

Lake County Schools

# Cypress Ridge Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

# Cypress Ridge Elementary School

350 EAST AVE, Clermont, FL 34711

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Joseph Frana**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (61%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

## Cypress Ridge Elementary School

350 EAST AVE, Clermont, FL 34711

<https://cre.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	No	25%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	35%

### School Grades History

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

### 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.

It is the mission of Cypress Ridge to ensure all of our students acquire the knowledge and skills essential to achieve high levels of success and become productive citizens.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

As a school community we believe in:

Collaborating to support all learners

Celebrating success

Integrating cross-curricular standards with a focus on STEAM

Using evidence to drive instruction

### 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
Voytko, Scott	Principal	Instructional Leader voytkos@lake.k12.fl.us
Schoenthaler, Virginia	Instructional Coach	Instructional Leader, STEAM schoenthalerv@lake.k12.fl.us
Perez, Betzaida	Administrative Support	Supporting the instructional leaders perezb@lake.k12.fl.us
Brouhard, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Professional Development and Instructional Leader brouhardn@lake.k12.fl.us
Spanswick, Marcella	Instructional Coach	ELA gelardim@lake.k12.fl.us
Taylor, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	Interventionist taylors3@lake.k12.fl.us
Kuennen, Jessica	Teacher, ESE	ESE Specialist
Forsyth, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Sunday 7/1/2018, Joseph Frana

**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.*

1

**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.*

6

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

33

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (61%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A



<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	85	74	93	69	86	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	478
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/27/2020

### Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	95	104	83	101	86	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	556
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	95	104	83	101	86	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	556
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	88%	58%	57%	80%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	75%	57%	58%	55%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	76%	49%	53%	43%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	82%	60%	63%	75%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	56%	62%	63%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	39%	51%	43%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	79%	54%	53%	60%	49%	51%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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	84%	60%	24%	58%	26%
	2018	88%	61%	27%	57%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	92%	60%	32%	58%	34%
	2018	86%	59%	27%	56%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	90%	59%	31%	56%	34%
	2018	82%	55%	27%	55%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	89%	62%	27%	62%	27%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	88%	65%	23%	62%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	61%	21%	64%	18%
	2018	80%	60%	20%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	74%	57%	17%	60%	14%
	2018	75%	58%	17%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	79%	56%	23%	53%	26%
	2018	78%	54%	24%	55%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
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	60	71	63	47	50	32	30				
ASN	80			80							
BLK	83	79		78	57						
HSP	79	82		72	55						
MUL	92	70		77	50						
WHT	91	72	75	85	67	30	85				
FRL	81	71	87	76	56	50	75				
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	48	42	33	47	35	36					
ASN	90			90							
BLK	86	64		77	64						
HSP	69	71		69	57						
MUL	68	57		74	64						
WHT	90	63	48	85	65	41	82				
FRL	77	70	57	72	63	53	67				

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	50	34	42	50	48	33	47				
BLK	82			71							
HSP	73	61		61	57		64				
MUL	71	60		57	40						
WHT	81	54	45	78	69	55	60				
FRL	73	51	40	59	47	32	50				

### ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	504
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	74
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	72
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	72
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	72
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	71
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.**

Our Math Lower Quartile was our lowest in 2019 and their growth was in question last winter according to Iready year of year comparisons. We will continue to target this group as our lowest performing.

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

1st grade reading. Our grade level planning was inconsistent and not all teachers were aligned to teaching the standards.

**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 was Math Lower Quartile by 12% points. This was due to a lack of targeted interventions and lack of instructor understanding of standard. While we have had this gap for 3 years, we do see a positive trend on local data from I-ready showing our students in 2019 were on track to make learning gains.

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

Science- Our 5th grade team focused on aligning tests to standards and created a clearer purpose in science lessons.

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

No students qualified for EWS.

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

1. Math LQ
2. Math LG
3. Math Proficiency
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our area of focus is ensuring that student independent work aligns to the rigor called for form the standard. . Research shows a disconnect between what the standard asks students to know, and the work that students actually do. When students do work that does not align to the standard they will rarely have the ability to master the content. Due to the published research and information gathered in walkthroughs, our gaps may exist due to a lack of high quality independent work.

**Measurable Outcome:** A research study showed 17% of independent work matched the standard, so we are aiming for 60% of students independent work to meet the demands of the standard.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Scott Voytko (voytkos@lake.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will plan and review student independent work to determine if the work assigned (and the student product) meets the standard. Teachers will unpack the standard to make this determination.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** If we implement, monitor and support more standard based tasks for students, then we will see a higher percentage of students mastering the standard.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Continue PLC structure and attend a grade level community weekly.
2. Walk through rooms capturing student work, providing feedback of what kids are doing compared to what is being asked in standard.

**Person Responsible** Scott Voytko (voytkos@lake.k12.fl.us)



**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Teachers and staff were presented with data that showed evidence of the disparity between the number of proficient white students on honor roll compared to the number of African American, Hispanic, and Economically disadvantaged students on honor. Based on this data, we created a guiding coalition to ensure that as a staff we eliminate unknown biases and monitor that all students receive the support they need to ensure equity.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Close the gap of proficient students receiving honor roll among subgroups. We want to see less than a 10% gap between White, Hispanic, African American, and Economically-Disadvantaged students receiving honor roll who show proficiency.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Nicole Brouhard (brouhardn@lake.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We will utilize a Guiding Coalition team. This team will conduct Guiding Coalition meetings which consists of teachers and staff to ensure that we can work on improving and eliminating unknown biases. We will look at Iready scores of students and the grades they receive in the classroom. We will also continue the use of Iready data to monitor the progress of all students in regards to proficiency and grades students receive by the teacher. Students not meeting expectations will be invited to tutoring for supplemental support outside of the scheduled school day in math and reading. Additionally, teachers will be selected to attend the 2021 PLC conference to learn more about equity and the PLC implementation.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	After attending a Lake County summer training/conference that was led by Dr. Anthony Muhammad, the leadership team and team of teachers went through the data presented that identified the honor roll disparity. As a team we decided to create a team of teachers and staff that could help support the change needed for our students. The Guiding Coalition team will look into individual student grades and performance scores to ensure that Gaps are addressed.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Ensure a structure for PLC meeting times
2. Meet with grade teams on under performing students, as well as MTSS coordinator, to keep students tracked and in interventions.
3. Schedule and invite students to tutoring
4. Invite staff to attend PLC conference.

**Person Responsible** Scott Voytko (voytkos@lake.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Instructional practice specifically related to differentiation is an area of need based on our bottom quartile data and students in the ESSA subgroups. When student gaps in learning form, teachers rely on differentiating instruction to close gaps so all students can achieve mastery within the standard. In our PLC teachers will work on Question 3, what do we do for students who don't get it, to plan these activities to differentiate and intervene content so that all students meet the intended purpose. We have historical data that indicates only about 50% of under achieving students close the gap while in 3-5th grade.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	We want to see 100% of our students identified in the lower quartile for ELA and Math demonstrate Learning Gains on the FSA assessment.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Scott Voytko (voytkos@lake.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Professional Learning Communities with an area of focus on standard based instruction and strategies to utilize for students who are not meeting the standard will be used to increase proficiency in the lower quartile in the area of math. To monitor this strategy the leadership team will participate in the PLC's with grade levels K- through fifth, supporting these teams in unpacking standards and identifying the causes for gaps and the plan to deliver differentiated instruction. , The leadership team will conduct classroom walk-throughs, and work with teams. Additionally, Students needing further differentiation will be invited to supplemental afterschool tutoring to work on specific gaps in skill.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Its essential that teachers differentiate instruction, but at the same time we must not lower our expectation to anything below what the standards calls for. While we can differentiate these pathways, we need the make sure it remains aligned to our PLC and school focus of understanding standards

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Implement PLC
2. Leadership Team attends PLC and supports question 2 and 3 of PLC model
3. Students needing support are invited to tutoring
4. Some teachers will be invited to PLC conference summer 2021.

**Person Responsible** Scott Voytko (voytkos@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.

**Supporting walkthroughs to ensure that independent work aligns to standard in science.**

**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.

As a school we address building a positive school culture by implementing The Seven Habits of Happy Kids by Dr. Covey. Each month starting in the month of September teachers and students work on one habit. Students are recognized as terrific kid for demonstrating those habits. These focus on character, respect, and working through feelings.

In addition as a school we provide multiple opportunities for parents to be involved in our campus activities. We host curriculum nights, movie nights, Father Daughter events, school carnivals, breakfast and luncheons to encourage student/parent participation in our school culture and environment.

Monthly SAC meetings and PTO meeting take place to ensure all stakeholders are involved in decisions made for the whole of the school.

#### **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: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>