Triangle Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Triangle Elementary School

1707 EUDORA RD, Mount Dora, FL 32757

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

Demographics

Principal: Deborah Hartog

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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

Triangle Elementary School

1707 EUDORA RD, Mount Dora, FL 32757

https://tre.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	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

School Grades History

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

Triangle Elementary is committed to a shared purpose and direction. We maintain expectations for student learning which are aligned with our school vision. School personnel and all other stakeholders support our shared purpose, vision, and mission. Our expectations serve as the focus for assessing student performance and effectiveness. Triangle's vision guides allocations of time as well as human, material, and fiscal resources.

MISSION:
The mission of Triangle Elementary School is to empower students to achieve, excel, and celebrate life-long learning through reading, writing, thinking and talking each day.

STUDENT PLEDGE:
Today, I will do my work and follow Triangle rules and expectations so I can achieve, excel, and celebrate life-long learning.

BELIEF STATEMENTS:
• All Triangle students are learners.
• The Triangle staff strives to meet the unique learning needs of all students.
• Teaching and learning occur in a safe and orderly environment.
• Resources and services support effective teaching and learning.
• Our staff encourages students and community to value tolerance, respect, and self-esteem.
• Our staff members continue to be active learners.
• Our school and community serve and support one another.
• Our school, with parent and community involvement, plans for continued improvement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

VISION:
Triangle Elementary School, in partnership with families and community, will provide relevant educational opportunities and maintain high academic expectations for a diverse community of learners.

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
Hartog, Deborah	Principal	Administrative duties and instructional support
Frazier, Whitney	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach, ELA support
Textor, Christina	Administrative Support	ESE Specialist
Dillow, Melissa	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor, Testing coordinator
Dooley, Tom	Instructional Coach	Strategic Intervention Support
Bolivar, Alexandria	Instructional Coach	MTSS Support
Harris, Angela	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor, Testing coordinator
Bence, Stephanie	Dean	Discipline School Safety
McCray, Tamara	Assistant Principal	Administrative duties and instructional support

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Deborah Hartog

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.*
2

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
48

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (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: B (57%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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	94	105	92	97	88	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	577
Attendance below 90 percent	0	18	8	12	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	5	4	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	5	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	5	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	39	50	53	49	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	253

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	2	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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 9/3/2020

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	114	122	124	98	111	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	698
Attendance below 90 percent	3	19	16	9	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	1	5	2	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	28	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	2	32	35	30	38	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176

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	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	4	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	114	122	124	98	111	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	698
Attendance below 90 percent	3	19	16	9	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	1	5	2	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	28	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	2	32	35	30	38	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176

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	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	4	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	55%	58%	57%	49%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	57%	58%	57%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	49%	53%	65%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	57%	60%	63%	59%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	56%	62%	63%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	39%	51%	57%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	54%	53%	48%	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	46%	60%	-14%	58%	-12%
	2018	54%	61%	-7%	57%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison	-8%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	60%	-1%	58%	1%
	2018	41%	59%	-18%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison	18%					
Cohort Comparison	5%					
05	2019	44%	59%	-15%	56%	-12%
	2018	47%	55%	-8%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison	-3%					
Cohort Comparison	3%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	46%	62%	-16%	62%	-16%
	2018	65%	65%	0%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison	-19%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	61%	-3%	64%	-6%
	2018	53%	60%	-7%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison	5%					
Cohort Comparison	-7%					
05	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%
	2018	59%	58%	1%	61%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison	-9%					
Cohort Comparison	-3%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	40%	56%	-16%	53%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	47%	54%	-7%	55%	-8%
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	33	65	64	47	62	83	45				
ELL	38	64	64	52	76	75	17				
BLK	50	59	65	41	51	52	37				
HSP	51	61	63	57	58	47	32				
MUL	50	53		46	32		55				
WHT	62	73	74	72	73	73	56				
FRL	55	67	68	54	57	51	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	47	66	65	52	58	42	50				
ELL	20	38		52	55						
BLK	38	50	53	52	51	47	26				
HSP	54	54	56	72	70	68	73				
MUL	50	42		67	58						
WHT	58	55	67	70	53	27	60				
FRL	47	49	53	62	56	48	53				
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	14	38	37	25	38	28	8				
ELL	18	54		60	76						
BLK	31	55	75	37	53	47	22				
HSP	46	60	57	64	75		45				
MUL	39	53		61	59						
WHT	62	58	57	67	63	63	59				
FRL	44	58	71	57	63	60	42				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	467
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
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	57
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	51
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	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	47
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	69
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	57
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.

For proficiency, science was the lowest at 44%, an 11% decrease from the year before. This was a bit of a surprise to drop so significantly. We did anticipate a slight decrease after analyzing the LSA data, but continued with Science Wednesdays as the prior year. Besides being a unique and challenging group, another contributing factor was the fact we piloted a new approach to departmentalizing in 5th grade (3-way split instead of 2). After dis-aggregating the data, however, we chose to return to the traditional ELA/SS and Math/Science split with two teachers partnered for 2020-2021. We also had our 5th grade Science teacher leave in October, and had to utilize a substitute for well over a month. We eventually hired a new teacher, but was inexperienced.

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

Not only was science the lowest in proficiency, but also showed the greatest decline from the previous year (11%). Math proficiency was the only other decrease out of the 7 graded categories with an 8% decrease to 57%..

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.

Once again, science has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. We were at 44% proficiency, and the district was at 54% and state at 53%. Some factors that contributed were the challenges that came with the class (behaviors and academic trends over the past 3 years) as well as the logistics of the schedule we utilized. We tried a new schedule with two teams instead of three and each teacher teaching one subject vs. two. It clearly did not benefit us so we returned to the traditional schedule for this year. We also had a first-year teacher in the 5th grade science position last year, who only started in Oct. due to the original teacher transferring to another school.

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

ELA increased in all categories: proficiency, learning gains and learning gains of the lower quartile. We had a focus on authentic literacy and utilized the literacy block. We increased classroom libraries for all classrooms and hired consultant Angela Schroden to lead PD in IDR with conferring. We conducted classroom walk throughs with feedback and offered several professional development opportunities.

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

Our current 4th grade class is relatively small with just over 100 students. We noticed, however, 28 current 4th graders scored a level 1 on the FSA last year. This accounts for over 25% over the class population. We will focus our efforts to identify the Lower Quartile, as well as the 'bubble kids' for intervention and continue to monitor their progress. Teachers will also differentiate instruction and utilize resources and strategies such as small group instruction.

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

1. Increase Science Proficiency to 62%
2. Increase Math Proficiency to 65%
3. Increase ELA overall proficiency to 62%
4. Increase ELA/Math LG for the LQ by 3 percentage points
5. Increase ELA/Math LG by 3 percentage points

.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With high expectations, teachers will utilize the strategies on the District's Instructional Framework to intentionally plan and focus on student learning; providing multiple opportunities for the students to read, write, think, and talk through authentic literacy. Students can state what they are learning, why they are learning it, and how they know they have learned it. Rationale If we monitor and support common planning, then teachers will intentionally plan and evaluate grade-level student assessments and work products. If we support the District's Instructional Framework, then teachers will understand and utilize setting purpose, modeling, guided instruction, collaborative and independent learning with high expectations for all students. This area of focus supports our goal on increasing overall proficiency in ELA, Math and Science.
Measurable Outcome:	Build capacity in the Marzano elements as evidenced by CLW's; Increase student achievement in ELA proficiency from 55 to 62%, ELA LG from 64 to 67%, ELA LQ LG from 67 to 70%; Math proficiency from 57 to 65%, Math LG from 59 to 62%, Math LQ LG from 54 to 57%, and Science proficiency from 44 to 62%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deborah Hartog (hartogd@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Create a common planning schedule for all grade levels to intentionally plan with support from leadership, including academic coaches, CRT and administrators. Common planning, PLC's and collaborative plan days will have clearly defined protocols, planning time frame and expected outcomes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor, and support common planning, then teachers will be able to collaboratively plan and create grade appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement and high expectations. Students will have daily opportunities to read, write, think and talk through authentic literacy and teachers will utilize a variety of strategies including modeling, guided instruction, purpose, collaborative and independent learning. This will be evidenced through student data and CLW's.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Introduce the instructional framework
2. PD on Purpose: A teacher survey will be used to collect suggestions on PD offered during our Genius Bar sessions that are offered monthly. Each PD session will focus on student learning.
3. Create common planning and PLC schedule and give support during instructional time and common plan
4. Conduct weekly classroom learning walks
5. Strategic Intervention Team to push in and support teachers and students across the grade levels and curriculum.

Person Responsible Deborah Hartog (hartogd@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With high expectations, we will create a culture that ensures a safe and equitable learning environment for all students. If we implement, monitor and support positive behavior support systems, then we will foster a safe and equitable learning environment for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	Increased positive student behaviors through PBIS strategies and classroom standard operating procedures; increase trust in law enforcement through interaction with the School Resource Officer (SRO); decrease the number of student referrals; reduce the number of students meeting the EWS indicator for suspensions each quarter.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Bence (bences@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will utilize the Sanford Harmony Social-Emotional Learning Program which includes a variety of problem-solving skills; continue the use of the Manatee Market to include student and teacher reward systems such as food, experiences, toys, and gift cards. Also continue to support our Ambassador Program, Manatee Mentoring, and safety/attendance committees.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The SEL program teaches students to embrace diversity and build healthy relationships that will last well into adulthood. We will see more positive behaviors by establishing clearly identified protocols and expectations while in common areas and offering a variety of incentives for good behavior. Supports will also be in place including counseling and mentoring (resources include SRO, counselors, Mental Health Liaison and PASS teacher).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create schedule for SEL teacher training and lessons using Sanford Harmony
2. Utilizing school-wide Character Education word of the month through games, songs, picture books, etc.
3. Develop and utilize schedule for Manatee Market
4. Provide positive incentives for students and teachers to include food items, toys, and gift cards.
4. Meet routinely to disaggregate data and measure impact of utilized resources
5. Safety and Attendance committees meets quarterly to discuss findings and/or concerns
6. Identify students and create a schedule for Manatee Mentoring Program

Person Responsible	Tamara McCray (mccrayt@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With high expectations, teachers will understand, plan and use intervention and enrichment strategies to meet the needs of all students in all content areas. If we monitor and support intervention and enrichment strategies, then we will meet the needs of all students across each content area. This area of focus was identified as a critical need based on the need to increase overall proficiency in all areas as evidenced by FSA scores. This impacts student learning and success by meeting the needs of students through differentiation and strategic intervention and enrichment.
Measurable Outcome:	Increased overall proficiency in ELA, math and science for all students, including those in the lower quartile (LQ) as evidenced on the FSA; increase support for both teachers and students as evidenced by increases in performance data and classroom learning walk data; increase the number of 3's and 4's on the FSA to 5's and maintain students scoring a 5 by continued enrichment time, strategies and support.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tom Dooley (dooleym@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will create and establish a schedule for the strategic intervention team to push-in to classrooms to assist teachers and students in all grades and content areas; create and establish intervention and enrichment time in the master schedule for all students in all grade levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By having specific time scheduled throughout the day for intervention and enrichment, students and teachers alike will get additional support in all grades and content. Leadership will conduct weekly CLW's to measure the impact of the intervention/enrichment time and the strategic intervention team will meet weekly do discuss data and summative/formative student assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Hire qualified additional personnel for strategic intervention team
2. Create intervention/enrichment time within the master schedule
3. Develop and utilize administrative schedule for attending and supporting intervention/enrichment time
4. Conduct weekly classroom learning walks with leadership team
5. Meet weekly to disaggregate data and identify students in need to supports.

Person Responsible	Deborah Hartog (hartogd@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.

We will work collaboratively as ONE TEAM to increase overall school improvement. We welcome feedback from all stakeholders and communicate effectively and efficiently. Each leadership team member will serve as a mentor to the students in our Lowest Quartile. This includes weekly check-ins, phone calls and post cards to Lake Live students as well as incentives for improvement of grades and behavior.

Our school leadership team will attend on-going District training to build their capacity to lead professional development within the school. The training and feedback the team provides will ensure teachers plan lessons that are differentiated, utilize small group instruction, and implement strategies which are imbedded in the district framework.

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.

Parent and community involvement is vital to our school. Parents and community members comprise two of the most important groups of our stakeholders. Community partners include: Mount Dora Police Department, Lake County Sheriff's Office, Mount Dora Kiwanis, Mount Dora Women's Club, Dominoes Pizza, Publix, Sonic, Burger King, Oakwood, Triangle Lanes, First United Methodist Church of Mount Dora, First Baptist Church of Mount Dora, Saint Phillips Lutheran Church, Northland Church, 7-11 and ValuTeachers, just to name a few. Many of these partners give their time as mentors, financial contributors for supplies, community services projects, and academic achievement (attendance, honor roll, etc.) as well volunteer for special projects and events held at the school.
Years ago, we started a school-wide initiative to boost both student achievement and community involvement through in-school presentations and activities. We will continue these presentations as well as a monthly community service outreach recognizing service groups who support our school.
We will also continue our partnership with the Mount Dora Police Department, who provide a full-time SRO to keep the school safe and help build community relations.
Our 2020-2021 PFEP has been uploaded for review. Communications are sent home in a language parents can understand.

Triangle Elementary has two full-time school counselors, a Mental Health Liaison, Dean and PASS (positive alternative to school suspension) teacher. They are all available for our students and parents to address needs in confidence. They are able to refer families to local

agencies for behavioral and emotional needs. Our school social worker and title 1 contact work closely with our family in need by providing backpacks, school supplies, clothes, shoes, food and support for our homeless families. We also provide referrals to Life Stream, Big Bear Behavioral and UCF CARD (Center for Autism and Related Disabilities). As a team, they work to support our students' behavior, attendance and emotional goals in the educational setting.

Our PBIS program also includes a mentoring program, "Manatee Mentors," where school personnel and other community stakeholders are assigned to students in need of support and guidance. They provide mentoring for academic, behavioral and social skills issues for all students, especially our ELL subgroup. Outside school mentors are also provided for students through outside community partnerships. In addition, we are utilizing the Sanford Harmony program for social-emotional lessons starting with the 2019-2020 school year. The lessons will be taught to students and supported by the counselors and mental health liaison.

Our Transition to Kindergarten nights are designed to strengthen the relationships between the teachers and staff of the school and the parents and students. Materials are given to each student to practice various skills at home before the school year starts. This is done in the spring for three months.

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**