

Lake County Schools

Mascotte 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Mascotte Elementary School

460 MIDWAY AVE, Mascotte, FL 34753

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

Demographics

Principal: Tiffany Mayhugh Rego

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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 (45%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Mascotte Elementary School

460 MIDWAY AVE, Mascotte, FL 34753

<https://mse.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	91%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	70%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Mascotte Charter School, we strive to develop a growth mindset in our students that inspires them to Learn, Grow, and Achieve.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our students will develop the confidence and motivation to explore all of their possibilities.

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
Mayhugh-Rego, Tiffany	Principal	Budget, personnel, hiring, accountability, Title 1, school improvement, enrollment,
Brown, Terri	Instructional Coach	Literacy Leadership Team, Professional Development, Curriculum and Instruction, New Teacher Academy, MTSS, Intervention, Title 1 Compliance
McMillan, Mary Lou	Instructional Coach	Curriculum and Instruction, Data Analysis, Progress Monitoring, Intervention, Title 1 Compliance, Title 1 Tutoring Program
Johnson, Radean	Assistant Principal	Teacher Evaluations, Facilities, Coaching
Newman, Wendi	Other	Lower Quartile Intervention, New Teacher Coaching and Retention, Literacy Leadership
Bultema, Leah	Other	Guidance Potentials Specialist, MTSS, Data Analysis, Attendance Committee, ESOL
Ramkissoon, Anita	Other	ESE Specialist, IDEA

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Tiffany Mayhugh Rego

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.*

31

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.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

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 (45%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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	133	138	124	124	110	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	743
Attendance below 90 percent	10	14	11	9	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	7	15	5	9	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	4	8	11	14	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	25	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	23	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	6	20	27	36	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

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	7	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/9/2020

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	148	137	125	113	129	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	765
Attendance below 90 percent	2	8	10	7	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	24	32	33	32	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	47	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	6	12	16	15	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	12	17	8	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	148	137	125	113	129	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	765
Attendance below 90 percent	2	8	10	7	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	24	32	33	32	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	47	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	6	12	16	15	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	12	17	8	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	52%	58%	57%	50%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	57%	58%	47%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	49%	53%	49%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	51%	60%	63%	54%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	51%	56%	62%	43%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	24%	39%	51%	24%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	54%	53%	40%	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	62%	60%	2%	58%	4%
	2018	58%	61%	-3%	57%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	60%	-11%	58%	-9%
	2018	54%	59%	-5%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	42%	59%	-17%	56%	-14%
	2018	38%	55%	-17%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	50%	62%	-12%	62%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	62%	65%	-3%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	61%	-9%	64%	-12%
	2018	54%	60%	-6%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
	2018	44%	58%	-14%	61%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	52%	56%	-4%	53%	-1%
	2018	32%	54%	-22%	55%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
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	35	25	22	30	29	26	31				
ELL	31	27	36	38	42	28	26				
BLK	61	53		46	53		64				
HSP	46	39	36	48	43	21	42				
MUL	60			30							
WHT	57	46	42	56	60	30	62				
FRL	46	37	39	46	49	22	43				

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	31	32	31	29	15	12				
ELL	25	41	45	33	38	36					
BLK	67	40		65	79						
HSP	46	52	46	49	49	33	28				
WHT	57	42	42	64	55	29	46				
FRL	47	46	46	50	50	34	32				

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	10	35	38	14	18	15	13				
ELL	12	29	35	28	38	30	13				
ASN	38	27		23	27						
BLK	45	58		43	17		25				
HSP	44	44	51	51	46	32	37				
MUL	58			42							
WHT	62	49	47	65	46	12	55				
FRL	45	45	47	50	41	25	35				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	375
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	55
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	43
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	45
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	50
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	44
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.

Continuation of 2019-20 SIP: ELA Lowest 25th percentiles is the lowest performance area. Contributing factors include a high percentage of students with learning disabilities.; 35% of 4th grade and 41% of 5th grade students scoring in the level 1 range were identified as students with learning disabilities. At the present time, 12% of 5th grade students and 16% of 4th grade students are identified with learning disabilities. Key Ideas and Details area has a consistent trend of low performance in reading.

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

Third grade Math showed the greatest decline in 2019. Progress monitoring data did not indicate this decline in math skills so test taking strategies is a focus area for improvement.

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.

Fifth grade ELA had the greatest gap between the school and the state average in 2019. Once again, 41% of the 5th grade students scoring in the level 1 range were identified as students with a learning disability.

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

Science data showed the greatest improvement from 32% proficient to 52% proficient. Implementation of a new science curriculum from HMH helped increase the rigor of the science instruction. Mascotte piloted a team teaching model that included a dedicated hour of science instruction in grades 1-5.

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

Our students experienced learning loss due to school closures this spring. Many students lost an entire 9 weeks of instruction when they were unable to access our technology platforms. Providing academic continuity for all of our students is a major goal to increase achievement.

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

1. ELA Lower Quartile Learning Gains
2. SWD Learning Proficiency below 41% in ELA
3. Equitable Access to Technology and Curriculum
4. Social and Emotional Learning through Guidance
5. ELL Learning Proficiency below 41% in ELA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our ELA lower quartile students are members of various subgroups. Students that have been identified with specific learning disabilities and students who are receiving MTSS tier 3 intensive interventions will receive intensive reading instruction through the Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention program.

Measurable Outcome: Increasing the reading proficiency of Students with Disabilities and MTSS tier 3 students to 33% scoring level 3 or above on FSA ELA will have a positive effect on our lower quartile gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Purchase and implement Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention reading program to use with ESE students who have ELA intervention on their IEP and also use for MTSS tier 3 ELA students. Students in grades 3, 4, and 5, will receive intensive intervention at their instructional level 4 days a week for 45 minutes. Kindergarten through 2nd grade students will receive instruction for 30 minutes a day 4 days a week with LLI. Provide ongoing professional development on how to use the LLI program with fidelity for all ESE teachers, potential specialists, curriculum specialists and selected classroom teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our goal is to accelerate the proficiency levels of our students through structured LLI lessons that address the 5 areas of reading daily. Fountas and Pinnell reading programs are research based and All ESE and MTSS Tier 3 students have been assessed using the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System to identify their F&P instructional level. The National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE) found Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention to have a positive effect on general reading achievement and reading fluency. Leveled Literacy Intervention works as an effective short-term measure to advance the ability levels of struggling readers who demonstrate below-level performance.

Action Steps to Implement

LLI consultants will provide professional development on how to accelerate student reading proficiency using the LLI program. ESE teachers, curriculum support teachers, and selected classroom teachers attended a full day workshop in July with two follow up coaching sessions scheduled for the fall.

Person Responsible Mary Lou McMillan (mcmillanm@lake.k12.fl.us)

Identify and assess students using Benchmark Assessment System, create schedules for intervention groups and teachers to assure fidelity and time on task.

Person Responsible Mary Lou McMillan (mcmillanm@lake.k12.fl.us)

Monitor student progress using BAS and STAR reading assessments, conduct data chats and walk-throughs with intervention teachers and classes. Analyze and compare midyear BAS and STAR reading data to confirm growth expectations and adjust interventions as needed.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)

Title I funds are used for a 1st grade Reading teacher class-size reduction, Art and Science enrichment teachers. Additional Title I funds are used for the Literacy Coach position and 1/2 Potential Specialist

position. Both positions are instructional coaching, student intervention and training new teachers on all curriculum and instruction. Other Title I funds are used for STAR ELA and STAR Math progress monitoring programs, Freckle ELA supplemental curriculum and Zearn Math supplemental curriculum.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA learning gains for our SWD students dropped from 31% in 2018 to 25% in 2019. Decreasing the number of students each VE teacher serves will allow additional time for intervention and more positive outcomes. All mainstreamed students with disabilities will receive intensive reading intervention through the Leveled Literacy Intervention program.

Measurable Outcome: Increasing the reading proficiency of SWD students to 33% scoring a level 3 or above on state tests is an achievable goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Anita Ramkissoon (bajrangia@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Decrease the ratio of students to VE teachers by allocating an additional VE unit to work with students and implement the LLI reading intervention program. VE teachers will coordinate interventions and schedules with classroom teachers to assure students in grades three through five receive 45 minutes of LLI 4 days a week and kindergarten through second grade students receive 30 minutes a day 4 days a week.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: VE teachers will facilitate student learning during Leveled Literacy Intervention small group instruction and provide support for classroom teachers in meeting accommodations and goals stated within each student's Individual Education Plan.

Action Steps to Implement

Restructure VE teachers' schedules based on LLI small group protocols to increase ELA intervention times.

Person Responsible Mary Lou McMillan (mcmillanm@lake.k12.fl.us)

Provide VE teachers with Leveled Literacy Intervention professional development.

Person Responsible Mary Lou McMillan (mcmillanm@lake.k12.fl.us)

Monitor student progress using Benchmark Assessment System and STAR progress monitoring assessments. Schedule monthly meetings between ESE team and Curriculum team to analyze data and adjust intervention as needed.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)

Title I funds are used to purchase Leveled Literacy Intervention kits to use with lower quartile students.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our charter board has made it a priority to provide equitable access to technology and curriculum for all students. Our school qualifies as a school-wide Title 1 program with 86% of our students qualifying as economically disadvantaged through the Federal Index. Access to our Title I funded online learning platforms such as Zearn Math and Freckle ELA and Math will provide educational continuity for our students.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to provide equitable access to technology and curriculum for 100% of our kindergarten through fifth grade students at school and at home.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: We have purchased 300 Chromebooks and 200 iPads to make 1:1 student to device ratio possible. We will provide hot spots for families identified as in need through the spring technology survey.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data from our spring technology survey confirms that our families do not have Ipads, computers or internet for their children to use at home so when our school closed due to COVID 19, many of our students did not have access to our online platforms or online instruction. These devices and hotspots will assure equitable access for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

Analyze data from spring technology survey to determine the quantity and types of devices and hot spots needed to provide access at school and at home. Our technology department has already ordered and received the devices.

Person Responsible Robin Harris (harrisr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Apply for CARES Act Grant to help purchase devices and hot spots.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)

Provide all instructional personnel with ongoing Google Classroom and Google for Education training. Require teachers to earn certification in Google for Education products by Spring 2021.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)

Title I funded learning platforms, Freckle and Zearn.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: MSE maintains a fully staffed guidance department to support our students' mental health, academic progress, and social well-being. Our two guidance counselors and one potential specialist will provide small group counseling, classroom presentations and interactive virtual lessons that focus on social and emotional learning.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to reduce student conflicts and classroom disruptions by increasing the social/emotional learning opportunities for students during the school day by means of small guidance groups and classroom /virtual lessons.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Radean Johnson (johnsonr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Two Guidance Counselors and one Guidance Potentials Specialist will provide small group lessons for students exhibiting social or emotional difficulties. Counselors will make interactive SEL classroom lessons available to classroom teachers to use with their students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our students were unable to experience the rituals and closure activities for the end of the 19-20 school year. They missed saying goodbye to their classmates and their teachers. Many students are experiencing emotional issues and loneliness due to stay at home guidelines and online instruction options. Providing SEL activities will reduce feelings of stress and isolation.

Action Steps to Implement

Guidance department will provide staff professional development on Social Emotional Learning options.

Person Responsible Leah Bultema (bultemal@lake.k12.fl.us)

Teachers and staff may recommend students for counseling groups based on classroom behaviors and individual student needs.

Person Responsible Leah Bultema (bultemal@lake.k12.fl.us)

Guidance department will develop Social Emotional Learning classroom lessons and analyze midyear discipline data to determine topics for lessons.

Person Responsible Radean Johnson (johnsonr@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.

English Language Learners learning gains will be addressed through our Title 1 tutoring program starting in October. Funds have already been budgeted for this program. ELL students will receive two 45 minute sessions of vocabulary and reading instruction weekly through April. ELL students are simultaneously learning a new language and academic content in their classrooms. The Title 1 intervention teachers reinforce this learning by coordinating with the classroom teachers concerning ELA vocabulary lists, science and social studies vocabulary and content and general environmental vocabulary. Progress will be monitored using STAR Reading data.

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.

Positive interactions and relationships with families and community members are supported and organized through our school's Title 1 Family Engagement Plan. Mascotte Charter School hosts multiple events throughout the year involving families and community members in both academic and creative experiences at our school. Events include; Orlando Science Center Family Science Night, Eagle Family Picnic, The Annual Vocabulary Parade, Kindergarten Grandparent Reading Rally, Science Fair Night, Kindergarten Musical, Parent Conference Nights, and Family Literacy Nights. Our school has programs in place such as Accelerated Reader to promote and reward students who make reading a priority. As a Growth Mindset school we promote positive relationships and interactions between students and staff through school-wide initiatives and training.

Mascotte Charter School encourages volunteerism by community members by having a dedicated volunteer coordinator responsible for recruitment, placement and training of our volunteers. MSE won the Golden School Award for volunteerism last year. We're going to have to be creative this year to achieve the same goals as in previous years. We're working on a plan to offer virtual family engagement opportunities for now.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00