative reading</p>
Pallitto, Stacy	Other	<p>Provides direct support to schools and serves in a liaison role with various district departments to effectively manage and coordinate school-based mental health services.</p>
Gagnon, William	Assistant Principal	<p>To assist in the administration, coordination and management of Sorrento Elementary' s campus and academic activities. Assist the Principal in the development, administration, and monitoring of educational programs, optimizing academic opportunities, and promoting safe and successful development of each student.</p> <p>Accountable for enforcing academic integrity, compliance with the faculty contract, appropriate credentials of teaching faculty, and the achievement of academic objectives through instructional programs, and accomplishes such in coordination with Schools Board goals and initiatives.</p>
Simmons, Jessica	Teacher, ESE	<p>Coordinates educational placement and appropriate services for students with disabilities. Mentors and demonstrates evidence-based strategies that</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		are effective with students who are exceptional. Utilizes behaviors consistent with Facilitated IEP training to conduct efficient and productive IEP meetings in which all participants feel valued and heard. Assists staffing committee/IEP team members in developing, implementing, and monitoring progress of IEP goals to ensure IEPs are implemented with fidelity. Utilizes district-wide data management systems to collect and analyze data to inform decisions related to student needs.
Ortega, Debra	School Counselor	Serves in a student advisement and advocacy capacity in fostering the attainment of student educational goals. Responsible for facilitating appropriate student entrance into the educational system and establishing a suitable course of academics based on identified goals and abilities of each individual student. Work includes maintaining communication, knowledge of student progress toward established goals, and providing professional counseling services. Monitors student progress, and facilitates achievement of academic success.
Augustine, Barbara	School Counselor	Serves in a student advisement and advocacy capacity in fostering the attainment of student educational goals. Responsible for facilitating appropriate student entrance into the educational system and establishing a suitable course of academics based on identified goals and abilities of each individual student. Work includes maintaining communication, knowledge of student progress toward established goals, and providing professional counseling services. Monitors student progress, and facilitates achievement of academic success.
Flynn, Caitlin J.	Other	Provides a supervised and structured environment for students assigned to the in-school suspension program, working with classroom teachers to coordinate the academic activities of assigned students and support students in completing the assigned work along with the implementation of social, emotional learning, behavioral and academic support.

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	149	139	139	139	152	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	868
Attendance below 90 percent	26	17	16	19	18	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	4	3	5	5	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	25	44	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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	30	28	31	35	38	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	198

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	15	7	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

59

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	26	18	17	16	27	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	3	1	6	7	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	13	9	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	56	29	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147

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	40	46	55	84	63	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350

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	26	18	17	16	27	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	3	1	6	7	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	13	9	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	56	29	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147

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	40	46	55	84	63	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350	

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	62%	58%	57%	68%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	57%	58%	62%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	49%	53%	50%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	67%	60%	63%	71%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	55%	56%	62%	62%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	39%	51%	42%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	64%	54%	53%	61%	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	149 (0)	139 (0)	139 (0)	139 (0)	152 (0)	150 (0)	868 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	26 (26)	17 (18)	16 (17)	19 (16)	18 (27)	24 (24)	120 (128)
One or more suspensions	4 (3)	3 (1)	5 (6)	5 (7)	6 (4)	8 (5)	31 (26)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (13)	0 (9)	0 (7)	0 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (32)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	25 (56)	44 (29)	34 (62)	103 (147)

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	64%	60%	4%	58%	6%
	2018	57%	61%	-4%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	60%	-6%	58%	-4%
	2018	70%	59%	11%	56%	14%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	65%	59%	6%	56%	9%
	2018	57%	55%	2%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	72%	62%	10%	62%	10%
	2018	60%	65%	-5%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	61%	0%	64%	-3%
	2018	77%	60%	17%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	64%	57%	7%	60%	4%
	2018	75%	58%	17%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	62%	56%	6%	53%	9%
	2018	58%	54%	4%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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	24	36	31	36	45	44	27				
ELL	44	30	19	49	40	67					
BLK	55	40		60	20						
HSP	55	47	30	60	59	63	50				
MUL	68	69		67	50						
WHT	65	54	37	70	55	25	67				
FRL	50	49	41	55	54	43	52				

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	26	35	36	35	56	56	18				
ELL	35	67	70	54	72	80					
BLK	55	46		68	69						
HSP	47	67	58	62	60	58	38				
MUL	60	50		60	50						
WHT	70	53	32	77	72	53	73				
FRL	52	52	46	65	64	55	50				
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	26	41	43	30	45	32	21				
ELL	38	63		54	63						
BLK	67	70		42	60						
HSP	62	59	50	68	59	53	67				
MUL	67	90		62	60						
WHT	70	60	47	74	63	31	58				
FRL	55	52	48	61	54	43	52				

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	435
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	44
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	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	64
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	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	53
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	50
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA learning gains last year. Focus on over all performance over growth, in all areas, including subgroups, caused lack of focus in meeting individual student needs. A change in progress monitoring tools created confusion in data monitoring. All learning gains showed a downward trend. Of the 65 ELA lower quartile students 36 students were SWD students (55%)

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Math learning gains. dropping from 54% to 39% gains. One contributing factor was a change in instructional personnel resulting in multiple instructors showing 0 percent learning gains among their lower quartile students. of the 67 MATH lower quartile students 34 students were SWD students (51%)

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 data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is ELA Lower Quartile gains. Focus on over all performance over growth, in all areas, including subgroups, caused lack of focus in meeting individual student needs. A change in progress monitoring tools created confusion in data monitoring. All learning gains showed a downward trend.

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 Science performance. The consistency in science teachers played a positive role in understanding the curriculum and presenting the standards to the full intent. We will continue what is currently in place. Additionally, 4th grade will begin quarterly assessments to help drive their instruction to support 5th grade learning.

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

Reflecting on EWS data, two potential areas of concern are attendance/mobility and students with two or more EWS indicators, totaling 109 students in 3rd-5th grade. Of those students 70 made a level 1 or 2 in one or more areas of the state assessment totaling 64%. These students are also in multiple subgroups. There were 65 student in our ELA lower quartile 39 students had 2 or more EWS

indicator (60%) and 19 had 3 or more EWS indicators (29%). There were 67 students in MATH lower quartile and 36 had two or more EWS indicators (54%) and 15 had 3 or more EWS indicators (22%)

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

1. ELA Lower Quartile
2. Math Lower Quartile
3. EWS with 2 or more indicators focus on attendance
4. Mobility
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Lower Quartile
Rationale	The data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA learning gains last year. Focus on over all performance over growth, in all areas, including subgroups, caused lack of focus in meeting individual student needs. A change in progress monitoring tools created confusion in data monitoring. All learning gains showed a downward trend. Of the 65 ELA lower quartile students 36 students were SWD students (55%)
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will increase our ELA Lower Quartile by 23%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brenna Burkhead (burkheadb@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Based on Hattie's research, our focus for the year is teaching with PURPOSE in mind. We will plan collaboratively for 1. What will the students learn 2. Why are they learning it 3. How will they know they have learned it. We will collectively work on teachers belief in this process. Teachers will complete a collaborative planning form to analyze the standard and document how each of these questions will be answered. Additionally we will implement the gradual release model supported by Fisher and Frey in "Better Learning Through Structured Teaching"
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Hattie's meta cognitive research in "Visible Learning" supports the evidence that "Clarity" in instruction has a positive impact of .75 in zone of desired effect and "Collective Teacher Efficacy" has a positive impact on student growth resulting in 1.57 in zone of desired effect.
Action Step	
Description	<p>Implementing the 120 minute authentic literacy block in 3rd and 4th grade to allow time for "What are we learning?, Why are we learning it?, How will we know when we have learned it?"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementing PAWS time in 1st-5th grade for an additional 30 minutes outside the reading block for additional support when students are "not learning it." • ELA Planning with Region support weekly during on Tuesdays with 4th and 5th grade to plan for "Purpose" • Planning using created form to address when students struggle (Tool kit, Wonders interventions, or Literacy first materials for PAW intervention/ Monitor for fidelity when students) "Clarity" • Address core issues in ELA instruction- Integration of Knowledge, Key ideas and details- The "What" • Tool kit during stations in 4th assigned to lower quartile "Gradual Release" • Conferring with LQ more than once a week. * Monitor weekly collaborative planning documentation * Monthly data chats for SWD students "how will I know when I've learned it?" * Monthly data chats for LQ students "how will I know when I've learned it?" * After school tutoring M,T,Th for Lower Quartile students funded by SAI funds

Person Responsible Heidi Edwards (edwardsh@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2

Title Math Lower Quartile

Rationale The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Math learning gains. dropping from 54% to 39% gains. Multiple instructors showed 0 percent learning gains among their lower quartile students. of the 67 MATH lower quartile students 34 students were SWD students (51%)

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve We will increase our Math Lower Quartile by 23%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Brenna Burkhead (burkheadb@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy Based on Hattie's research, ur focus for the year is teaching with PURPOSE in mind. We will plan collaboratively for 1. What will the students learn 2. Why are they learning it 3. How will they know they have learned it. We will collectively work on teachers belief in this process. Teachers will complete a collaborative planning form to analyze the standard and document how each of these questions will be answered. Additionally we will implement the gradual release model supported by Fisher and Frey in "Better Learning Through Structured Teaching"

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Hattie's meta cognitive research in "Visible Learning" supports the evidence that "Clarity" in instruction has a positive impact of .75 in zone of desired effect and "Collective Teacher Efficacy" has a positive impact on student growth resulting in 1.57 in zone of desired effect.

Action Step

Description

- Implementing math support in 5th grade 2 days a week per team to support students that are not closing the gap
- Using data analysis performance matters, i-ready to drive instruction for MATH PAWS for "clarity"
- Implement small group instruction during math block identified by i-ready data "Gradual Release"
- Address core issues in math instruction- numbers and operations, fractions, algebraic thinking
- Morning math lab in the computer lab.
- District curriculum planning support with a focus on "Purpose"
- * Monthly data chats for SWD students "how will I know when I've learned it?"
- * Monthly data chats for LQ students "how will I know when I've learned it?"
- * After school tutoring M,T,Th for Lower Quartile students funded by SAI funds

Person Responsible Brenna Burkhead (burkheadb@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	EWS with 2 or more indicators with a focus on attendance
Rationale	Reflecting on EWS data, two potential areas of concern are attendance/mobility and students with two or more EWS indicators, totaling 109 students in 3rd-5th grade. Of those students 70 made a level 1 or 2 in one or more areas of the state assessment totaling 64%. These students are also in multiple subgroups. There were 65 student in our ELA lower quartile 39 students had 2 or more EWS indicator (60%) and 19 had 3 or more EWS indicators (29%). There were 67 students in MATH lower quartile and 36 had two or more EWS indicators (54%) and 15 had 3 or more EWS indicators (22%)
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Reduce our 3rd-5th grade students that are determined EWS because of a greater than 10% absence rate from 34% to 18% and
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	William Gagnon (gagnonw@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Research from "Attendance Works" supports, reaching out to the families telling them you are concerned about the situation and to offer support, once you know which children are chronically absent . They encourage finding out if they face any barriers to attendance, such as illness, transportation problems or housing instability. .
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	"Attendance Works" supports that Data can make a difference. Research shows, preschool providers who created Attendance Improvement Action Plans for children with too many absences, cut chronic absence by 25 percent. Research shows that an increase in parent and family involvement, promotes an increase in student attendance. School will provide a safe and secure environment for this to happen.
Action Step	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance- Implement weekly monitoring/contact system for students who are an attendance issue • Teachers will report students with chronic absences to Guidance • Attendance meeting will be held when deemed necessary * Attendance research will be shared with parents through social media * Promote school friendly and welcoming environment through Family Events * Purchase additional equipment to assure school safety during Family Events.
Person Responsible	Barbara Augustine (augustineb@lake.k12.fl.us)

#4	
Title	Mobility
Rationale	Sorrento Elementary enrolled 93 students after the initial enrollment date during the 18-19 school year. Ending the year with an enrollment of 918 students (10%). 40 of the 93 students had a D or F for one or more course failures (43%).
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Although we cannot limit our mobility, we will reduce our D or F course failures among our mobile students from 43% to 25%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brenna Burkhead (burkheadb@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Based on Hattie's research on Mobility, we will implement an Orientation Program for new students. Students will spend their first day on campus in an orientation program. This will include matching students to a peer based on interest surveys completed by all students. This will be overseen by our Mental Health Liaison and our PASS Instructor.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Hattie's meta cognitive research in "Visible Learning" supports the evidence that "Mobility" is one of the few indicators that has a negative effect of student learning. Mobility has a -.34 in zone of desired effect.
Action Step	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * All students will complete an interest inventory provided by MHL * An orientation program will be implemented for students during their entry date * New students will be matched with a student with like interests * MHL and PASS instructors will oversee orientation process
Person Responsible	Stacy Pallitto (pallittos@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).