Fruitland Park Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fruitland Park Elementary School

304 W FOUNTAIN ST, Fruitland Park, FL 34731

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

Demographics

Principal: Dawn Brown   Start Date for this Principal: 8/18/2020

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: C (47%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (42%)
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 is pending approval by the Lake County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Fruitland Park Elementary School

304 W FOUNTAIN ST, Fruitland Park, FL 34731

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served
(per MSID File)

Elementary School
PK-5

2019-20 Title I School

Yes

2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
(as reported on Survey 3)

100%

Primary Service Type
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

50%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

MISSION:
At Fruitland Park Elementary, we are committed to encouraging and teaching all students in ways that promote wise decision-making, good citizenship, and a love for life-long learning. Fruitland Park Elementary, and the community we serve, strive to create an atmosphere of positive expectations in a safe and resource-filled learning environment.

BELIEFS:
Student learning is our chief priority. We believe that a commitment to continuous improvement and modeling
life-long learning is imperative for producing confident, self-directed, life-long learners.

Families, teachers, administrators, and the community share the responsibility for producing responsible, trustworthy, productive, and respectful citizens.

Each student is a valued individual with unique physical, social, emotional, and intellectual needs.

An "inviting" school environment, that enhances mutual respect among students and staff, is essential for fostering healthy self-esteem and integrity.

A safe and physically comfortable environment promotes student learning.

Curriculum and instructional practices should incorporate activities which promote conceptual thinking and decision-making as essential skills.

A variety of instructional approaches and methods should be presented to support and facilitate learning for all in a meaningful context.

Provide the school's vision statement.

VISION:
Every Child a Success in a Global Society!

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
Langley, Tammy	Principal	Instructional leader of the school. Provides strategic direction for the school through instructional leadership to increase student achievement based on data. Builds community by relationship building and communication between the community, teachers, parents, students, and stakeholders. Supports teacher instructional practice through Targeted Feedback and TEAM Evaluation.
Redding, Rebecca	Instructional Technology	Leads, supports Instructional Technology, ELL Lead, teacher/student support with ELL accommodations, and Testing Coordinator.
Blozis, Diane	School Counselor	Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Lead, Co-Lead English Language Learners (ELL), Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) Lead, Monitor Student Attendance, Social-Emotional support for students.
McKibben, Mary	Teacher, ESE	ESE School Specialist, Support Lead for ESE Teachers, Coordinates and Conducts IEP Meetings and Staffings for students, ESE Student Support
Brown, Dawn	Assistant Principal	Assists Principal with leading direction of the school and providing instructional leadership support to teachers and students. Student Discipline and Behavior Support, Health Coordinator, Science Instruction Lead, STEAM Lead, Teacher Quality Retention (TQR) Lead, Targeted Feedback, TEAM Evaluations, Learning Walks Maintains communication with parents, teachers, students, community, and stakeholders.
Santos, Daniel	Dean	Student Discipline and Behavior Support, Math Lead, Math Interventionist Lead, support teachers through instructional leadership and targeted feedback, Safety Coordinator.
Sivek, Lorelei	Instructional Coach	Reading Intervention Specialist, coordinates and implements intervention efforts by leading a team of teachers through weekly PLC. Creates and implements reading intervention schedule to provide MTSS interventions to bottom quartile reading students based on reading skills needing remediation. Collects data and maintains data and fidelity records for students in MTSS Tier 2 or Tier 3.
Dillon, Juan	Other	Provides a supervised and structured environment for students assigned to the in-school suspension program, working with classroom teachers to coordinate the academic activities of assigned students and support students in completion of the assigned work along with the implementation of social, emotional learning, behavioral and academic support.
Purvee, Joy A.	Instructional Coach	Organizes and leads ongoing, job-embedded professional learning that is standards-based and data-driven including, but not limited to: leading job-embedded reading endorsement coursework; facilitating

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		face-to-face learning sessions at school site; observing and problem-solving with teachers, using the district-approved coaching cycle; monitors participant implementation and progress.
Frampton, Leona N.	Instructional Coach	The purpose of this position, under the supervision of the principal and District Office Curriculum Department, is to provide leadership at the school level in data analysis, classroom strategies, curriculum development and instructional methodology in specific content area of math. Position performs at high professional level to provide program over-site and training. Performs related work as directed.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/18/2020, Dawn Brown

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.*
16

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.*
31

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
57

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)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students*

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (42%)
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	80	98	109	114	114	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	624
Attendance below 90 percent	17	9	15	6	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	5	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	4	4	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	4	4	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	30	40	51	57	84	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	337

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	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/18/2020

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	102	105	116	136	126	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	18	11	19	13	20	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	7	3	11	14	18	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	16	18	35	40	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	22	27	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	3	6	26	28	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111

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	8	2	3	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	102	105	116	136	126	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	18	11	19	13	20	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	7	3	11	14	18	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	16	18	35	40	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	22	27	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	3	6	26	28	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111

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	8	2	3	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	49%	58%	57%	49%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	57%	58%	58%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	49%	53%	58%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	60%	63%	54%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	48%	56%	62%	60%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	39%	51%	48%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	54%	53%	30%	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	45%	60%	-15%	58%	-13%	
	2018	48%	61%	-13%	57%	-9%	
Same Grade Comparison		-3%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	47%	60%	-13%	58%	-11%	
	2018	45%	59%	-14%	56%	-11%	
Same Grade Comparison		2%					
Cohort Comparison		-1%					
05	2019	51%	59%	-8%	56%	-5%	
	2018	45%	55%	-10%	55%	-10%	
Same Grade Comparison		6%					
Cohort Comparison		6%					

				MATH			
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	52%	62%	-10%	62%	-10%	
	2018	50%	65%	-15%	62%	-12%	
Same Grade Comparison		2%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	42%	61%	-19%	64%	-22%	
	2018	51%	60%	-9%	62%	-11%	
Same Grade Comparison		-9%					
Cohort Comparison		-8%					
05	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%	
	2018	44%	58%	-14%	61%	-17%	
Same Grade Comparison		3%					
Cohort Comparison		-4%					

				SCIENCE			
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	49%	56%	-7%	53%	-4%	
	2018	39%	54%	-15%	55%	-16%	
Same Grade Comparison		10%					
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	21	46	42	22	33	28	22				
ELL	50	56		36	56						
BLK	34	43	37	33	48	30	36				
HSP	51	50		48	40		55				
MUL	32	67		52	47						
PAC											
WHT	58	62	43	55	49	39	59				
FRL	42	53	48	43	43	31	48				

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	21	38	34	25	39	34	16				
ELL	17	17		22	50						
ASN	50			50							
BLK	40	38	20	32	36	33	25				
HSP	50	47		57	53	50	44				
MUL	39	36		43	29						
WHT	54	52	41	59	56	36	46				
FRL	45	46	34	46	46	37	39				

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	15	40	44	20	33	21	3				
ELL	10	31		24	56	64					
BLK	33	50	57	36	52	52	4				
HSP	43	54		55	58		33				
MUL	46	67		42	50		15				
WHT	57	61	54	63	64	36	42				
FRL	43	55	58	50	57	47	23				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	52
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	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	40
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	52
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	46
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.

Students with Disabilities showed the lowest performance in both English Language Arts (ELA) and Math proficiency. Traditionally Students with Disabilities demonstrate the lowest performance in all academic areas. The contributing factor are the learning gaps that these students develop throughout their academic career. In addition, teacher knowledge of differentiating instruction to meet the varied needs of Students with Disabilities is a factor.

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

The greatest decline from the previous year is in the areas of math Hispanic sub-group learning gains which demonstrated a decline of 13%, math achievement which was a decline of 3% and Math bottom quartile decline of 3%. The factor that contributed to this decline was teacher understanding of the full intent of the standards. There were a few teachers who were new to their grade levels. Instruction provided did not meet the expected rigor; therefore, students were not exposed to rigorous tasks that would have given them the opportunity to practice and demonstrate competence in the standard.

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 when compared to the state average is math bottom quartile with a gap of 16%. The greatest decline we experienced was in fourth grade math. The main contributing factor was teacher's understanding of the standards. As a result, students opportunities to engage in rigorous instruction and tasks was not consistently
administered.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was English Language Arts lowest quartile with an increase of 13%. The new actions we took to improve in this area was the organization of an intervention team that work with under-performing students daily in the area of reading.

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

One potential area of concern is Black students not meeting the 41% expected federal index. The second potential concern is our Students with Disabilities not meeting the expected federal index of 41% for the past two years.

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

1. To improve teachers instructional practices in order to increase student achievement
in all subject areas.
2. Organize a math intervention team.
3. Provide support for the Black sub-group, Students with Disabilities and Pacific
Islanders in order to meet the expected federal index of 41%
4. Increase math and reading learning gains.
5. Increase students reading and math proficiency.

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 the Florida Standards Assessment and ESSA Federal Index standards based instruction with grade appropriate assignments is one of our most critical areas of focus. Standards based instruction with appropriate grade level assignments was identified as a critical area of need because the Florida State Assessment revealed that our English Language Arts student performance levels did not increase but remained stagnant. In addition, student performance in math declined by 3%. Focusing on standards based instruction with appropriate grade level assignments will improve student learning and success by ensuring students receive strong instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, we expect to see increased student performance in the areas of math, writing, reading and science as evidenced by at least a 7% increase on all indicators of the Florida Standards Assessment. Our ELA proficiency will increase from 49% to 56%, ELA Learning Gains will increase from 56% to 63%, ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains will increase from 46% to 53%, Math proficiency will increase from 48% to 55%, Math Learning Gains will increase 48% to 55%, Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains will increase from 35% to 42% and Science Proficiency will increase from 50% to 57%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tammy Langley (langleyt@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Gradual Release of Responsibility will be used to increase our overall achievement on the Florida Standards Assessment from 47% to 54%. To monitor this strategy the school's classroom walk through data, the districts Lake Standards Assessments (LSA's), address teacher usage during common planning, and Early Warning Signs data will be analyzed monthly by the school's leadership team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor and support the Gradual Release of Responsibility, then there will be an increase in students academic performance as evidenced by the Florida Standards Assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration will continue to facilitate professional development on the gradual release of responsibility using strategies from "Better Learning Through Structured Teaching" (Fisher & Frey 2014) for all instructional staff monthly. Presentation materials and teacher work samples of student products will be used to determine progress. The targeted focus will be on Modeling and Guided Instruction.
2. The Principal, Assistant Principal and Dean will conduct weekly classroom learning walks with targeted feedback. The districts classroom learning walk tool will be used to collect instructional trend data.
3. As needed the Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean, and Instructional Coaches will model best practices for teachers when facilitating the coaching cycle including strategies for the gradual release of responsibility.
4. Instructional Coaches will facilitate collaborative planning once a week. Strategies for the gradual release of responsibility will be discussed and reviewed during this time. Teacher lesson plans, Instructional Focus Calendars, and collaborative planning meeting notes will serve as evidence.
5. The Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean, Instructional Coaches, Teachers and Students will engage in data chats to monitor student progress of standards. Data presentations, student data folders and teacher data folders will be used to monitor progress of completion.

Person Responsible	Tammy Langley (langleyt@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2019 ESSA Federal Index an area of focus is to provide differentiated instruction through interventions in math, ELA and Science. This area was identified as a critical area of need because Students with Disabilities, Black/African American students and Pacific Islander Students all scored below the Federal Index of 41%. This is the second year that Students with Disabilities have scored below the expected performance level. Focusing on differentiated instruction through interventions will help to close the academic achievement gaps of these learners and will improve their learning gains on the Florida Standards Assessment and the Florida Alternative Assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	Students with Disabilities, Black/African American students and Pacific Islander students will demonstrate a 10% increase in learning gains and will increase their Federal Index score from SWD 31% to 41%, Black/AA from 37% to 47% and Pacific Islanders from 40% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tammy Langley (langleyt@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction with the use of data driven lessons through iReady Instructional Priorities, Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS), Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), and Pearson Math Diagnosis and Intervention System. As a result of implementing this strategy all subgroups will meet or exceed the 41% Federal Index. To monitor this strategy school administration will use iReady progress monitoring data, SIPPS Mastery Tests, and classroom walk-through data. Classroom learning walk data will be analyzed weekly and iReady progress monitoring data will be monitored quarterly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor, and support small group instruction, then all subgroups will meet the desired Federal Index of 41% and demonstrate learning gains on the Florida State Assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The Principal and Dean will develop, implement, support and monitor small group math intervention using iReady progress monitoring data, student FSA data when applicable and classroom assessment data. Small group instruction will be monitored by the Principal, Assistant Principal and Dean weekly.
2. The Math Coach will facilitate weekly collaborative planning sessions with the math intervention team to discuss student progress, data and lesson planning based on data.
3. The Principal, Literacy Coach and the Reading Content Area Coach will develop, implement, support and monitor small group ELA interventions. The expected outcome is the intervention team will implement daily reading skills groups which will produce increased student performance.
4. The Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean and Instructional Coaches will facilitate professional development to increase teacher capacity in providing small group instruction in their classrooms. Instructional Coaches will support teachers in the classroom with building appropriate intervention lessons.

Person Responsible	Tammy Langley (langleyt@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the Early Warning System data an area of focus is to enhance the opportunity of building a community of learners. This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because of the level of EWS which impacts collaboration, attendance and classroom management.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, we expect to see a decrease in EWS data from 123 to 95.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tammy Langley (langleyt@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Positive Behavior System, Restorative Practices, Positive Alternative to Suspension, and Sanford Harmony Curriculum will be used to decrease from 123 to 95. To monitor this strategy EWS data will be analyzed monthly by administration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement monitor, and support Positive Behavior System, Restorative Practices, Positive Alternative to Suspension, and Sanford Harmony Curriculum, then there will be an increase in collaboration, attendance and classroom management.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development for faculty and staff on Positive Behavior System, Restorative Practices, Positive Alternative to Suspension, Sanford Harmony on a weekly basis.
2. Creating an environment where all teachers will perform restorative circles and implement Sanford Harmony lessons at least once a week.
3. PBS weekly meetings to discuss the progress of students and fidelity of implementation at the school level.
4. Using PASS as means to build relationships between all stakeholders with students whom are at risk as defined by multiple EWS factors.

Person Responsible	Tammy Langley (langleyt@lake.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2019 ESSA Federal Index an area of focus is the total number of Subgroups missing their target of 41% or above. The Students With Disabilities Subgroup did not meet the 41%, achieving 31% proficiency. The Black/African American Subgroup did not meet the 41%, achieving 37% proficiency. The Pacific Islander Subgroup did not meet the 41%, achieving 40% proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Students with Disabilities, Black/African American students and Pacific Islander students will demonstrate a 10% increase in learning gains and will increase their Federal Index score from SWD 31% to 41%, Black/AA from 37% to 47% and Pacific Islanders from 40% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tammy Langley (langleyt@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing Professional Development in the area of closing the academic achievement gap and developing equity teams to support student achievement within lower performing subgroups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we provide teachers with instructional strategies to monitor and support closing the academic achievement gap of the Students With Disabilities, Black/African American, and Pacific Islander Subgroups, then there will be an increase in student academic performance and a decrease in the academic achievement gap as evidenced by the Florida Standards Assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The Principal, Assistant Principal and Dean will facilitate professional development using a book study on "Overcoming the Achievement Gap Trap" (Muhammad 2015) for all instructional staff.
2. The Principal will create an Equity Team to analyze subgroup data to monitor ongoing student performance. The team will identify needs of each subgroup and develop action steps to increase student achievement.
3. The Social-Emotional Team will develop a Student Ambassadors Group to build striving students' leadership skills and improve students' academic identities.

Person Responsible	Tammy Langley (langleyt@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.

Daily math fluency practice and Number Talks will be implemented in grades K-5 weekly. Each student will have an opportunity to read independently and confer with their teachers weekly on a book of their choice.
Write Score will be used in grades 4 and 5 to monitor text based writing progress and to develop data driven lessons. Third grade students will be administered a Write Score Assessment to forecast writing instructional needs for the upcoming year.
K-4 classrooms will implement mini-benchmark assessments in Science quarterly to monitor student progress. The data will be used to guide school-wide instructional focus in science.
Morning academic tutoring will be provided to students in grades Kindergarten through fifth who are demonstrating academic deficiencies in the areas of reading and math. Focused instruction will be based on students learning gaps as evidenced by iReady progress monitoring data and teacher input.

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 relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders will be built by following the Parent Family Engagement Plan attached below. In addition, mental health professionals are available to implement social-emotional learning and support for students with mental health challenges.

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**	**$0.00**
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction**	**$0.00**
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**	**$0.00**
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**	**$0.00**

	Total:	$0.00