

Lake County Schools

Astatula Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Astatula Elementary School

13925 FLORIDA AVE, Astatula, FL 34705

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

Demographics

Principal: Robert Sherman

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	other
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Astatula Elementary School

13925 FLORIDA AVE, Astatula, FL 34705

<https://ael.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	79%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
other	No	43%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

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 Astatula Elementary is to encourage creativity, personal pride and academic excellence. In a safe, caring environment, individuals will be challenged to become productive lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Linking today to tomorrow.

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
Sherman, Robert	Principal	The principal is responsible for ensuring school safety, standards-based instruction, and stakeholder involvement. In a collaborative effort, the leadership team collects, monitors, and analyzes data to allow for shared decision making.
Christianson, Jacalyn	Other	The ESE specialist coordinates the services to meet the needs of all students with disabilities. In a collaborative effort, the leadership team collects, monitors, and analyzes data to allow for shared decision making.
Bonvento, Andrea	Instructional Coach	The instructional coaches provide support to teachers through modeling, coaching, mentoring, and conferencing. They provide resources to support instructional practice. In a collaborative effort, the leadership team collects, monitors, and analyzes data to allow for shared decision making.
Marcinkus, Amy	Instructional Coach	The instructional coaches provide support to teachers through modeling, coaching, mentoring, and conferencing. They provide resources to support instructional practice. In a collaborative effort, the leadership team collects, monitors, and analyzes data to allow for shared decision making.
Lyals, Destiny	Other	Provides direct support to schools and serves in a liaison role with various district departments to effectively manage and coordinate school-based mental health services.
Adair, Stacy	School Counselor	The purpose of the job is to serve in a student advisement and advocacy capacity in fostering the attainment of student educational goals. Employees in this job classification are responsible for facilitating appropriate student entrance into the educational system and establishing a suitable course of academics based on identified goals and abilities of each individual student. Work includes maintaining communication, knowledge of student progress toward established goals, and providing professional counseling services. The position monitors student progress, and facilitates achievement of academic success. Performs related work as directed.
Wodek, Thomas	Other	Provides a supervised and structured environment for students assigned to the in-school suspension program, working with classroom teachers to coordinate the academic activities of assigned students and support students in completing the assigned work along with the implementation of social, emotional learning, behavioral and academic support.
Phipps, Lauren	Instructional Coach	MTSS Coach

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Harris, Dave	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is responsible for ensuring school safety, standards-based instruction, and stakeholder involvement. In a collaborative effort, the leadership team collects, monitors, and analyzes data to allow for shared decision making.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/25/2020, Robert Sherman

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

51

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	other
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (53%)

	2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	67	71	68	79	86	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	440
Attendance below 90 percent	16	8	6	4	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	33	29	37	55	42	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	248

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	100	97	107	121	87	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	608
Attendance below 90 percent	5	13	13	10	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	17	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	4	14	28	20	23	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113

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	3	1	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	100	97	107	121	87	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	608
Attendance below 90 percent	5	13	13	10	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	17	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	4	14	28	20	23	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113

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	3	1	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	61%	58%	57%	58%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	57%	58%	54%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	49%	53%	51%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	63%	60%	63%	68%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	56%	62%	64%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	39%	51%	52%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	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	59%	60%	-1%	58%	1%
	2018	57%	61%	-4%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	60%	2%	58%	4%
	2018	48%	59%	-11%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	61%	59%	2%	56%	5%
	2018	54%	55%	-1%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
	2018	57%	65%	-8%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	61%	0%	64%	-3%
	2018	58%	60%	-2%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	65%	57%	8%	60%	5%
	2018	54%	58%	-4%	61%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	56%	-3%	53%	0%
	2018	60%	54%	6%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
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	28	48	54	37	60	61	22				
ELL	46	71	67	41	54	73	33				
BLK	47			60							
HSP	53	65	55	54	63	61	37				
MUL	60			70							
WHT	67	64	56	67	65	52	59				
FRL	53	61	62	53	66	67	37				
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	28	39	47	42	47	33	43				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
ELL	23	29	42	37	43	50					
BLK	53	70		53	60						
HSP	39	43	46	47	49	46	40				
MUL	55			55							
WHT	64	58	57	65	57	35	73				
FRL	45	48	50	51	48	37	50				
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	28	41	41	43	61	48	36				
ELL	23	46		58	63	40	30				
BLK	44	27		47	45						
HSP	47	52	57	66	70	48	49				
MUL	60			60							
WHT	65	56	52	70	62	48	66				
FRL	49	49	48	59	59	46	54				

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	61
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	484
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	56

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	54
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	57
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	65
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	61
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	58
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 lowest data component was reflected in our 5th Grade Statewide Science Assessment (SSA) score at 50%. The prior year, we showed our greatest increase of performance in SSA scores. In monitoring our progress in science through the district's quarterly assessments throughout the year, the expected proficiency was comparable to the prior year's performance.

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

Our Statewide Science Assessments scores showed the greatest decline from the prior year. In monitoring our students' progress in science throughout the 2018-19 school year, our quarterly assessments data was comparable to the 2017-18 data in which we showed the greatest 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.

The biggest gap when compared to the state average was third and fourth grade math. The state proficiency rate increased in third and fourth grade and our proficiency increased as well. In both grade levels, we are closing the gap between the school and state data.

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

The data which showed the most improvement was fourth grade ELA, which increased from 48% to 62% (+14%). Fourth grade learning gains in ELA increased from 47% to 66% (+19%). There were multiple actions taken to increase the ELA data. Side by side coaching took place with the ELA teachers along with the implementation tutor. Another contributing factor was the implementation of intervention/enrichment time in all grade levels.

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

Students with attendance below 90%
Students scoring level 1 on statewide assessments.

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

1. Math proficiency in 3rd and 4th grade-Math learning gains in 4th grade
2. Science proficiency in 5th grade

3. ELA and Math proficiency in the SWD subgroup
4. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on FSA ELA scores from the Needs Assessment, we will implement academic intervention and acceleration time. FSA ELA proficiency for the SWD subgroup was identified as a critical area of focus because the percentage proficient stayed the same. This area of focus will improve learning and success by ensuring a 3% increase in proficiency for this subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on intervention and enrichment oppourtunties, we expect to see an increase in FSA ELA proficiency for the SWD subgroup from 28% to 31%. In addition, we expect to see a 3% increase in FSA ELA proficiency and learning gains with all subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robert Sherman (shermanr@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Intervention and enrichment groups will be used to increase FSA ELA proficiency and learning gains by 3%. To monitor this strategy iReady Reading data will be analyzed quarterly by the Leadership team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor and support intervention/enrichment groups, then there will be an increase in FSA ELA achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Facilitate data sorts to create intervention and enrichment groups based on multiple data points
2. Implement 30 minute intervention/enrichment blocks 4 times per week for all grade levels
3. Conduct learning walks to monitor fidelity and effectiveness and provide feedback to teachers
4. Adjust groups as needed following iReady diagnostic windows
5. Conduct MTSS/RtI meetings to monitor progress of interventions

Person Responsible Robert Sherman (shermanr@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on 5th grade Science Assessment data, science achievement is a critical area of focus. Science was identified as a critical area of focus because 5th grade science proficiency levels were below the state average. Focusing on purpose and guided instruction within the district framework, this will improve learning and ensure increased proficiency in science.

Measurable Outcome: By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in Statewide Science Assessment proficiency. Science achievement will increase from 50% to 55%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robert Sherman (shermanr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: LSA Science assessments will be used to increase 5th grade Science achievement from 50% to 55%. To monitor this strategy, quarterly LSA Science assessments will be analyzed by the Leadership Team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we implement and monitor LSA Science assessments, there will be an increase in achievement levels. Collecting and analyzing the LSA quarterly assessment data will enable us to make determinations in regards to the areas of focus to meet the needs of students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Science Quarterly Assessments- Analyzing for instruction next steps
2. Monthly vertical collaboration to ensure standards based instruction for grades 3-5
3. Science Bootcamp– Standards-Based Review before SSA targeting Nature of Science and Scientific Method
4. Purchase school laminator for Science Bootcamp materials.
5. Reading in the content area- Science monthly PLC.
6. Monitor lesson plans weekly
7. The Leadership Team will conduct learning walks to monitor instruction and will support common planning with their assigned grade levels.

Person Responsible Robert Sherman (shermanr@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the EWS data we will focus on ensuring high expectations, building relationships, develop efficacy and recruiting and retaining highly qualified and effective staff.

Measurable Outcome: By looking at student performance data we will decrease the amount of students with Early Warning Signs by increasing the number of students who are on honor roll and making growth on i-Ready diagnostic by 3%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robert Sherman (shermanr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: By utilizing Sanford harmony and restorative practices we will build and increase student relationships which will impact student achievement by 3%.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By building relationships, rewarding students for academic achievement and growth, instilling a common instructional framework and analyzing best teacher practices there will be a 3% increase in student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Restorative practice professional development
2. Restorative practice implemented in the classrooms
3. Bobcat club - quarterly data review for honor roll, top 5 i-Ready and growth
4. Sanford Harmony Professional Development
5. Sanford Harmony implementation in classrooms
6. Leadership team will conduct learning walks to ensure fidelity
7. Grade level PLC's will be held weekly to collaborate on the district framework
8. Teacher Induction Support Team will meet with new teachers

Person Responsible Robert Sherman (shermanr@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.

N/A

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.

Science Fair-- Increased academic awareness of the scientific and/or engineering process.

School STEAM Night- Increase family engagement in Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Mathematics

Data-Driven Parent Conference Nights- Parents will know child's academic progress and expectations for success.

Internet Safety Parent Night- Parent and student awareness of online threats and dangers

Title I Annual Meeting- Families will be provided information and expectations of Title I program

Family School Liaison- Family resource center, prescription pads for learning resources and manipulatives to aid

student success

Family Literacy and Book Fair Night- Parents will receive reading strategies to take home to assist students with

comprehension and fluency.

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: Differentiation					\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction					\$2,600.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	5100	641-Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment Capitalized	0271 - Astatula Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,600.00	
			Notes: School Laminator Machine				
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems					\$0.00
Total:						\$2,600.00	