

Lake County Schools

Altoona School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	20

Altoona School

42630 STATE ROAD 19, Altoona, FL 32702

<http://altoonaschool.org>

Demographics

Principal: Dawn Cerney

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	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* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (49%) 2014-15: C (50%)
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

N/A

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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	20

Altoona School

42630 STATE ROAD 19, Altoona, FL 32702

<http://altoonaschool.org>

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 KG-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	Yes	14%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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 Altoona School mission is to provide a high-quality, comprehensive, and meaningful education for all students. Each student will be expected to succeed within the bounds of their abilities and chosen educational goals. Each student will be treated individually, given the tools to be a lifelong learner, and be taught to function as a member of a group and as a productive member of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is the vision of Altoona School to help students master academic skills, to educate them to the greatest extent possible so that they become active learners, and to teach them to be responsible citizens.

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
Schmidt, Walter	Principal	Administration of the school, educationally and financially.
Cerney, Dawn	Assistant Principal	Administration of the school, educationally and financially.
Nelson, Beth	SAC Member	Governance board member.
Thompson, Jami	Teacher, ESE	ESE specialist.
Lovoy, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Lead teacher.

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	70	49	47	51	40	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	308
Attendance below 90 percent	12	6	6	6	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	3	3	11	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	6	4	8	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

21

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/21/2019

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	17	7	2	10	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	1	8	1	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	3	2	4	6	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	17	7	2	10	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	1	8	1	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	3	2	4	6	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	56%	58%	57%	51%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	57%	58%	38%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	49%	53%	35%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	45%	60%	63%	52%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	56%	62%	51%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	21%	39%	51%	40%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	54%	53%	46%	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	70 (0)	49 (0)	47 (0)	51 (0)	40 (0)	51 (0)	308 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	12 (17)	6 (7)	6 (2)	6 (10)	6 (10)	8 (15)	44 (61)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (2)	1 (0)	0 (1)	1 (3)	2 (7)
Course failure in ELA or Math	5 (3)	3 (1)	3 (8)	11 (1)	11 (4)	8 (9)	41 (26)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	23 (6)	13 (10)	15 (11)	51 (27)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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	63%	60%	3%	58%	5%
	2018	66%	61%	5%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	60%	-7%	58%	-5%
	2018	55%	59%	-4%	56%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	51%	59%	-8%	56%	-5%
	2018	44%	55%	-11%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	41%	62%	-21%	62%	-21%
	2018	59%	65%	-6%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	61%	-13%	64%	-16%
	2018	59%	60%	-1%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%
	2018	42%	58%	-16%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	44%	56%	-12%	53%	-9%
	2018	31%	54%	-23%	55%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
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	25	32	36	24	35	8	15				
HSP	60			50							
WHT	55	46	50	44	54	24	45				
FRL	46	40	41	34	47	18	34				
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	19	35	43	26	32	25	8				
WHT	55	51	53	55	49	39	29				
FRL	52	50	53	52	52	39	33				
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	32	32	38	25	36	31					
HSP	23	10		31	30						
WHT	56	42	39	54	53	37	48				
FRL	45	42	40	43	47	40	35				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	314
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	45
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Science achievement showed the lowest performance at 43%. Science achievement scores have been consistently lower than the state and district averages over the past 3 years. The 2019 Science achievement score is a 12% gain from the previous year. One contributing factor that led to the increase in Science achievement was implementing more rigorous science instruction in all grades. Other contributing factors included implementing and participating in our school Science Fair and holding a Science Night event for families.

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

Math Achievement was Altoona School's second lowest area at 45%. This area showed the largest decline of 9% from the previous year. After analyzing the data, this is not a trend and we don't anticipate to repeat or continue.

One of the contributing factors for the low math achievement last year was due to the severity of the learning disabilities in math for a large portion of our Students With Disabilities. Our lowest achieving students in math were the 3rd graders of the 2019 school year. This particular grade level has a trend of being an overall lower achieving grade level since the time they were in Kindergarten. With continued interventions, they are closing the learning gaps every year. Another factor was that we tested a relatively small student population. With one grade level having a significant amount of Students With Disabilities who were struggling in math, the percentages of math achievement were impacted negatively.

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.

Math Achievement and Math Lowest 25th Percentile had the greatest gaps compared to the state average. We have had a gap between our math scores and the state average, but not to the extent that it was this past year. Math Achievement gap was 18% between the school and the state average. Math Lowest 25th Percentile was 30% lower than the state average. (See above for contributing factors)

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

Science achievement showed the greatest gain this year with an increase from 31% to 43%, which is a 12% gain. We implemented a daily science focus in 4th and 5th grade, along with additional STEM

activities. Additionally, the classroom teachers implemented a more rigorous science program in all grade levels.

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

Course failure in ELA or Math and Level 1 on statewide assessments are our areas of concern.

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

1. Math Achievement and Math Lowest 25th Percentile
2. Science Achievement
3. ELA Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Achievement and Math for the Lowest 25th Percentile
Rationale	Math Achievement and Math Lowest 25th Percentile showed a decline and was our largest gap between the school and the state. In 2018 we score 54% while in 2019 we were at 45% for Math Achievement. In 2018 we scored 40% and in 2019 we scored 51% in 2019 for Math Lowest 25th Percentile. This Area of Focus will impact student learning and success by meeting the needs of all students through differentiation and strategic intervention and enrichment.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Math Achievement on FSA will improve by 5% in the 2019-2020 school year for grades 3-5. Math Lowest 25th Percentile on FSA will improve by 5% in the 2019-2020 school year for grades 3-5. 50% of our students in grades 1-5 will score proficient/on grade level for iReady math assessments by the end of the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jami Thompson (thompsonj@altoonaschool.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Explicit, systematic math instruction used daily. Visual representations to aide concrete to abstract learning. Schema instruction including mnemonics. Metacognitive strategies modeled and used. Scaffolding while considering obstacles to learning. Differentiating/Individualized instruction with multiple tiers. Response notebooks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Implement Concrete Representational Abstract (CRA), a three step instructional approach that has been found to be highly effective in teaching math concepts. Students are able to build a better connection when moving through the levels of understanding from concrete to abstract. Concrete Representational Abstract aligns with Universal Design for Learning (UDL). UDL draws from a variety of research including the fields of neuroscience, the learning sciences, and cognitive psychology. It is deeply rooted in concepts such as the Zone of Proximal Development, scaffolding, mentors, and modeling, as well as the foundational works of Piaget, Vygotsky, Bruner, Ross, and Wood, and Bloom.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review the Concrete Representational Abstract, CRA, and correlate it to the Florida standards for math for the year-long scope and sequence, grades K-5. 2. Common planning time for math instruction using the three step instructional approaches in CRA. 3. Professional development provided on the philosophy of CRA, grades K-5. 4. Monthly professional learning communities will meet to discuss, reflect, and plan for CRA. 5. Classroom walk throughs during math instruction to assess implementation of the strategies. 6. Review math lesson plans for inclusion of the CRA instructional approaches. 7. Analyze i-Ready math data three times a year. Modify tiers of instruction as needed. 8. Data notebooks to be kept that include students' setting goals.
Person Responsible	Jami Thompson (thompsonj@altoonaschool.org)

#2	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	Science Achievement will be an area of focus as we are 10% below the state achievement score. in 2018 Altoona scores in the 31% while the state was at 55%. In 2019 we saw and increase to 43%, but we were still behind the state which was at 53%. This Area of Focus impacts student learning and success by meeting the needs of all students through differentiation and hands on experiences.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will improve Science Achievement on the statewide assessment by 3% for the 2019-2020 School Year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dawn Cerney (cerneydawn@altoonaschool.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Explicit, systematic science instruction.</p> <p>Visual representations including graphic organizers to extend learning.</p> <p>Meta-cognitive strategies modeled and used.</p> <p>Scaffolding lessons while considering obstacles to learning.</p> <p>Differentiating/Individualized student engagement through hands-on learning.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Science instruction needs to meet the needs of all learners - no matter what economic background, age, or ability level. Universal Design for Learning is a framework to improve and optimize teaching and learning for all people based on scientific insights into how humans learn. Universal Design for learning, UDL, draws from a variety of research including the fields of neuroscience, the learning sciences, and cognitive psychology. It is deeply rooted in concepts such as the Zone of Proximal Development, scaffolding, mentors, and modeling, as well as the foundational works of Piaget, Vygotsky, Bruner, Ross, and Wood, and Bloom.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Common planning for science instruction in grades K-5. 2. Hands on activities that allow for multiple representations of learning. 3. Use science leveled readers to differentiate and feature embedded graphics, photos, charts, etc. 4. STEM activities that allow for a variety of levels of engagement. 5. Classroom walk throughs during science instruction. 6. Review science plans for evidence of UDL principles. 7. Professional learning communities will meet monthly to plan, reflect, and revise science instruction. 8. Use technology to extend learning both in the classroom and in the lab. Technology will provide a wide range for students to represent their learning.
Person Responsible	Dawn Cerney (cerneydawn@altoonaschool.org)

#3	
Title	ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	ELA Learning Gains decreased by 4% and we are 9% lower than the state in this component. In 2018 we scored in the 51% just behind the state which was at 55%. In 2019 we saw a slight decline to 47% while the state was at 58%. This Area of Focus impacts student learning and success by building thriving, literate readers who are able to comprehend as they engage in various reading activities.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELA Learning Gains on FSA will increase by 3% for the 2019-2020 School Year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jami Thompson (thompsonj@altoonaschool.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Differentiated Instruction using complex text to teach comprehension.</p> <p>Explicit/Systematic Instruction for phonics and word reading including syllable type and morphology.</p> <p>Explicit instruction and feedback on oral reading fluency.</p> <p>Explicit instruction of academic vocabulary.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on studies of early reading interventions, expert panels and individual researchers have recommended that students who are at risk for reading difficulties in the primary grades be provided with explicit, sequential instruction in decoding and word recognition (e.g., Gersten et al., 2008; National Reading Panel, 2000; Torgesen, 2004). Instructional programs of this nature typically include extended opportunities to practice skills in isolation and application in connected text. Research evidence also supports the provision of explicit instruction and practice in reading fluency (Chard, Vaughn, & Tyler, 2002) and comprehension (Shanahan et al., 2010). Vocabulary knowledge is critical to reading comprehension and research indicates that the intentional, explicit teaching of specific words and word-learning strategies can both add words to students' vocabularies and improve reading comprehension of texts containing those words.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Common instructional planning for reading, grades K-5. 2. Professional development on explicit phonics instruction; word reading strategies including syllable type and morphology; how to match text to the reader; and strategies to teach both fluency and academic vocabulary. 3. Training on conducting running records to aide in choosing the right complex text. <p>Running record data is to be conducted four times a year and will be a part of the data binder kept by each teacher.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Analyze i-Reading reading data and modify tiers of instruction if the expected gains are not evident. 5. Classroom walk throughs during the reading block to find evidence of implementation. 6. Review reading lesson plans for instruction for the targeted evidence-based strategies.
Person Responsible	Jami Thompson (thompsonj@altoonaschool.org)

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.

Parent and community involvement is vital to Altoona School. These two groups serve as important school stakeholders. Some of our community partners include: Umatilla Kiwanis Club, First Baptist Church of Umatilla, United Methodist Church of Altoona, First Baptist Altoona, Astor Kiwanis, Altoona Trail Riders, United Southern Bank, Sunsational Citrus, Breakpointe Alley, Oakwood, and TheCross Mount Dora. Many of these organizations give supplies, donations to our clothes closet, financial support, and serve as volunteers for special events held at school.

In our efforts to give back to the community we have several community service projects planned. Some of these projects include: canned food drive for local food banks, letters to our military personnel, winter coat drive for the homeless, hygiene drive for the homeless, community clean up days and an adopt a teacher program.

Our main building is available for community members to use at no charge to host meeting or special events. Many local organizations use the building on a regular basis to accommodate their meeting needs.

Umatilla Kiwanis Club sponsors our school chapter of K-Kids. This program teaches students the importance of school and community involvement. We also have a very active Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) which meets monthly to plan, organize and host events for families. PTO helps build relationships between school and families.

Although we have a small ELL population, we strive to eliminate as many barriers as possible. All notices are sent home in the student's native language as indicated on the Home Language Survey. When necessary, a translator is made available for phone calls, messages and meetings. All students identified as ELL are provided additional resources such as (but not limited to) access to Rosetta Stone, Word to Word Dictionaries and Academic Glossaries. All materials are inventoried and monitored by our ELL Coordinator.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), 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.

Altoona School has counselors who are available to meet with students and parents to address social-emotional needs. When necessary, we also provide referrals to Life Stream, NOVO Behavioral Services

and UCF CARD (center for Autism and Related Disabilities). Our Family School Liaison works closely with families in need by providing backpacks, school supplies, clothes, shoes and food to support our families in need. We have implemented the Stanford Harmony Social Emotional Learning program for grades K-5. Lessons are taught weekly and reinforced in the classroom daily. For our ELL population, if the need arises, a translator will be made available to discuss with families the resources available for social-emotional needs. Our counselors will work hand in hand with the school and families to meet the needs of the student.

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

Kindergarten Round-Up is held every April for prospective parents and students. Information regarding curriculum, transportation, services provided by the school and special events are discussed. Informal Kindergarten Readiness Screeners may be given before school begins and FKLRS (Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener) is administered within the first 30 days of Kindergarten to assess current programs for preschoolers and to help classroom teachers determine school readiness.

5th to 6th grade promotion requirements: report card grades, which reflect mastery of the Florida Standards for all 5th grade content area with a passing grades in Math, Language Arts/Reading, Science and Social Studies. Alternative Promotion Criteria: committee recommendation, with the principal making the final determination, based on student performance in all grade level specific content area Florida Standards and a) previous retentions, b)English Language Learner, c) ESE Status d)504 Status e) Progress Monitoring Status f)Health Status g)Alternative Assessment Score (if applicable).

Outgoing fifth grade students participate in the middle school visitation programs. Additionally, the middle school sends counselors to speak to the students in regard to 6th grade preparation. Articulation meetings for all 5th grade ESE students moving to middle school are held at the end of year to ensure a smooth transition of services and accommodations as needed.

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.

TITLE 1

Altoona School utilizes Title 1 funds to help improve student academic achievement. Through this funding additional instructional personnel are hired to help remediate students in the lower quartile and materials are purchased for mathematics, reading and science. Funds are also used to provide after school tutoring for math and reading, professional development for staff. All Title 1 resources are inventoried by the FSL. Resources may be checked out from the Family Engagement Center.

TITLE III

This funding is used to provide services for ELL students. Our ELL coordinator works with district personnel and the school's family liaison to help meet the academic needs of ELL students. Materials include Rosetta Stone, Word to Word Dictionaries and Academic Glossaries. All resources are inventoried and maintained by the ELL Coordinator. Dictionaries are signed out to students at the beginning of the year and collected at the end of the year. Other resources can be signed out from ELL Coordinator.

TITLE IX-HOMELESS

Altoona School's Family Liaison works with Administration and the District Social Worker to provide resources for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to help eliminate barriers

for a free and appropriate education.

VIOLENCE PREVENTION

Altoona School participates in Red Ribbon Week. Red Ribbon Week promotes healthy lifestyles/living, drug prevention and violence prevention. Stanford Harmony social-emotional curriculum is used schoolwide.

NUTRITIONAL PROGRAMS

Altoona School participates in the free breakfast and lunch program for all students. We sponsor a weekend food pack program that provides our students with additional food and milk for the weekend.

IDEA FUNDS

Our school receives federal IDEA funds to purchase equipment and materials to be utilized for our ESE students. All purchases with IDEA funds are inventoried by the ESE Coordinator. Resources can be signed out from the ESE coordinator for use with students.

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

In an effort to show our students the importance of college and career readiness, we invite community members and professionals to our campus throughout the year. Our desire is to have them share with our students how education played a role in their college and professional life. We also have a graduating senior, who previously attended Altoona School, return to speak to our students about high school and setting goals for the future. Some professionals who have been a part of this program include: military personnel, Adopt a Pilot program, Dr. Cook- heart surgeon LRMC, Mid Florida Dentistry, Nature Scientist , D & J Apiary. We also participate in the BUG Program which is sponsored by the Umatilla Kiwanis Club. This program teaches students to set personal academic goals and recognizes them when they reach those goals.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Achievement and Math for the Lowest 25th Percentile	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Achievement	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00