

Lake County Schools

Tavares Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Tavares Elementary School

720 E CLIFFORD ST, Tavares, FL 32778

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

Demographics

Principal: Stacia Werner

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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: C (52%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Tavares Elementary School

720 E CLIFFORD ST, Tavares, FL 32778

<https://tel.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	92%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

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

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.

It is the mission of Tavares Elementary School to ensure high levels of learning for all students. Through mutual respect within the school community, our children will grow and learn in a positive atmosphere where faculty, staff, students, and families are enthusiastic about the teaching and learning process.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that the most effective strategy for achieving the mission of our school is to develop our capacity to function as a professional learning community. We envision a school in which staff:

- work together to achieve a common purpose
- seek and implement effective strategies for improving student learning on a continuous basis
- monitor each student's progress on a frequent basis
- demonstrate a personal commitment to the academic success and general well-being of all students.

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
McKinney, Durenda	Principal	Instructional lead campus wide Guiding Coalition leader Promotes student learning through the implementation of best teaching practices. Supports all teachers in their instructional delivery and professional growth. Monitors student achievement through the Guiding Coalition, grade level and leadership meetings. Creates opportunities for collaboration between teachers and provides support when needed. Ensures a welcoming culture for students, families, teachers and staff. Seeks community partners continuing to support the foundation our school is in this area.
Peppers, Carol	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader for grades 3-5. Discipline lead for grades 3-5 New Teacher Induction Lead Instructional Materials coordinator Health and Safety Coordinator PBIS Administrator Assists to create a safe and secure environment to allow for student learning.
Lowery, Lisa	Instructional Coach	Math Coach K-5 planning STEAM Coordinator Math i-ready coordinator Professional Development in Math Content areas
Luevano, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach 3-5 planning Oversees Literacy activities campus wide (Read Across America, Literacy night Instructor and monitor for Reading Endorsement for Teachers Professional Development in Literacy content areas
Le Moyne, Judith Ann	Instructional Coach	Curriculum Resource Teacher Instructional coach for grades K-2 New Enrollment and placement Red Ribbon Week, Freedom Week, Too Good for Drugs Coordinator Professional Development in all content areas
Elliott, Dawn	Assistant Principal	Instructional lead for grades K-2 Discipline lead for grades K-2 Safety Coordinator Assists to create a safe and secure environment to allow for student learning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/12/2014, Stacia Werner

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.*

2

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

70

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: C (52%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	

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

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	90	121	122	103	132	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	705
Attendance below 90 percent	10	5	2	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	1	4	9	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	9	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	10	11	17	22	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	1	1	0	4	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/12/2020

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	163	156	134	171	151	172	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	947
Attendance below 90 percent	5	27	17	13	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	13	8	10	17	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	21	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	8	8	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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

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	163	156	134	171	151	172	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	947
Attendance below 90 percent	5	27	17	13	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	13	8	10	17	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	21	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	8	8	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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

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	54%	58%	57%	61%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	57%	58%	61%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	49%	53%	43%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	60%	63%	64%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	56%	62%	51%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	39%	51%	39%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	54%	53%	51%	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	52%	60%	-8%	58%	-6%
	2018	60%	61%	-1%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	60%	-8%	58%	-6%
	2018	54%	59%	-5%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	53%	59%	-6%	56%	-3%
	2018	54%	55%	-1%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	67%	62%	5%	62%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	71%	65%	6%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	61%	4%	64%	1%
	2018	60%	60%	0%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	56%	57%	-1%	60%	-4%
	2018	62%	58%	4%	61%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	56%	-6%	53%	-3%
	2018	52%	54%	-2%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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	18	28	29	33	45	33	22				
ELL	29	42		64	74		27				
BLK	46	51	25	53	58	38	42				
HSP	36	38	36	60	54	38	24				
MUL	58	63		59	65						
WHT	62	60	52	70	60	42	62				
FRL	47	54	44	56	54	40	49				
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	26	21	28	30	21	32				
ELL	33	25		57	50						
BLK	39	39	38	40	27	18	25				
HSP	48	42	35	58	55	35	24				
MUL	67	75		73	56						
WHT	61	41	28	73	55	38	61				
FRL	49	43	36	58	44	30	45				

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	19	38	36	27	31	25	21				
ELL	18			47							
BLK	32	45	39	42	38	25	30				
HSP	37	42		51	60	54					
MUL	67	57		63	57						
WHT	71	68	53	71	51	41	54				
FRL	51	57	40	55	47	38	43				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	431
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
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	45
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	45
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	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	58
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 data component with the lowest performance was ELA Achievement (54%) which is below the District and State averages. Additionally, there has been no growth from 2018 - 2019.

Some contributing factors to last year's performance was:

- ELA lower quartile proficiency scored (38%)
- had no growth and was significantly below the District and State Averages
- another factor was low proficiency in the ESSA subgroups of SWD
- Black subgroup continue to score the lowest of all demographics

Further analysis as to why these scores are low and very little growth may be the result of intervention practices. Last year was the first year LLI intervention was fully implemented. Prior years our intervention block was not as systemic.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline was ELA Achievement in both grades three and four each having an 8% point decline. These grades shown a declining trend for two years. One factor contributing to the decline was not having a systematic intervention program.

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

The data component showing the greatest gap is our lowest quartile for both ELA and Math having a plus or minus 11 point gap. The main contributing factor would be having a systemic intervention program. Last year we did create a system for intervention which will be used again this year for this subgroup.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was in learning gains for ELA & Math plus or minus 12 points improved. Math for LQ was plus or minus 8 points and 4th grade Math. Math has been a positive trend for our campus. Factors contributing to the improvement would be small group instruction with the teacher.

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

Our EWS data shows a potential area of concern with Level 1 on the 2019 statewide ELA assessment for grade five with 25 students.

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

1. ELA Achievement using state assessment and i-ready for all grades
2. ELA and Math LQ achievement
3. ESSA group SWD continues to trend at around 30%
4. Blk subgroup ELA achievement in both Learning gains and Lower quartile
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on our ELA achievement data and ELA lower quartile data for the past two years our instructional practice is one of the most critical area of focus. This ELA achievement area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because achievement data shows a consistent 3-5 point difference below the District for the past two years. Additionally our ELA LQ from 2018 to 2019 has shown no growth.

Measurable Outcome: By focusing on these areas of focus ELA achievement school-wide will increase a minimum of 5% points raising our ELA achievement to 57% and our ELA LQ achievement will increase at the same rate raising our school-wide achievement to 43% above the ESSA required 41%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Durenda McKinney (mckinneyd@lake.k12.fl.us)

District Instructional Framework emphasizing Teacher modeling

Evidence-based Strategy: Strategy will be monitored through grade level planning attended by Instructional Coaches and Leadership to ensure modeling opportunities are designed and implemented in classroom instruction for both traditional and virtual students ensuring we are reaching our desired goals in both ELA achievement and ELA LQ groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we design Teacher modeling opportunities and monitor the intentional use of this area of the District Framework then there will be an increase in student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development on the Instructional framework emphasizing teacher modeling to teachers. The delivery of this professional development will occur during our PEP meetings as well as Choose your Learning events. Monitored by Instructional Coaches and Leadership as evident by lesson plans and walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Durenda McKinney (mckinneyd@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Coaches will attend grade-level planning to provide support and ascertain professional development opportunities. Grade-level planning occurs weekly and is attended by Instructional Coaches who will monitor lesson plan designs and implementation monitored during walk-through.

Person Responsible Judith Ann Le Moyne (lemoynej@lake.k12.fl.us)

3. Grade-level PLC's will design lessons for traditional and virtual students reflecting teacher modeling opportunities and monitoring the implementation for student understanding. Coaches will attend and ensure these opportunities are intentional. Data from formative and summative assessments will be used to monitor the student understanding and achievement.

Person Responsible Judith Ann Le Moyne (lemoynej@lake.k12.fl.us)

4. Learning walks will focus on the visible implementation of the District framework specifically teacher modeling ensuring teachers are using the tool to plan and deliver instructions. These walks will identify additional coaching and professional development opportunities.

Person Responsible	Durenda McKinney (mckinneyd@lake.k12.fl.us)
---------------------------	---

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the ESSA data for Students with Disabilities for the past two years this subgroup has scored below the required threshold of 41% with our scores being 38% for 2019 and 36% for 2018. Additionally our Black subgroup is growing but continues to show a gap in ELA achievement from other groups. Finally our Lower quartile students are trending below their peers creating a continued gap in achievement of in ELA specifically.

Measurable Outcome:

- Students with Disability will increase from 18% to 41% above the Federal threshold.
- Black students with an emphasis on black males will increase from 46% in ELA achievement to 56% a growth of 10%.
- Lower Quartile in ELA achievement will increase to close the gap in achievement.
- All students will be scheduled for intervention to improve ELA achievement by a minimum of 5% in all categories.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Durenda McKinney (mckinneyd@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Implementation and monitoring of Leveled Literacy intervention for grades 3-5
- SIPPS implementation for grade K-2 and students in grades 3-5 as needed.
- Targeted instruction (small groups and tutoring)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The selection of these strategies will focus on key areas of reading instructions. SIPPS will focus on the phonics and fluency, while LLI will focus on comprehension. Targeted instruction by the teacher using i-ready data will focus on individual student gaps in learning and tutoring will focus on systemic reading instruction across the grade-levels.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Master schedule reflects intervention/acceleration four times a week in all grade levels. Adjustments based on student needs will be reflected in the master schedule time allotments.

Person Responsible: Durenda McKinney (mckinneyd@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Accurately identify all students reading needs to create instructional groups for SIPPS, LLI and targeted instruction. Student lists will be based on i-ready testing, SIPPS screeners, LLI screeners and IEP goals. Delivery of the lists will occur within the first weeks of school.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Luevano (luevanot@lake.k12.fl.us)

3. Provide professional development to our teachers and intervention team on SIPPS and LLI instruction. Professional development will occur within the first two weeks of school.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Luevano (luevanot@lake.k12.fl.us)

4. Use a systemic approach to monitoring data used to adjust intervention instruction and support for MTSS process. Intervention team and teachers will meet with instructional coaches and guidance counselors regularly to discuss individual student progress.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Luevano (luevanot@lake.k12.fl.us)

5. ESE teachers will create schedules in conjunction with FIN guidelines of providing services based on student individual needs. ESE teachers will review IEP plans to identify targeted instruction for their students.

Person Responsible Jamie Hawkins (hawkinsj@lake.k12.fl.us)

6. SAI targeted assistance action plan includes funds for after school tutoring (curriculum and salaries) in ELA and Math for our lower quartile both traditional and virtual settings in order to close the achievement gap.

Person Responsible Judith Ann Le Moyne (lemoynej@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: School leadership will focus on the tenets of Professional Learning Communities providing the foundation for instructional delivery, accountability system, collective efficacy and high expectations for all students.

Measurable Outcome: Teacher efficacy in their instructional delivery will reflect a consistent use of the PLC process and Instructional framework will increase student achievement in all areas for all students.
Guiding Coalition and grade level plc process accountability system will increase student achievement in all areas with and emphasis of closing the achievement gaps for our targeted subgroups (SWD/Black students/LQ)
Professional Learning communities will improve instructional delivery of teachers improving collective efficacy and teacher performance scores.
Professional Learning communities will set high expectations in all lesson delivery increasing student achievement in all areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Durenda McKinney (mckinneyd@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Established Guiding Coalition will guide and direct the PLC process school-wide. Setting goals that will ensure an increase in student achievement specifically in ELA and for our targeted subgroups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we implement, support and monitor our PLC process school-wide then we will increase student achievement in all areas, create teacher efficacy and set high expectation for all students including ELA and targeted subgroups.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Guiding coalition will direct and monitor the use of the PLC process and goal achievement school-wide.

Person Responsible Durenda McKinney (mckinneyd@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Grade- level Coalition members will lead the PLC process in each grade level. Set goals for their grade level to monitor student achievement.

Person Responsible Carol Peppers (peppersc@lake.k12.fl.us)

3. Coaches will monitor grade-level implementation during planning meetings, data discussions and identify professional development opportunities.

Person Responsible Judith Ann Le Moyne (lemoynej@lake.k12.fl.us)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on Early Warning Systems data our attendance school-wide is in meeting the threshold of 90% or higher. However, with virtual learning occurring continued vigilance in this area will allow for proactive intervention. Additionally, our EWS data for one or more suspension reflects a disparity for our economically disadvantaged students representing 85% of the suspensions last year.

Kindergarten,

Measurable Outcome:

Maintain attendance for all students less than 10%
Reduce suspensions for all students by 10%
Increase the use of suspension alternative for our economically disadvantaged students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Elliott (elliottd@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Use of Attendance monitoring system
- Improve our Positive Behavior Support program (GROWL) to include faster delivery of rewards (electronic monitoring of GROWL tickets)
- Utilize PASS and Mental Health Liasion for early intervention and restorative practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Early intervention is key to changing behavior. Our school suspension rate has not decreased and trends to close to the threshold. Additionally, equity data shows a huge disparity for our economically disadvantaged students receiving a greater number of suspensions. This leads to missed instruction and increases in the achievement gaps for our high risk subgroups.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students who have attendance and suspension early warning factors.

Person Responsible

Carol Peppers (peppersc@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Create an EWS overview group to discuss concerns at Guiding Coalition and PBIS meetings.

Person Responsible

Carol Peppers (peppersc@lake.k12.fl.us)

3. Continue use of PBIS system adding the electronic monitoring of rewards to the process.

Person Responsible

Carol Peppers (peppersc@lake.k12.fl.us)

4. PASS and Mental Health Liasion to provide professional development to teachers emphasizing alternatives for controlling student behavior in their classrooms.

Person Responsible

Carol Peppers (peppersc@lake.k12.fl.us)

5. Behavior Support Team to meet regularly on students exhibiting inappropriate behavior while at school. To include and in conjunction with the school-wide threat assessment process.

Person Responsible

Dawn Elliott (elliottd@lake.k12.fl.us)

6. PASS to provide coaching opportunities for teachers needing classroom assistance.

Person Responsible Carol Peppers (peppersc@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.

N/A

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.

Tavares Elementary School believes in involving parents in our Title 1 programs. Parents comprise at least 50% of our SAC committee who help finalize the School Compact. All parents are given the opportunity and access to all meeting minutes. Flexible meeting times are also available to ensure all parents have the opportunity to attend. Communication is sent home in a language parents are able to understand. Monthly newsletters produced by our Family School Liaison assist with the family to school connection.

Throughout the year, parent and student activities will be scheduled whether in person or virtually. The events are posted on our marquee and social media. At each events the Parent Resource Room is available for parents to check out items for assisting their students.

Parents are vital to our IEP meetings and accommodation is made to conduct meetings which are flexible for parent schedules.

Social and emotional needs of our students are being met through our Guidance small groups, PASS and Mental Health intervention in the classroom and small group practices. Specifically PASS teacher addresses behavioral concerns and restorative practices. Our Mental Health liaison will focus on student emotional concerns and family therapy referrals.

At Tavares Elementary School our Voluntary Pre-K program continues to run at full capacity bridging the gap for our four-year old. Additionally we hold an orientation for our upcoming kindergarten students (Kindergarten Roundup). Finally articulation meetings are held for our fifth graders and students with disabilities transitioning to middle schools as well as our

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
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0551 - Tavares Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$5,000.00
			Notes: Classroom Grade -level PLC writing teams			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$9,035.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	100-Salaries	0551 - Tavares Elementary School	Other		\$7,020.00
			Notes: Extra Duty Pay for Instructors (tutoring)			
	5100	210-Retirement	0551 - Tavares Elementary School	Other		\$594.59
			Notes: Retirement costs for instructors			
	5100	220-Social Security	0551 - Tavares Elementary School	Other		\$537.03
			Notes: Social Security & Medicare			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	0551 - Tavares Elementary School	Other		\$42.82
			Notes: Workman's Compensation			
	5100	520-Textbooks	0551 - Tavares Elementary School	Other		\$840.56
			Notes: Curriculum Workbooks			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems				\$0.00
Total:					\$14,035.00	