Umatilla Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Umatilla Elementary School

401 LAKE ST, Umatilla, FL 32784

https://uel.lake.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly (Diane) Dwyer

Start Date for this Principal: 8/27/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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 was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

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

Umatilla Elementary School

401 LAKE ST, Umatilla, FL 32784

https://uel.lake.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	81%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

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 Umatilla Elementary School is to help each student achieve to one's potential by providing motivating instruction, successful learning experiences, and a safe and orderly environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Umatilla Elementary School is to prepare students for the demands and opportunities of the 21st Century. A professional and highly motivated staff, in partnership with parents and the community, will accomplish this vision by modeling, challenging, guiding, and inspiring all students of varied backgrounds and abilities to be prepared, respectful, and responsible life time learners.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dwyer, Dianne	Principal	Establishes a school wide vision of commitment to high standards and the success of all students. Ensures teachers' and students' performance aligns with district policies and procedures. Supports and encourages continual professional learning to improve teaching and learning and initiate discussions about instructional approaches, both in teams and with individual teachers. Looks for ways to improve students' experiences at school by implementing and evaluating programs within our school (ie. Reading Horizons). Builds and nurtures relationships with parents and the community. Ensures our teachers know what is expected when it comes to student discipline, handles student discipline, makes fair decisions, and informs parents when necessary.
Choy, Therese	School Counselor	Maintains communication, knowledge of student progress toward established goals, and provides professional counseling services; supports and monitors student progress through MTSS; provides leadership in the development of a comprehensive guidance program that meets the academic, career and social needs of students.
Six, Alice	Other	Ms. Six serves as the ESE Specialist. She serves as Local Education Agent at staffings and Individual Education Plan (IEP) meetings; conducts staff development activities designed to ensure appropriate education for all students with disabilities; facilitates team meetings focusing on the accomplishment of the reading and math standards. She assists the principal in managing all ESE functions within the school and ensures compliance in all areas of ESE.
Caldwell, Susan	Instructional Coach	Provides and maintains a comprehensive and culturally diverse collection of books, magazines, AV materials, and electronic resources that support and enhance the school curricula; teaches research skills using a variety of references, literature appreciation and genres, media literacy, online search strategies and other library skills; maintains and services an inventory of audio-visual equipment, computers, and software for the school; instructs and assists teachers in a variety of teaching methods, resources and advanced technologies; inspires a love of reading and learning; operates and organizes a variety of software programs, such as Reading Renaissance, AR, STAR, and other networked programs; sponsors book fairs, author days, and storytelling events; works with students, teachers, parents, reading coach, and administrators to facilitate reading incentive programs, evaluate programs and computer-based instruction and research activities.
Gagnon, William	Assistant Principal	Helps the principal implement the school's vision, ensures high standards and rigorous learning goals are implemented in the classrooms. Builds and nurtures relationships with parents and the community. Handles and documents discipline issues, makes fair decisions, and informs parents when necessary.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vroman, Loretta	Instructional Media	Provides and maintains a comprehensive and culturally diverse collection of books, magazines, AV materials, and electronic resources that support and enhance the school curricula; teaches research skills using a variety of references, literature appreciation and genres, media literacy, online search strategies and other library skills; maintains and services an inventory of audio-visual equipment, computers, and software for the school; instructs and assists teachers in a variety of teaching methods, resources and advanced technologies; inspires a love of reading and learning; operates and organizes a variety of software programs, such as Reading Renaissance, AR, STAR, and other networked programs; sponsors book fairs, author days, and storytelling events; works with students, teachers, parents, reading coach, and administrators to facilitate reading incentive programs, evaluate programs and computer-based instruction and research activities.
Mann, Michele	Instructional Coach	Provides guidance on the K-12 ELA plan, facilitates and supports data collection; assists in data analysis; encourages and supports teachers in their efforts to implement targeted reading instruction using data analysis in order to shape instruction; provides professional learning based on data results; facilitates Student Teams Achieving Reading Success (STAR); supports the implementation of the Multi-Tiered System Support (MTSS).

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 8/27/2020, Kimberly (Diane) Dwyer

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
40

Demographic Data

2020-21 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

2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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](#).	

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	72	96	90	91	92	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	520
Attendance below 90 percent	15	11	9	18	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	15	13	13	17	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in Math	7	3	18	16	21	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	19	31	31	38	48	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/27/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	99	106	93	91	94	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	604
Attendance below 90 percent	12	11	9	9	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	4	7	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	0	3	5	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	5	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	
Number of students enrolled	99	106	93	91	94	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	604
Attendance below 90 percent	12	11	9	9	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	4	7	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	0	3	5	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	5	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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%	64%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	57%	58%	63%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	49%	53%	61%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	68%	60%	63%	73%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	56%	62%	60%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	39%	51%	51%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	54%	53%	56%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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.

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	60%	-4%	58%	-2%
	2018	63%	61%	2%	57%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	60%	-10%	58%	-8%
	2018	66%	59%	7%	56%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	56%	59%	-3%	56%	0%
	2018	62%	55%	7%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	62%	-2%	62%	-2%
	2018	66%	65%	1%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	61%	-1%	64%	-4%
	2018	72%	60%	12%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	77%	57%	20%	60%	17%
	2018	69%	58%	11%	61%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	55%	56%	-1%	53%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	58%	54%	4%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	19	39	36	30	51	48	12				
ELL	28	26	30	65	74		48				
BLK	40	50		60	60						
HSP	34	32	31	56	68	38	42				
WHT	62	60	41	71	71	61	61				
FRL	45	45	36	61	67	48	46				

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	29	46	41	25	33	26	24				
ELL	52	65	60	62	55						
BLK	46			46							
HSP	55	61	65	64	57	50	50				
WHT	69	62	48	73	64	47	61				
FRL	61	58	48	67	61	50	49				

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	24	39	45	29	36	35	25				
ELL	43	67	60	50	50						
HSP	44	60	54	51	52	40	33				
WHT	69	66	64	78	64	57	59				
FRL	59	62	62	67	56	47	50				

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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 component that showed the lowest performance was in the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. Umatilla Elementary introduced classroom purpose boards for instructional clarity. The process and procedures were rolled out through Professional Learning Communities based on the study of Learning By Doing by Richard DeFour. This was a learning process for all teachers throughout the year. The focus was for students to better understand what and why they were learning in order to share responsibility and enhance student learning. The purpose of collaboration was to help students achieve at higher levels.

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

The greatest decline was shown in Kindergarten ELA iReady proficiency. Proficiency dropped from 95% to 66% Factors contributing to this decline may include insufficient core curriculum.

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

The greatest gap between our school and the state average was in the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. Umatilla Elementary implemented targeted intervention groups utilizing Reading Horizons Phonetic program. The process and procedures were rolled out through Professional Development and PLC. Students had a pervious gap in phonetic instruction so this process is new to students and teachers. We are in the initial implementation phase and expect gaps to close as teachers become more proficient instructing and students begin to it in utilize daily intervention time and gain more understanding of program.

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

Math Learning Gains showed the most improvement. A number of teachers at Umatilla Elementary utilized Number Talks and Problem Based Learning during math instruction. Teachers had a specified time to provide targeted math interventions to students performing low in math.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Potential areas of concern include; number of students exhibiting 2 or more signs in the EWS and students scoring Level 1 on the statewide ELA assessment.

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

1. ELA lowest 25%
2. ELA Achievement
3. Increase students earning C or above in core curriculum

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because Umatilla Elementary experienced a decrease in ELA and Science achievement which was below both the district and state averages, as determined from our data sources of the FSA and FCAT Assessments. By setting a purpose and increasing student engagement through electronic collaboration for ELA , Science and Math instruction, Umatilla Elementary will improve learning and success by ensuring an overall increase in ELA, Math and Science Achievement on the Florida Standards Assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, utilizing FSA data from 2019, we expect to see increases in: *ELA Achievement from 56% to 60% *ELA Learning Gains from 53% to 61% *ELA Lowest 25th% from 37% to 51%. *MATH Achievement from 70% to 75% *MATH Lowest 25th% from 53% to 70%. *Science Achievement from 56% to 60%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Susan Caldwell (caldwells@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Weekly collaborative planning, with a focus on setting purpose, increasing student engagement with interactive technology and interventions will be used to increase Overall Achievement from 56% to 62%. To monitor this strategy, classroom walkthrough data will be analyzed twice a month by administration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor, and support collaborative planning, there will be an increase in the ELA achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Schedule Collaborative Planning times with grade levels.
2. Weekly meet to identify focus standards and setting purpose, developing engaging lessons through interactive technology.
3. Utilize PENDA Learning for Math, Science and vocabulary acquisition.
3. Schedule leadership walkthroughs to monitor implementation of purpose.
4. Review and analyze walkthrough data.
5. Share data/feedback with grade levels.
6. Leadership will attend PLC training to assist with collaborative meetings.

Person Responsible Susan Caldwell (caldwells@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because students with disabilities and students scoring in the lowest 25th percentile in the ELA FSA assessment did not make sufficient gains. This area of focus will improve learning and success by ensuring students received targeted instruction in their area of need.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, based on data form 2019 FSA, we expect to see increases in: *Students with Disabilities increase on the ELA assessment from 19% to 21% *Students in the Lowest 25th Percentile for ELA will increase from 37% to 51%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michele Mann (mannm1@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Targeted intervention utilizing interactive technology will be used to increase ELA scores by 3 percentage points. To monitor this strategy, the leadership team will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to ensure implementation of interventions as well as reviewing I-Ready diagnostic data for ELA at the beginning and middle of the year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor and support targeted interventions, there will be an increase in ELA FSA achievement for students with disabilities and student in the lowest 25th percentile.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify time for school wide intervention utilizing all staff.
2. Develop groups by academic need.
3. Provide interventions in classrooms utilizing interactive technology.
4. Conduct walkthroughs during intervention time.
5. Provide a a full day with substitutes in order to review data and plan for next steps.

Person Responsible Michele Mann (mannm1@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	School culture was identified as a critical area of focus because the number of students' failing grades increased in our EWS data. This area of focus will improve learning and success by ensuring students are engaged in interactive lessons and receiving necessary instruction. We are identifying student leaders through the school safety patrols, Blazing Bulldogs and K Kids to mentor students with failing grades through character building lessons and Restorative Practices. Mentor teachers have been identified by their leadership skills and positive encouraging attitudes to assist with the aforementioned programs.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, we expect to reduce the percentage of students meeting the EWS indicator for D's and F's in a course from 4% to 2%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Therese Choy (choyt@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Sanford Harmony and Restorative Practices will be used to decrease emotional conflict and Sonic view TVs with chrome books will be used to increase engaging lessons. To monitor this strategy, EWS data will be analyzed monthly by leadership team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor and support Sanford Harmony, Restorative Practices and engaging technology infused lessons, then student and teachers in classrooms will build rapport with one another, develop a culture of accountability, and course failures will decrease from 4% to 2%.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Social Emotional Support Team attend Sanford Harmony and Restorative Practice training.
2. Google Classroom and Sonic View Training
3. Team supports implementation in the classrooms by teachers throughout the year.
4. Analyze monthly attendance reports.

Person Responsible   Therese Choy (choyt@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The leadership team will meet weekly to discus student progress and identify areas of need. Each member will address issues as they pertain to their current position.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Curriculum nights are held virtually for each grade level. Teachers review specific grade level information followed by a question and answer session. Weekly grade level newsletters are sent home which outline lessons and skills for the current week. Communication is sent home in students' home language when feasible. Teachers call parents regularly in regards to student progress. Report Card Nights are held virtually throughout the school year. Translators are also available for parent meetings. At these virtual meetings, parents meet one-on-one with the teachers to discuss their child's progress and recent report card. Parents are aware of current events through the use of the school website, social media, weekly calls and emails through school messenger and monthly school newsletters. The parent call out service(School Messenger) is used for emergency notification along with special events.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7710	519-Technology-Related Supplies	0561 - Umatilla Elementary School	Other		$2,500.00
			Notes: Technology will be purchased fro instructional staff to use to develop and utilize engaging instruction.			
	7710	500-Materials and Supplies	0561 - Umatilla Elementary School	Other		$2,000.00
			Notes: Reading strategies books, Story works and other magazines, PENDA Learning and other programs to use when planning and implementing engaging lessons.			
	7710	519-Technology-Related Supplies	0561 - Umatilla Elementary School	Other		$500.00
			Notes: programs, device accessories, and materials for intervention			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$1,400.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7710	500-Materials and Supplies	0561 - Umatilla Elementary School			$1,400.00
			Notes: Reading strategies books, Story works and other magazines, PENDA Learning and other programs to use when planning and implementing engaging lessons.			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems**				**$3,102.62**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7710	140-Substitute Teachers	0561 - Umatilla Elementary School			$3,102.62
			Notes: Substitutes will be provided for each grade level team to meet for a day of data analysis and planning to create engaging standards aligned interventions.			
					Total:	**$9,502.62**