

Lake County Schools

Clermont Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	27

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: 9/3/2016

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	27

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 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	72%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

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 among 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Williams, Jeffrey	Principal	Provides curriculum support to the faculty through the monitoring of Florida's B.E.S.T Standards, Progress Monitoring and Pacing. Ongoing profession 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 Florida's B.E.S.T Standards, Progress Monitoring and Pacing. Ongoing profession 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
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
Oliver, Tammy	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 - OliverT1@lake.k12.fl.us

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 9/3/2016, 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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

470

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	68	68	69	72	74	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	434
Attendance below 90 percent	15	18	26	19	16	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	3	14	12	12	12	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Course failure in Math	3	14	12	12	12	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	5	16	14	30	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107

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	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	1	2	2	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/30/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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		

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				57%	58%	57%	45%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				63%	57%	58%	45%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	49%	53%	44%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				52%	60%	63%	52%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				47%	56%	62%	49%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				31%	39%	51%	32%	41%	47%
Science Achievement				48%	54%	53%	40%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	58%	60%	-2%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	60%	-6%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	59%	-12%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	62%	-11%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	61%	-12%	64%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	57%	-13%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	42%	56%	-14%	53%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

I-ready BOY, MOY, and EOY as well as LCS 5th grade science Q1, Q2, and Q3.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11	25	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	not reported	not reported	not reported
	Students With Disabilities	0	11	11
	English Language Learners	0	8	15
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12	17	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	not reported	not reported	not reported
	Students With Disabilities	0	6	17
	English Language Learners	12	17	23
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	15	29	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	not reported	not reported	not reported
	Students With Disabilities	4	12	21
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6	16	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	not reported	not reported	not reported
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	22
	English Language Learners	0	0	40

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49	50	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	not reported	not reported	not reported
	Students With Disabilities	14	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17	31	not reported
	Economically Disadvantaged	not reported	not reported	not reported
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	not reported
	English Language Learners	0	13	not reported
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19	34	not reported
	Economically Disadvantaged	not reported	not reported	not reported
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	not reported
	English Language Learners	0	13	not reported
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14	26	not reported
	Economically Disadvantaged	not reported	not reported	not reported
	Students With Disabilities	0	6	not reported
	English Language Learners	17	13	not reported

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26	32	not reported
	Economically Disadvantaged	not reported	not reported	not reported
	Students With Disabilities	6	5	not reported
	English Language Learners	0	0	not reported
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18	30	not reported
	Economically Disadvantaged	not reported	not reported	not reported
	Students With Disabilities	12	11	not reported
	English Language Learners	0	0	not reported
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50	33	61
Science	Economically Disadvantaged	50	33	61
	Students With Disabilities	9	29	45
	English Language Learners	13	0	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50	33	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	33	61

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	24			39							
ELL	29			19							
BLK	17	16		20	20		21				
HSP	45	25		33	23		36				
WHT	78	60		70	73		59				
FRL	34	26	50	32	33		25				
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				

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
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				
FRL	40	44	39	44	45	32	34				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	332
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	19
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	36
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	68
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

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.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

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.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

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.

We are currently ensuring common assessments are given across the grade level and analyzing the data in weekly grade level PLC meetings. Intervention groups are formed based on student performance to ensure mastery of each standard.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA Achievement proficiency showed an improvement of 12% over prior year equating to the highest proficiency in 8 years.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

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 120 minute reading block and incorporated Reading with Conferring.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We have made adjustments to our grade level teams to ensure students engage in the 120 minutes authentic literacy block each day. Students will also have intervention time in both Reading and Math 4 days a week to remediate or accelerate skills.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Many reading teachers have received professional development in ELA, UDL, and have obtained their Reading Endorsement to accelerate learning. Curriculum support will be ongoing throughout the school year via School Leadership and Regional Teams.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Students requiring additional support will be given opportunities throughout the year through tutoring, intervention time, and progress monitoring of grades along with grade recovery, lunch buddies, and peer mentoring.

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 i-ready data (EOY/MOY) and end of year FSA data.

Monitoring: Quarterly data chats will be held each Nine Weeks period to review trajectory of student achievement. BOY and MOY i-ready diagnostic data will be analyzed by the Leadership Team along with Grade Levels during weekly PLC meetings to ensure each student has the necessary instructional support to reach both target and stretch growth goals. Common assessments will be created and analyzed by grade level teams during PLC meetings as well.

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 Early Warning Systems

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/ISS incidents 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.

Monitoring: EWS and Discipline Data will be reviewed on a monthly basis to allow the Leadership Team to make necessary adjustments to ensure all students are given access to quality instruction each day.

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 Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Math - 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%.</p> <p>ELA - 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.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Math - 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%.</p> <p>ELA - 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.</p>
Monitoring:	<p>Quarterly data chats will be held each Nine Weeks period to review trajectory of student achievement. BOY and MOY i-ready diagnostic data will be analyzed by the Leadership Team along with Grade Levels during weekly PLC meetings to ensure each student has the necessary instructional support to reach both target and stretch growth goals. Common assessments will be created and analyzed by grade level teams during PLC meetings as well.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Jeffrey Williams (williamsj3@lake.k12.fl.us)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Math - 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%.</p> <p>ELA - We will provide ongoing professional development opportunities to our Primary Grade teachers to implement Discover Intensive Phonics program (K-2) and Leveled Literacy Intervention (3-5) 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 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 differentiated by reading level and interest. Student growth will be measured via BOY, MOY, and end of year assessments (FSA and i-Ready) to track proficiency targets.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-	<p>Math - 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.</p>

**based
Strategy:**

ELA - 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

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. 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%.

Monitoring: Student data will be monitored at the BOY, MOY and EOY using the i-ready platform as well as FSA scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kevin Schichtel (schichtelk@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 Kevin Schichtel (schichtelk@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need due to the Spring 2021 FSA English Language Arts scores which did not exceed 50% in the tested grade levels. Students scoring at level 3 or higher were as follows; 3rd grade - 40%, 4th grade - 47%, and 5th grade - 43%. Our Beginning of Year diagnostic data according to i-Ready also show percentages of students scoring at Tier 1 or on grade level in reading; Kindergarten - 30%, 1st grade - 14%, 2nd grade - 19%, and 3rd grade - 40%.
Measurable Outcome:	The iReady and Adaptive Progress Monitoring (APM) assessments will be administered throughout the year to gauge proficiency targets to increase the percentage of students scoring level 3 or higher on 2022 FSA ELA standardized assessment from 40% to 45% in 3rd Grade, 47% to 52% in 4th Grade, and 43% to 48% in 5th Grade.
Monitoring:	Quarterly data chats will be held each Nine Weeks period to review trajectory of student achievement. BOY and MOY i-ready diagnostic data and APM Assessments will be analyzed by the Leadership Team along with Grade Levels during weekly PLC meetings to ensure each student has the necessary instructional support to reach both target and stretch growth goals. Common assessments will be analyzed by grade level teams during PLC meetings to determine next steps. If the implementation goes as planned, we will reach the target goal of improving our ELA proficiency by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jeffrey Williams (williamsj3@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Establish a common planning/collaboration schedule in which grade levels will work with the leadership team 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 the data generated from the ongoing assessments (iReady /APM) and used the data during collaborative planning to drive instruction, we will increase our teachers ability to deliver on demand instruction to increase student performance in ELA proficiency by 5% or greater.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Standards based instruction will be examined in common planning and Classroom Learning Walks. The trend data will be used to identify areas of strengths and improvement opportunities by the leadership team for the sole purpose of adjusting instruction to meet the academic needs of students.
2. Timely feedback will be shared with teachers as a method to reflect on their instructional practice
3. Teachers will access data from i-Ready BOY, MOY, and APM assessments to formulate a progressive plan to increase proficiency commensurate with a 5% increase expectation.
4. Administration/Leadership team will meet with teachers on a weekly basis to evaluate student performance tasks in reading to design a plan of action for improvement. Once the plan of action has been established, a definitive approach to increase mastery will be initiated using the intervention resources (such as the iReady toolbox & APM resources).

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

We have found the following after viewing discipline data over the past 4 years. Currently, our Violent Incidents and Property Incidents are rated at "Very Low" as indicated in the Incident Rank Details section found on the School Safety Dashboard. Our Drug/Public Order Incidents is rated as "High" but when you disaggregate the data you will find that it was a single Weapons Possessions incident that attributed to that rating. Overall our Total Reported Suspensions for 2019-2020 was rated as "Very High". There has been improvement in the Out of School Suspension (OSS) events as it was the lowest in the past 4 school years at 11 days. In School Suspension (ISS) events have increased in year over year data to 52 events. This could be attributed into assigning students to the Positive Alternative to School Suspension (PASS) teacher when receiving referral infractions from teachers. This assignment allows the PASS teacher to provide prescribed positive behavior and social skills lessons to students to reduce the amount of classroom instructional time lost for all students based on individual student behavior disruptions in class. The Leadership Team will continue to examine weekly behavior incidents as well as the number of students assigned to both ISS and OSS events. Restorative Practices, CHAMPS and PBS training will be offered to new teachers to ensure students will have access to a positive and engaging school culture in a place of High Expectations.

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.

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.

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.

Literacy 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.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

All members of the Leadership Team play a role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Families play an important part in their child's education as well. Engaging families in the education process is essential to improving academic success for students. Here are some of the ways stakeholders are involved during the school year.

1. Hold an annual meeting for parents to inform them of the Title 1 program.
2. Involve families in developing, writing and/ or revising the Parent Involvement Plan (PIP) school- parent compact
3. Provide trainings and workshops to build capacity with families and staff to raise student achievement and encourage active participation of families in their child's education.
4. Utilize a percentage of the school Title 1 allocation to support the parent involvement program. The School Advisory Council provides input in determining how the Title 1 funds are used.
5. Provide a Family Engagement Center to provide a place where families can find resources to help their child succeed. Materials can include: ipads, laptops, educational games, school supplies, Roseta Stone and food bags.

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				\$1,975.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3374	690-Computer Software	0041 - Clermont Elementary School	Other		\$1,975.50
			Notes: School wide purchase of Brain Pop.			

4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Multi-Racial	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$6,940.50