Clermont Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Clermont Elementary School

680 E HIGHLAND AVE, Clermont, FL 34711

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

Demographics

Principal: Jeffery Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 10/3/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2023-06-30
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 (51%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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

Clermont Elementary School

680 E HIGHLAND AVE, Clermont, FL 34711

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	98%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

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

Clermont Elementary School strives to create a challenging learning community where all members focus on high expectations for success while developing students with individual differences and learning styles. We engage students with challenging academics while promoting a safe, and supportive environment. Every effort is taken to create an inclusive community which actively supports students' learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Clermont Elementary School is a place of high expectations that promotes collaboration between staff, parents and students to achieve academic excellence. We strive to develop responsible, caring students who are lifelong learners and are prepared to meet the challenges of a diverse, 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
Williams, Jeffrey	Principal	Provides curriculum support to the faculty through the monitoring of the Florida Standards, Progressing Monitoring and Pacing. Ongoing professional development will be provided for the faculty and staff based on needs. Email - WilliamsJ3@lake.k12.fl.us
Schichtel, Kevin	Assistant Principal	Provides curriculum support to the faculty through the monitoring of the Florida Standards, Progressing Monitoring and Pacing. Ongoing professional development will be provided for the faculty and staff based on needs. Email - SchichtelK@lake.k12.fl.us
Aklan, Michele	School Counselor	Supports the school and families transition needs to and from home. Social and emotional services are provided to our school family as needed. Email - AklanM@lake.k12.fl.us
McRoy, Kenneth	Dean	Provides ongoing behavior management support to faculty & staff to ensure students are engaged at all times; minimizing off task opportunities. Email - McRoyK@lake.k12.fl.us
Barker, Beverly	Administrative Support	Coordinates staffing, placement and reevaluations, develop & support inclusive practices, and model effective teaching strategies to ESE teachers. Email - BarkerB@lake.k12.fl.us
Sorrells, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Models and coaches fellow colleagues using reading, writing, thinking and talking strategies while embracing authentic literacy across the curriculum. Identifies strategies, resources, and materials for math academic support and interventions. Email - SorrellsM@lake.k12.fl.us
Anderson, Karrie	Instructional Coach	MTSS School-Based Coordinator - coordinates meetings and notifies members of dates and times and provides support for the teachers throughout the MTSS process. Models and coaches fellow colleagues using reading, writing, thinking and talking strategies while embracing authentic literacy. Also helps identify strategies, resources, and materials for reading interventions. Email – Andersonk2@lake.k12.fl.us

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 10/3/2016, Jeffery Williams

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.*
11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
47

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2023-06-30
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 (51%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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	41	51	40	58	53	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	295
Attendance below 90 percent	7	5	7	8	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	17	19	24	50	41	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	67	76	82	83	90	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	476
Attendance below 90 percent	17	15	19	20	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	2	1	4	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	6	3	7	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	25	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	10	10	22	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	67	76	82	83	90	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	476
Attendance below 90 percent	17	15	19	20	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	2	1	4	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	6	3	7	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	25	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	10	10	22	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	57%	58%	57%	50%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	57%	58%	61%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	49%	53%	53%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	52%	60%	63%	58%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	47%	56%	62%	65%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	39%	51%	59%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	54%	53%	42%	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	58%	60%	-2%	58%	0%
	2018	43%	61%	-18%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	60%	-6%	58%	-4%
	2018	43%	59%	-16%	56%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	47%	59%	-12%	56%	-9%
	2018	40%	55%	-15%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	51%	62%	-11%	62%	-11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	47%	65%	-18%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	61%	-12%	64%	-15%
	2018	52%	60%	-8%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	44%	57%	-13%	60%	-16%
	2018	41%	58%	-17%	61%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	42%	56%	-14%	53%	-11%
	2018	36%	54%	-18%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	43	72	71	36	37	29	43				
ELL	50	67		56	59						
ASN	69			77							
BLK	43	63	69	29	39	33	41				
HSP	52	61		52	49	20	48				
MUL	40			30							
WHT	71	65		66	47	30	52				
FRL	46	59	58	40	45	32	39				
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	41	38	30	36	18	20				
ELL	36			29							
ASN	76	54		65	54						
BLK	25	29		27	32	29	14				
HSP	42	51	42	49	46		31				
MUL	43			57							
WHT	53	48		65	59		55				

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
FRL	40	44	39	44	45	32	34				

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	8	38	36	22	43	45	8				
ELL	41	39	27	41	56	55					
ASN	69	46		81	100						
BLK	32	61	56	38	45	54	21				
HSP	52	53	50	60	65	50	46				
MUL	47	91		67	58						
WHT	63	67		68	74		71				
FRL	45	62	58	53	64	55	34				

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	418
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	59
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	73
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	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	35
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	55
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	48
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.

Math - Learning Gains (47%), a decrease of 2% from prior year and Math Learning Gains of Lowest Quartile (31%) a decrease of 1% from prior year. Overall Math Achievement stayed the same over prior year at 52%. Historically Numbers and Operations have been a skill deficit for our students.

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

Math Learning Gains had the greatest decline from the prior year of 2%. Subgroup data shows a decrease in the White subgroup in Math Learning Gains from 59% in 2018 to 47% in 2019. That subgroup could have contributed to the overall decline of 2% in Math Learning Gains.

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.

Math Lowest 25th Percentile had the biggest gap of 20%. That was an increase of 5% over the previous year. After examining Math cluster data 92% of our students did not perform well within the Measurement, Data and Geometry Cluster.

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

ELA Achievement proficiency showed an improvement of 12% over prior year. An emphasis on giving students the opportunity to Read, Write, Think and Talk during all subject contents but primarily during the reading block may have had a positive impact in this area. Our teachers and leadership team worked closely with district and regional staff to offer strategic Professional Development. Support was rendered in the 90/120 minute reading block and incorporated Reading with Conferring.

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

Fifteen percent of our student population missed at least 10% of school last year. Our overall average daily attendance rate for the 2019 - 2020 school year was 95.3%. As a contributing factor, math performance indicated that 11 out of 52 students scored at level 1 which could be an indirect result of the daily attendance rate.

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

1. Math Proficiency
2. Science Proficiency
3. ELA Proficiency
4. Increase proficiency in all Subgroups with focus on Multi Racial
5. Increase average daily attendance rate

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 FSA data from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section list we have opportunities in reading, math and science to improve. Math was identified as a critical area of Focus because Math Achievement, Math Learning Gains and Math Lower Quartile all had the highest gap as compared to the District and State average.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, we expect to see performance improvements in iready data (EOY/MOY) and end of year FSA data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jeffrey Williams (williamsj3@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Establish a common planning/collaboration schedule in which a member of the leadership team will monitor each week. The focus will be on standards, alignment of tasks, pacing, progress monitoring and setting the purpose for learning. Data gathered during this process will be analyzed by the teachers and Leadership Team to make strategic decisions as needed to improve student performance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor and support weekly collaborative planning with fidelity, we will increase our teachers ability to deliver more rigorous standards based instruction to increase student (Math) performance to exceed 52% commensurate with previous performance of 74%.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Standards based instruction will be monitored by common planning and Classroom Learning Walks.
2. Timely feedback, best practices and trend data will be shared with teachers.
3. Teachers will be able to access i-Ready BOY and MOY assessment data to formulate a progressive plan to close the achievement gap for all students.
4. Administration/Leadership team will consult with teachers on a weekly basis to monitor academic progress using our data matrix and performance
matters platforms.

Person Responsible Jeffrey Williams (williamsj3@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	New staff and existing staff members on campus have varying degrees of experience in using CHAMPS, PBS strategies, Restorative Practices, or Bully Proofing Your School curriculum. Our EWS data reflects average daily attendance and OSS as being an area of opportunity to improve. Therefore by offering professional development in these areas, all stakeholders will benefit from a safe and conducive learning environment.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on the learning environment there will be academic time devoted to on task learning versus off task learning. This will lead to a decline in classroom disruptions which will minimize students being referred for disruptive behavior; often leading to lost time out of class. Teachers and the Leadership Team will continue to coordinate their efforts by monitoring classroom incident frequency data and providing resources to ensure student learning time is accountable by removing barriers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Schichtel (schichtelk@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PBS and Restorative Practices will be used to increase daily positive student interactions and therefore reduce the amount of negative consequences and interruptions to the academic learning environment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor, and support PBS with Restorative Practices then there will be a decrease in student discipline infractions by 10%.

Action Steps to Implement

1. We will review discipline data, OSS rates and ISS rates through Performance Matters once a month.
2. We will continually monitor discipline incidents reported to the office and investigate any imminent concerns immediately.
3. Our school Guidance Counselor will conduct Character Lessons during grade level enrichment classes during Media.
4. Our PASS teacher will meet with identified students on a regular basis and respond proactively in the classroom to support teachers using Restorative Practices.
5. The Teacher Induction Team will work with new teachers and existing staff regarding CHAMPS and classroom management techniques.
6. Our Mental Health Liaison will intervene as needed to support students in crisis.

Person Responsible	Kevin Schichtel (schichtelk@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because we have noticed a downward trend in our Math proficiency over the past 3 years according to FSA data. 2016-2017 - 58%, 2017-2018 - 52%, and 2018-2019 - 52%.
Measurable Outcome:	Students will be given daily opportunities for remediation as well as acceleration across the content areas, including Math. By monitoring our student progress, our school data should reflect positive trends of academic momentum leading to increased student proficiency to 65%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Sorrells (sorrellsm@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Leadership Team will discuss and prioritize students weekly during common planning and Leadership Meetings. Teachers will provide additional measures of skilled instruction as needed to accelerate students learning commensurate with grade level expectations. Supplemental support using the Brain Pop platform will help students to visualize their learning by providing introductory instruction to support expected proficiency of 65%.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor, and support our Intervention/Acceleration block, we will see an increase in student performance which will indicate students are accessing their learning by understanding the rationale.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Our Intervention/Acceleration block (Panther Challenge) will be offered each week.
2. School data will be analyzed on a consistent basis to determine the need for growth of each student.
3. BOY, MOY and EOY diagnostics along with teacher quarterly data chat information will be used to measure student performance.

Person Responsible	Jeffrey Williams (williamsj3@lake.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	While our trend data indicates a 8 year high for ELA proficiency, we still need to improve literacy development in all grades. In prior years our data has been inconsistent. Therefore, it is necessary to continue to focus on literacy strands to ensure early literacy is strengthened within the core. This will allow all students to access their learning. Using the District Instructional Framework, purpose driven learning will help students connect with the What, Why, and How.
Measurable Outcome:	Students will be exposed to daily attributes of literacy development (phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary development, fluency and comprehension). Teachers will give students the ability to interact with text throughout the day and across all content areas. As a result, students will be prepared with the literacy skills necessary to become successful learners. This effort will minimize retentions (to zero) and increase proficiency (to 65%); closing the achievement gap.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karrie Anderson (andersonk2@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will provide ongoing professional development opportunities to our Primary Grade teachers to implement Discover Intensive Phonics program to strengthen early literacy development. District support personnel will work in conjunction with the faculty/administration to support intermediate literacy development by utilizing the districts recommended (90/120 minute) literacy block and integrating the conferring while interacting with text. By having access to classroom libraries, students will be able to select preferred texts from a wide variety of genres. This will provide teachers the opportunity to monitor students independent practice. Student growth will be measured via BOY, MOY, and end of year assessments (FSA and i-Ready) to track proficiency targets.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor and support weekly collaborative planning with fidelity, we will increase our teachers ability to deliver more rigorous standards based instruction. Student performance in ELA will exceed our existing proficiency rate of 57% to exceed previous performance of 71%. Learning Walk look-fors and trends will help support this focus area.

Action Steps to Implement

The monitoring of our Literacy Development plan will consist of the following
methods below. As data is collected, instructional adjustments and decisions will be made to meet the needs of individual students.
1. Common Planning
2. Classroom Learning Walks
3. i-ready data
4. quarterly data chats
5. Professional Learning Communities

Person Responsible	Jeffrey Williams (williamsj3@lake.k12.fl.us)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because the Federal Index for Multiracial Students is currently at 35%. (40% ELA, 30% Math)
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in the Math and ELA proficiency rates for our Multiracial students to exceed 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jeffrey Williams (williamsj3@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	BOY results will be analyzed to determine needs and skill deficits of all students including Multiracial subgroup. Leadership Team will discuss and prioritize students weekly during common planning and Leadership Meetings. Teachers will provide additional measures of skilled instruction as needed to accelerate students learning commensurate with grade level expectations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If barriers that impede academic progress are resolved in a timely manner, multiracial student performance will surpass current performance of 35% and exceed 50%.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School data will be analyzed on a consistent basis to determine the need for growth of each student.
2. BOY, MOY and EOY diagnostics along with teacher quarterly data chat information will be used to measure student performance.
3. Members of the Leadership Team will regularly meet with Zone Students to track academic achievement across all subject areas.
4. The school will address barriers that may impede academic progress with an expedient resolution.

Person Responsible Jeffrey Williams (williamsj3@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.

Students will be identified to analyze the correlation between average daily attendance and level 1 performance in math. The leadership team will monitor attendance trends and academic performance of students on a regular basis to remove barriers that impede progress. Student expected outcomes must be commensurate with peers.

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.

The events scheduled throughout the year will be communicated with families through multiple platforms and mediums to reduce communication barriers.

FSA Nights - Parents will receive information on FSA content and expectations.

SAC and PTO meetings are advertised to all school stakeholders including Traditional and Lake Live families.

Social media platforms are updated frequently and invite families and other key stakeholders to become involved in Clermont Elementary School activities. Information is shared to the following platforms - Clermont Elementary School Website (www.cel.lake.k12.fl.us), Facebook (@CESLakePanthers), Twitter (@CESLakePanthers) and Peachjar.

Data Parent/Teacher Conferences - Teachers will discuss each child's assessment results,expectations and goals for the school year.

Reading is Freedom Night - Parents will receive materials and modeling of literacy activities that can be used in the home.

Parent Resource Room Conferences/Prescription Pad - Classroom teachers will identify skills that parents can help with at home. The FSL will help parents choose appropriate materials.

iMOM and All Pro Dad - Increased parent involvement and improved student achievement.

Curriculum Family Events - Increased parent involvement and improved student achievement.

End of the year Family Picnic will consist of all parents/guardians of each student to attend a luncheon provided by the school to promote literacy and community partnerships.

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: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$1,975.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3374	690-Computer Software	0041 - Clermont Elementary School	Other		$1,975.50
			Notes: School wide purchase for Brain Pop.			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Multi-Racial				$0.00
					Total:	$4,965.00