

Lake County Schools

Astatula 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	20

Astatula Elementary School

13925 FLORIDA AVE, Astatula, FL 34705

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

Demographics

Principal: Robert Sherman

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)	other
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (53%) 2014-15: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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	20

Astatula Elementary School

13925 FLORIDA AVE, Astatula, FL 34705

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">81%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">other</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">38%</p>

School Grades History

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

Our Mission is to encourage creativity, personal pride and academic excellence. In a safe, caring environment, individuals will be challenged to become productive lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Linking today to tomorrow.

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
Sherman, Robert	Principal	The principal is responsible for ensuring school safety, standards-based instruction, and stakeholder involvement. In a collaborative effort, the leadership team collects, monitors, and analyzes data to allow for shared decision making.
Christianson, Jacalyn	Other	The ESE specialist coordinates the services to meet the needs of all students with disabilities. In a collaborative effort, the leadership team collects, monitors, and analyzes data to allow for shared decision making.
Bonvento, Andrea	Instructional Coach	The instructional coaches provide support to teachers through modeling, coaching, mentoring, and conferencing. They provide resources to support instructional practice. In a collaborative effort, the leadership team collects, monitors, and analyzes data to allow for shared decision making.
Marcinkus, Amy	Instructional Coach	The instructional coaches provide support to teachers through modeling, coaching, mentoring, and conferencing. They provide resources to support instructional practice. In a collaborative effort, the leadership team collects, monitors, and analyzes data to allow for shared decision making.
Colovos, Cara	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is responsible for ensuring school safety, standards-based instruction, and stakeholder involvement. In a collaborative effort, the leadership team collects, monitors, and analyzes data to allow for shared decision making.
Lyals, Destiny	Other	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.
Adair, Stacy	School Counselor	The purpose of the job is to serve in a student advisement and advocacy capacity in fostering the attainment of student educational goals. Employees in this job classification are 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. The position monitors student progress, and facilitates achievement of academic success. Performs related work as directed.
Wodek, Thomas	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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		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	100	97	107	121	87	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	608
Attendance below 90 percent	5	13	13	10	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	17	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	4	14	28	20	23	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113

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	3	1	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

43

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/22/2019

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	21	15	6	17	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	2	5	9	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	25	32	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	34	29	29	49	75	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	256

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	21	15	6	17	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	2	5	9	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	25	32	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	34	29	29	49	75	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	256

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	61%	58%	57%	58%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	57%	58%	54%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	49%	53%	51%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	63%	60%	63%	68%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	56%	62%	64%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	39%	51%	52%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	54%	53%	60%	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	100 (0)	97 (0)	107 (0)	121 (0)	87 (0)	96 (0)	608 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 (21)	13 (15)	13 (6)	10 (17)	5 (10)	13 (17)	59 (86)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	2 (3)	1 (2)	0 (1)	1 (1)	2 (3)	6 (10)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 (7)	0 (2)	2 (5)	1 (9)	0 (7)	0 (1)	5 (31)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (25)	17 (32)	26 (27)	51 (84)

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	59%	60%	-1%	58%	1%
	2018	57%	61%	-4%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	60%	2%	58%	4%
	2018	48%	59%	-11%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	61%	59%	2%	56%	5%
	2018	54%	55%	-1%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
	2018	57%	65%	-8%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	61%	0%	64%	-3%
	2018	58%	60%	-2%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	65%	57%	8%	60%	5%
	2018	54%	58%	-4%	61%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	56%	-3%	53%	0%
	2018	60%	54%	6%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
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	28	48	54	37	60	61	22				
ELL	46	71	67	41	54	73	33				
BLK	47			60							
HSP	53	65	55	54	63	61	37				
MUL	60			70							
WHT	67	64	56	67	65	52	59				
FRL	53	61	62	53	66	67	37				
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	28	39	47	42	47	33	43				
ELL	23	29	42	37	43	50					
BLK	53	70		53	60						
HSP	39	43	46	47	49	46	40				
MUL	55			55							
WHT	64	58	57	65	57	35	73				
FRL	45	48	50	51	48	37	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	28	41	41	43	61	48	36				
ELL	23	46		58	63	40	30				
BLK	44	27		47	45						
HSP	47	52	57	66	70	48	49				
MUL	60			60							
WHT	65	56	52	70	62	48	66				
FRL	49	49	48	59	59	46	54				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	484
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
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	54
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	57
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	65
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	61
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	58
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.

Our lowest data component was reflected in our 5th Grade Statewide Science Assessment (SSA) scores. The prior year, we showed our greatest increase of performance in SSA scores. In monitoring our progress in science through the district's quarterly assessments throughout the year, the expected proficiency was comparable to the prior year's performance.

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

Our Statewide Science Assessment scores showed the greatest decline from the prior year. In monitoring our students' progress in science throughout the 2018-19 school year, our quarterly assessments data was comparable to the 2017-18 data in which we showed the greatest gains.

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 biggest gap when compared to the state average was third and fourth grade math. The state proficiency rate increased in third and fourth grade and our proficiency increased as well. In both grade levels, we are closing the gap between the school and state data.

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

The data which showed the most improvement was fourth grade ELA, which increased from 48% to 62% (+14%). Fourth grade learning gains in ELA increased from 47% to 66% (+19%). There were multiple actions taken to increase the ELA data. Side by side coaching took place with the ELA teachers along with the implementation of numerous cooperative structures. The lowest quartile students received extra support from an instructional tutor. Another contributing factor was the implementation of intervention/enrichment time 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)

Students with attendance below 90%
Students scoring level 1 on statewide assessments

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

1. Math proficiency in 3rd and 4th grade - Math learning gains in 4th grade
2. Science proficiency in 5th grade
3. ELA and Math proficiency in the SWD subgroup
4. Attendance
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Based on FSA ELA from the Needs Assessment, Modeling Thinking and Collaborative Learning are our most critical areas of focus.
Rationale	Modeling Thinking and Collaborative Learning were identified as critical areas of focus because of FSA ELA achievement levels. This area of focus will improve learning and success by ensuring that students can explain their thinking and consolidate their understanding.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in FSA ELA achievement from 61% to 64%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Andrea Bonvento (bonventoa@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Modeling Thinking and Collaborative Learning will be used to increase FSA ELA achievement from 61% to 64%. To monitor this strategy iReady Reading data will be analyzed quarterly by the Literacy Coach and the Leadership Team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we implement, monitor and support Modeling Thinking and Collaborative Learning, then there will be an increase in FSA ELA achievement from 61% to 64%.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teacher leaders will present the District Instructional Framework at faculty meetings. 2. The District Instructional Framework will be used to guide weekly common planning. 3. Leadership team members will use a Google form to collect evidence during common planning. 4. Learning walks will be conducted to measure the impact of Modeling Thinking and Collaborative Learning and provide opportunities for feedback. 5. Work with bookkeeper to order Curriculum Associates Reading LAFS books with SAI funds in the amount of \$1,337.05 for teachers to utilize with Level 1 and 2 students in ELA. 6. Work with bookkeeper to employ an instructional tutor to work with 4th and 5th grade students scoring a Level 1 or 2 in ELA. Total cost will be \$3,782.05 provided through SAI funds. An additional \$80.90 in SAI funds will be used for supplies for the tutor. 7. District personnel will be utilized for additional support.
Person Responsible	Robert Sherman (shermanr@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Based on EWS data from the Needs Assessment, our critical areas of focus are attendance, safety, and a Bully-Free environment.
Rationale	These areas of focus were identified as a critical need based on EWS attendance data. These areas of focus will improve learning and success by ensuring that students attend school on a regular basis in a safe and positive environment where they can thrive.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By focusing on these areas, we expect to see an decrease in the number of students with attendance below 90% from 10% to 7% and a decrease in disciplinary incidents by implementing a new attendance plan, bully-proofing curriculum and Sanford Harmony curriculum.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cara Colovos (colovosc@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The attendance plan will be used to decrease the number of students with attendance below 90% from 10% to 7%. To monitor this strategy, EWS data will be analyzed monthly by the Attendance Committee.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we implement, monitor and support the attendance plan, then there will be a decrease in the number of students with excessive absences.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attendance Committee will meet monthly to analyze data, monitor parent letters and address concerns 2. Guidance Counselor will generate parent letters, make personal calls and partner with district Social Worker, local counseling agencies and law enforcement to conduct home visits and obtain needed resources. 3. Attendance Awareness Week - partner with families to develop teacher/family relationships and discuss attendance contracts 4. Implement bully-proofing curriculum and Sanford Harmony curriculum campus-wide 5. Address safety concerns as they arise i.e. purchasing fence slats
Person Responsible	Cara Colovos (colovosc@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Based on FSA ELA scores from the Needs Assessment, we will implement academic intervention and acceleration time.
Rationale	FSA ELA proficiency for the SWD subgroup was identified as a critical area of focus because the percentage proficient stayed the same. This area of focus will improve learning and success by ensuring a 3% increase in proficiency for this subgroup.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By focusing on intervention and enrichment opportunities, we expect to see an increase in FSA ELA proficiency for the SWD subgroup from 28% to 31%. In addition, we expect to see a 3% increase in FSA ELA proficiency and learning gains with all subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Robert Sherman (shermanr@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Intervention and enrichment groups will be used to increase FSA ELA proficiency and learning gains by 3%. To monitor this strategy iReady Reading data will be analyzed quarterly by the Leadership Team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we implement, monitor and support intervention and enrichment groups, then there will be an increase in FSA ELA achievement.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Facilitate data sorts to create intervention and enrichment groups based on multiple data points 2. Implement 30 minute intervention/enrichment blocks 4 times per week for all grade levels 3. Conduct learning walks to monitor fidelity and effectiveness and provide feedback to teachers 4. Adjust groups as needed following iReady diagnostic windows and SIPPS mastery testing 5. Conduct MTSS/Rtl meetings to monitor progress of interventions
Person Responsible	Cara Colovos (colovosc@lake.k12.fl.us)

#4	
Title	Based on FSA Math and 5th grade Science Assessment data, math and science achievement is a critical area of focus.
Rationale	Math and science were identified as critical areas of focus because 3rd and 4th grade math proficiency levels and 5th grade science proficiency levels were below the state average. This area of focus will improve learning and success by ensuring increased proficiency in math and science.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By focusing on this area, we expect to see increases in FSA Math and Statewide Science Assessment proficiency. FSA Math achievement will increase from 63% to 66%. Science achievement will increase from 50% to 55%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Robert Sherman (shermanr@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	iReady Math and district Science LSAs will be used to increase FSA Math achievement from 63% to 66% and 5th grade Science achievement from 50% to 55%. To monitor this strategy, iReady Math and LSA Science assessments will be analyzed quarterly by the Leadership Team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we implement, monitor and support iReady Math and LSA Science, there will be an increase in achievement levels. Collecting and analyzing the LSA quarterly assessment data and iReady Math data will enable us to make determinations in regards to the areas of focus to meet the needs of students.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Select teachers will attend the Math Standards Academy and Math Content Training and share the information with their grade level teams during common planning 2. iReady Math diagnostics, growth monitoring and lessons will be utilized in all grade levels. The iReady consultant will meet with teachers in October and January to analyze data and determine next steps. 3. Grade level teams will intentionally plan to incorporate reading, writing, thinking and talking in math. 4. 4th grade Science teachers will attend the district 4th grade Science Talks quarterly. The 5th grade Science teacher will attend the district Science Content training. 5. The Leadership Team will conduct learning walks to monitor instruction and will support common planning with their assigned grade levels.
Person Responsible	Robert Sherman (shermanr@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).

NA

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.

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Based on FSA ELA from the Needs Assessment, Modeling Thinking and Collaborative Learning are our most critical areas of focus.				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Based on EWS data from the Needs Assessment, our critical areas of focus are attendance, safety, and a Bully-Free environment.				\$1,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	7900	510-Supplies	0271 - Astatula Elementary School	Other	652.0	\$1,500.00
			Notes: The funds will be used to buy fence slats for the section of fence that can be accessed by our car rider line. SAC funds will purchase the fence slats.			

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Based on FSA ELA scores from the Needs Assessment, we will implement academic intervention and acceleration time.	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Based on FSA Math and 5th grade Science Assessment data, math and science achievement is a critical area of focus.	\$0.00
Total:			\$1,500.00