

Lake County Schools

Clermont Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Clermont Middle School

301 EAST AVE, Clermont, FL 34711

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

Demographics

Principal: Scott Voytko

Start Date for this Principal: 8/28/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-09-02
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan 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.

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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Clermont Middle School

301 EAST AVE, Clermont, FL 34711

<https://clm.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)
Middle School 6-8	No	80%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	67%

School Grades History

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

The mission of Clermont Middle School is to engage, educate, and motivate our students to prepare for their futures. We will do this by encouraging all stakeholders to be positive role models who inspire students to be responsible, productive citizens and future leaders of our global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision- All CLMS Falcons will be equipped to SOAR into their limitless futures. It is the goal of Clermont Middle School to become a destination Middle school in South Lake County.

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 that supports the success of the school with quality teachers and instruction.
Kovacsev, Jason	Teacher, K-12	Avid Coordinator: Monitor and maintains academic department for standards based curriculum.
Santuchi, Sophy	School Counselor	Interaction with students to identify, support and guide academic and personal success. MTSS facilitator.
Gordon, Maryellen	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach builds teacher capacity for improving student achievement. Supports all aspects of literacy in content area classrooms as well as the reading departments attention to struggling readers. MTSS facilitator. School Improvement Plan, MTSS (Achieve & IXL coordinator and data pulls-monthly) FAIR/PSAT Coordinator.
Frana, Joe	Assistant Principal	Multi-tasked responsibilities in the day to day routine of students, teachers and community. Interacts with guidance for the academic and behavior success of the students.
Larkin, John	Teacher, K-12	Positive Alternative to Suspension School, Safety Committee.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/28/2020, Scott Voytko

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.*

11

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

27

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-09-02
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	99	130	0	0	0	0	326
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	12	28	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	12	28	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	5	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	5	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	44	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	48	0	0	0	0	85

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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	5

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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/28/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	159	213	0	0	0	0	522
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	25	37	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	22	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	10	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	52	57	0	0	0	0	145

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	49	69	90	0	0	0	0	208

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	159	213	0	0	0	0	522
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	25	37	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	22	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	10	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	52	57	0	0	0	0	145

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	49	69	90	0	0	0	0	208

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	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	48%	50%	54%	49%	47%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	52%	54%	49%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	44%	47%	38%	39%	44%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	49%	56%	58%	56%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	52%	55%	57%	58%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	46%	51%	49%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	52%	49%	51%	53%	46%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	62%	70%	72%	73%	72%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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
06	2019	41%	52%	-11%	54%	-13%
	2018	35%	47%	-12%	52%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	44%	49%	-5%	52%	-8%
	2018	46%	48%	-2%	51%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
	2018	57%	55%	2%	58%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	37%	53%	-16%	55%	-18%
	2018	36%	49%	-13%	52%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	48%	58%	-10%	54%	-6%
	2018	57%	59%	-2%	54%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
08	2019	21%	39%	-18%	46%	-25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	41%	39%	2%	45%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	50%	49%	1%	48%	2%
	2018	55%	51%	4%	50%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	71%	-12%	71%	-12%
2018	67%	70%	-3%	71%	-4%
Compare		-8%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	80%	52%	28%	61%	19%
2018	85%	62%	23%	62%	23%
Compare		-5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%

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	20	38	30	22	51	37	24	39	64		
ELL	14	49	50	19	57	56	7				
ASN	63	71		57	61				82		
BLK	32	43	41	25	39	36	27	39	69		
HSP	42	50	45	43	53	51	41	51	65		
MUL	41	57		46	43		69		64		
WHT	59	59	52	65	59	54	65	81	77		
FRL	37	48	45	37	49	49	35	49	67		
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	39	36	26	43	27	28	28			
ELL	19	31	33	31	38	24		40			
ASN	52	55		74	62		71		85		
BLK	30	40	39	35	43	27	43	54	67		
HSP	41	44	45	46	49	49	48	63	58		
MUL	52	47		63	71		60	77			
WHT	59	59	61	67	59	48	69	78	71		
FRL	38	44	44	46	48	42	49	63	60		
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	17	35	28	21	46	38	14	37			
ELL	11	23	23	28	50	29					
ASN	68	58		65	61		67	86	100		
BLK	35	43	41	42	57	50	38	66	70		
HSP	42	44	37	53	58	42	49	73	82		
MUL	50	56	40	46	64	70					
WHT	56	52	36	63	58	49	58	75	77		
FRL	38	45	38	46	55	48	41	64	82		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
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	67
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	39
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	50
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	53
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	63
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.

6th grade ELA showed the lowest performance, along with 8th grade Math. We have seen a decline in 6th grade scores over the last year. A lack of effective tier 1 instruction is the likely cause to the low performance.

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

7th grade math showed the largest drop year over year. Lack of interventions, targeted instruction and effect strategies all contributed.

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.

8th grade math had the largest gap from performance to state. Lack of interventions, targeted standards instruction and ineffective strategies all contributed.

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

7th grade cohort increased scores from 6th grade in both ELA and Math. The school has 50% turnover and new administrators so current staff is unable to determine what contributed to this growth.

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

The number of failures in ELA and Math. We must address the number of students failing ELA and math.

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

1. Math proficiency
2. ELA proficiency
3. Science proficiency
4. LQ gains in ELA and Math
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on 2018-2019 FSA scores, A focus on standards aligned instruction is most critical. With proficiency scores at 48% in ELA and 49% in math, less than half of our students met satisfactory. With recent studies from TNTP showing only 17% of assignments are on grade level (on average), if we focus on ensuring our instruction is standards based we will have more students reach proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: By focusing on this area, we expect to see 50% or more assignments to meet standard when doing walkthroughs in the 1st quarter. We currently do not have a baseline data in this category.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Our literacy coach with our administrative team will walk through classrooms weekly (at least 1 time each) to capture student independent work. Teachers will receive feedback on whether the students work/task aligns to the nouns and verbs of the standard.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we support teaching planning and implementation of more standard based assignments, we will see an increase of student proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Each Wednesday we will highlight the Essential standards for our upcoming curriculum.
2. We will ensure our independent tasks meet the level of rigor asked by the standard.
3. We will walk rooms in each content area to get a sample of student work.
4. We will provide feedback on what the students do and say to see if it aligns to standard (Scott Voytko and all admin team, including literacy coach)

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

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on FSA declining scores from 2018 to 2019, developing high expectations is a critical area of focus for this school year. Clermont Middle has had a declining enrollment over several years and is closing this year. Some teachers believe that the students currently enrolled are not able to meet standards. By focusing on teaching to the standard and keeping high expectations, we will see an increase in the percentage of students that will meet those expectations.

Measurable Outcome: By focusing on teaching to standard and expecting students to achieve it, we expect to see an increase in student performance on FSA in proficiency scores from 48 in ELA to 58.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: More often than not, students achieve the expectations we set out for them. By raising our expectations and expecting teachers lessons to ensure students can master the standard, we will provide all students the opportunity to meet it. We plan to send up to 5 staff members to the PLC conference in Summer 2021 in Orlando to learn about the PLC process to implement into the future.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: With declining enrollment and scores over the past 4 years, teacher comments allude that high performing students have left the school and students scores are a result of students and teachers leaving. However, if we teach a rigorous curriculum and ensure students learn it, we will see proficiency percentages increase.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Organize and secure meeting times for PLC each week.
 2. Member of leadership team helps facilitate Question 1
 3. Send team of 5 to PLC conference.
- (Scott Voytko and all admin team)

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on Learning gain scores from 2018-2019, differentiating our instruction is one of our most critical areas of focus. Only 50% of our students made a learning gain in 2018-2019. If we differentiate our instruction we will be able to fill in the learning gaps for all students while continuing to accelerate others. Additionally, we had less than 41% of our ELL, Black, and economically disadvantaged students reach satisfactory.

Measurable Outcome: By differentiating our instruction we expect to increase our learning gains in ELA and math from 50% to 62%. We expect Black, ED, and ELL students to achieve 52% proficiency. We will do this through classroom instruction and through inviting students to tutoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joe Frana (franaj@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiating instruction will be used to increase learning gains to 62%. We will monitor differentiation by planning essential instruction in PLCs with teams and walking through rooms with each teacher 1x per week. Teachers will work with Advancement planning with the FSA Data range document, as well as ensuring all assignments meet, at least, level 3 work.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we support differentiated planning, and monitor those plans in classroom instruction and before school tutoring, then we will increase our percentage of students making a learning gain.

Action Steps to Implement

In PLC, determine students needing supplemental instruction and invite to tutoring. (Joe Frana)

Person Responsible Joe Frana (franaj@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.

Our administrative team will be in classrooms looking at independent work daily, and aligning that work to standard. We will also plan with teachers weekly to support the general outline of content.

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.

Our school had a large turnover last summer and has 60% new teachers on campus. Along with only 40% of students returning face to face, we are met with small class sizes and a staff that can get to know students better than ever before. Our Mental Health Liason is able to meet with any students that has a disruption issue on campus.

Additionally, we instituted the PLC process this year with one hour of formal planning to plan an overview of exactly what we need kids to know and be able to do each week. When we are clear about our intended purpose when teaching, we will see more students rise to the expectations.

Last, with the inability to move students around for intervention, our staff developed a plan for interventions. During intervention block, we will institute a reading with conferring block. Additionally, we will institute virtual interventions so students can log in during that time period for small group interventions.

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: Early Warning Systems	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00