Fruitland Park Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fruitland Park Elementary School

304 W FOUNTAIN ST, Fruitland Park, FL 34731

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

Demographics

Principal: Dawn Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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
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 (47%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (51%)
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

Fruitland Park Elementary School

304 W FOUNTAIN ST, Fruitland Park, FL 34731

https://fpe.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	51%

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.

MISSION:
At Fruitland Park Elementary, we are committed to encouraging and teaching all students in ways that promote wise decision-making, good citizenship, and a love for life-long learning. Fruitland Park Elementary, and the community we serve, strive to create an atmosphere of positive expectations in a safe and resource-filled learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

VISION:
Every Child a Success in a 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
Brown, Dawn	Principal	*Provide strategies, interventions, resources for teachers and parents to help students make the needed gains to be successful. *Instructional leader facilitating collaborative team meetings, PLC Guiding Coalition, faculty meetings and leadership meetings. *Leadership Development *Coaching Cycles, Collaborative Planning-Standards Aligned Instruction/Resources using the District Instructional Framework *Oversee data chats of progress monitoring for both academics and behavior. *Mentor lowest quartile students using Bottom Quartile Data & Progress Monitoring *MTSS, EWS Data & Progress Monitoring, i-Ready Reading and Math Data & Progress Monitoring, ESSA Data & Progress Monitoring *Discipline *Teacher Evaluations- 3, 4, 5, Leadership, ESE, Learning Walks, Targeted Feedback *Oversees Budget *Secure and track all necessary resources that are needed to enhance student success *Parent Conferences *Partner with local community stakeholders *Attends and participates in PTO & SAC
Dillow, Melissa	Assistant Principal	*Set the tone for implementing highly effective teaching strategies across all grade levels *Instructional Leader *Teacher Evaluation: K, 1, 2, ESE, Enrichment, Learning walks, Targeted Feedback, Coaching Cycles *Collaborative Planning-Standards Aligned Instruction/Resources, District Instructional Framework *Professional Development *PLC Guiding Coalition, *Teacher Induction Support Team (TIST) Lead *Safety Coordinator, Safe School/ Emergency Plans/ Active Shooter *Title I Compliance, MTSS, Attendance, Early Warning System (EWS) Data & Monitoring, ESSA Data & Progress Monitoring *Bottom Quartile Data & Progress Monitoring, Equity Coalition *Oversee data chats of progress monitoring for both academics and behavior *Mentor lowest quartile students *Parent and Family Engagement *Title I Annual Parent Meeting *TOY-RTOY-SREOY

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Tomassian, Clifford	Dean	*Set the tone for implementing highly effective teaching strategies across all grade levels *Leadership *Student Discipline / Referrals *Restorative Practices *MTSS- Behavior LEAD, Monthly Data Chats *EWS Data & Progress Monitoring *Provide coaching and mentoring with standards instructional practices *Coaching Cycle, Learning Walks, Targeted Feedback, *Collaborate, observe and give meaningful feedback in a timely manner. *Supports teachers ensuring all instruction is aligned to the standards and that it matches the full intent of mastery. *PBIS Collaborative Planning- Standards Aligned Instruction/ Resources, ESSA Coalition, PLC Guiding Coalition *Textbook Manager *Social Studies Curriculum, Health Coordinator, District Instructional Framework, FSA Night
McKibben, Mary	Other	*ESE School Lead *IEP Meetings *Parent Conferences *ESE Coach *ESE Instructional Support *SWD Data and Progress Monitoring *ESSA Coalition
Blozis, Diane	School Counselor	*MTSS Problem Solving Team Leader *PBIS Lead *Scheduling *Daily Morning Routine TV Production Crew *Small Group and one on one Counseling *Behavior Intervention Plans *Restorative Practice *Red Ribbon Week *Bully Prevention *5th Grade Transition to Middle School
Patrick-Doughty, Nakia	Other	*Mental Health Support *Support families / students with Mental Health Resources *Student Counseling *Restorative Practice *Sanford Harmony Lead *SEL *ESSA Coalition

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Redding, Rebecca	Curriculum Resource Teacher	*ELL Leadership and Instructional Coach *Testing Coordinator *Technology Support / Chromebook Distribution *Student Intervention/Acceleration *Instructional Support *Curriculum Resource Support *Science *ESSA Coalition *Teacher Mentor *FSA Night *Kindergarten Round Up *STEAM/Science Fair Night
Parisoe, Rikki	Reading Coach	*Literacy Coach *i-Ready Reading Data & Progress Monitoring *MTSS-ELA Lead *Coaching Cycles *Learning Walks *Teacher Mentor *Instructional Support, ELA Resource Support, ELA BEST Standards Lead * Reading Endorsement for Teachers *Literacy Lead Literacy Week *Literacy Night *iReady Award Celebrations *Authentic Literacy Block *ESSA Coalition
Sivek, Lorelei	Reading Coach	*Reading Interventionist Specialist *Systematic Instruction in Phonemic Awareness and Phonics (SIPPS) *Leveled Literacy Instruction (LLI) *Interventionist Lead *Intervention Data & Progress Monitoring *MTSS-Reading Intervention Lead *Restorative Practice *Reading Incentives *Literacy Night *Teacher Mentor / Coaching Cycle *Student Mentor *ESSA Coalition
Dillon, Juan	Other	*Positive Alternative to School Suspension (PASS) *Restorative Practice *Sanford Harmony *SEL *Student Mentor *ELL Support *ESSA Coalition

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		*MTSS- Behavior Support *COVID Manager
Goodwin, Alexa	Math Coach	*Math Coach *Math Instruction Lead *i-Ready Math Data & Progress Monitoring *Learning Walks, Targeted Feedback, Coaching Cycles, Collaborative Planning- Standards Aligned Instruction/Resources Math Lead *Teacher Mentor *MTSS- Math Lead *Math Bottom Quartile Data & Progress Monitoring *Math Interventionist Coordinator *Math Interventions *Title I Tutoring Math Resource Lead *Student Mentor *Restorative Practices *Math Incentives *ESSA Coalition *PLC Guiding Coalition *Family Math Night, *STEAM Night

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Dawn Brown

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

766

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

13

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

15

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	92	110	114	142	132	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	4	22	30	26	23	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	9	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA	4	10	13	1	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in Math	2	4	3	4	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	17	28	39	54	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	217

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	1	2	4	8	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/29/2021

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	80	98	109	114	114	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	624
Attendance below 90 percent	17	9	15	6	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	5	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	4	4	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	4	4	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	30	40	51	57	84	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	337

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	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	80	98	109	114	114	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	624
Attendance below 90 percent	17	9	15	6	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	5	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	4	4	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	4	4	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	30	40	51	57	84	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	337

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	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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				49%	58%	57%	49%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	57%	58%	46%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	49%	53%	33%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				48%	60%	63%	51%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				48%	56%	62%	49%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	39%	51%	38%	41%	47%
Science Achievement				50%	54%	53%	41%	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	45%	60%	-15%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	60%	-13%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	59%	-8%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	52%	62%	-10%	62%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

| MATH | | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	42%	61%	-19%	64%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

| SCIENCE | | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	56%	-7%	53%	-4%
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 Reading and Math Diagnostic Assessments were used to compile the progress monitoring data for English Language Arts and Mathematics for grade levels 1-5. LSA Quarterly Science Assessments created by Lake County Schools were used for progress monitoring for 5th Grade Science.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10%	30%	46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	30%	46%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	15%	15%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	11%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10%	30%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	30%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	23%	23%
	English Language Learners	0%	22%	11%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29%	32%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	32%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	.04%	1%	1%
	English Language Learners	0%	25%	38%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15%	23%	38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	23%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	14%	14%
	English Language Learners	13%	0%	13%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40%	54%	78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40%	54%	78%
	Students With Disabilities	1%	21%	58%
	English Language Learners	11%	11%	56%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10%	30%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	30%	
	Students With Disabilities	.04%	16%	
	English Language Learners	0	11%	

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19%	27%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	19%	19%	
	Students With Disabilities	.03%	12%	
	English Language Learners	20%	10%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13%	32%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	32%	
	Students With Disabilities	1%	10%	
	English Language Learners	20%	20%	

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23%	37%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	23%	37%	
	Students With Disabilities	10%	10%	
	English Language Learners	0%	20%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17%	31%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	31%	
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	48%	35%	65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48%	35%	65%
	Students With Disabilities	.05%	.05%	36%
	English Language Learners	20%	20%	60%

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	17	29	29	14	17	18	10				
ELL	24			24							
BLK	22	45	45	30	23	8	22				
HSP	36			43			10				
MUL	33			33							
WHT	51	57		56	52		61				
FRL	32	55	45	39	38	22	32				

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	21	46	42	22	33	28	22				
ELL	50	56		36	56						
BLK	34	43	37	33	48	30	36				
HSP	51	50		48	40		55				
MUL	32	67		52	47						
PAC											
WHT	58	62	43	55	49	39	59				
FRL	42	53	48	43	43	31	48				

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	38	34	25	39	34	16				
ELL	17	17		22	50						
ASN	50			50							
BLK	40	38	20	32	36	33	25				
HSP	50	47		57	53	50	44				
MUL	39	36		43	29						
WHT	54	52	41	59	56	36	46				
FRL	45	46	34	46	46	37	39				

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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	328
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
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	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	28
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	35
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	33

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	55
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	39
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?

According to the 2019 state assessments, students with disabilities and black students are under performing compared to the overall percentage of students that are proficient. Progress monitoring data also showed that our students with disabilities did not improve from the Beginning of the Year compared to the End of the Year ELA and Math data compared to the student population as well.

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

The data component that demonstrates the greatest need for improvement was the math lowest quartile with 35% proficient and Students with disabilities with 21% proficient based on the 2019 state assessments. Students with disabilities also showed lower proficiency throughout all grade levels on the progress monitoring.

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

One of the contributing factors to this low performance is attendance of both student and staff members. As a result students were also not receiving standards based lessons and assignments that met the rigor necessary. The planning for standards aligned instruction also suffered as a result of staff members not being present because the instructional coaches were often asked to cover

classes. The lack of acceleration and intervention provided to all students across all grade levels also contributed. While intervention and acceleration was provided, due to restrictions, not all students were receiving the standards aligned instruction they needed.

To address the attendance factor we have created a team to monitor attendance and create a family outreach. We will contact families and work with them to improve attendance and find ways to ensure that their children are here on time and stay the full day. We are also ensuring that the intervention and acceleration time focuses on disaggregating data and finding ways to meet our students where they are. We will use standards aligned tasks and interventions to both intervene and accelerate our students learning. We have also created specific days for mandatory meetings to ensure that all teachers will be able to attend collaborative planning days with their teams with the literacy and math instructional coaches.

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

Based on the 2019 state assessments and progress monitoring ELA showed the most improvement. The ELA lowest quartile grew 13% from 2018 to 2019. Our progress monitoring data component also showed that ELA had the most improvement, specifically in grades 1 and 2.

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

The improvement can be contributed to the Intervention/Acceleration Block and using Leveled Literacy Instruction (LLI) and Systematic Instruction in Phonics (SIPPS). Students were screened and progress monitoring was used to determine the specific intervention that was necessary to meet the needs of the students.

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

During collaborative team time, grade levels will plan for specific use of formative assessments for CORE instruction and making sure they are standards aligned. The formative assessments will be used to determine b Intervention/Acceleration for the students to meet them where they are and assist them in growing and meeting grade level expectations and push them to accelerate. The Walk to Intervention/Acceleration will also be used to close achievement gaps based on deficient 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.

Professional development with PLC @ Work with a focus on 4 Essential Questions- specifically Question 3- What
will we do when students are not learning? Question 4- What will we do when students already know it?
Professional development on integrated standards instruction in reading with focus on writing.
Explicit phonics instruction with tracking of 80% mastery in grades K-2.

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

We will continue to meet as a collaborative team to ensure that the focus on the 4 Essential questions is being used to create engaging, standards-aligned lessons for all students, including during intervention/acceleration lessons. As a school team we will continue to have data chats to review formative assessments, progress monitoring data and state assessments to meet the needs of our students.

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 plan and deliver standards based instruction with focuses on authentic literacy and numeracy experiences. By focusing on instructional delivery with a school-wide focus on core content in English Language Arts and Mathematics through utilizing Lake County Schools' District Instructional Framework with student learning strategies that incorporate Reading, Writing, Thinking, and Talking, student achievement will increase and achievement gaps will decrease.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, we expect to see increases in the following: From 40% to 51% proficient in English Language Arts From 55% to 60% of all students making learning gains in English Language Arts From 43% to 51% of students in the lower quartile making learning gains in English Language Arts From 45% to 52% proficient in Mathematics. From 37% to 49% of all students making learning gains in Mathematics From 17% to 36% of students in the lower quartile making learning gains in Mathematics. From 41% to 51% of 5th Grade students proficient in Science.
Monitoring:	Collaborative Team Time, Learning Walk Data, Coaching/Feedback Cycles by Instructional Coaches, Targeted Feedback by Administrators, Progress Monitoring Data, Formative Assessment Data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Administration, Instructional Coaches, and Faculty will utilize Collaborative Team Time to plan for standards based instruction and implementation of gradual release of responsibility strategies: setting purpose, modeling thinking, collaborative learning, and independent practice. PLC Framework with the four essential questions will be used to increase teacher clarity. Teacher clarity on the standards to be taught, how they are assessed, and intervention/acceleration strategies will be monitored through Administrative and Instructional Coach attendance and facilitation in Collaborative Team Time. Learning walk schedule will be developed to collect trend data on implementation of standards aligned instruction based on the instructional framework. Administration and instructional coaches will walk 10 classrooms per week. Coaches will implement coaching/feedback cycles based on learning walk data to determine effectiveness and provide ongoing support. Progress monitoring and formative assessment data will be analyzed and intervention/acceleration opportunities provided. Quarterly data chats will be scheduled with teachers to monitor student achievement with standards mastery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By implementing common planning using the PLC Four Essential Questions and Instructional Framework as a structure for lessons, coaching/feedback cycles, targeted feedback, and formative assessments to drive instruction, teachers will have clarity on what students need to learn, how they will demonstrate understanding, what will be done when students are not learning, and what will be done if students already know it. Through effective use of instructional coaches utilizing learning walks and coaching cycles, teacher delivery and effectiveness will increase, which will result in improved academic achievement through all grade levels.
Action Steps to Implement	

1. Hiring instructional coaches with skills for coaching support and strong knowledge of academic standards/instructional practices: K-5 Literacy Coach Rikki Parisoe, K-5 Math Coach Alexa Goodwin, Curriculum Resource Teacher Rebecca Redding- Science

Person Responsible Dawn Brown (brownd@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Have all teachers/leaders of ELA attend K-5 Wit and Wisdom Training and K-2 Fundations Training to deepen knowledge of adopted textbook aligned to BEST ELA Standards.

Person Responsible Rikki Parisoe (parisoer@lake.k12.fl.us)

3. Purchase of Curriculum Associates READY LAFS textbooks (grades 3-5) to provide supplemental lessons providing rigor, increased stamina using standards aligned content, and extra practice.

Person Responsible Clifford Tomassian (tomassianc@lake.k12.fl.us)

4. Conducting ongoing data analysis by using common assessments, district mini-assessments, and quarterly data chats to drive standards aligned instruction and increase student achievement.

Person Responsible Melissa Dillow (dillowm@lake.k12.fl.us)

5. Provide professional development for Professional Learning Communities centered around the Four Essential Questions targeting instructional delivery to support increased alignment, rigor, and engagement for students.

Person Responsible Melissa Dillow (dillowm@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With high expectations, faculty and staff will cultivate a school culture and climate where positive relationships are developed, student and teacher collective efficacy is developed, and students and families are welcomed and engaged in learning. This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because school EWS data showed high student tardies, repeat students with low student attendance, and low academic growth.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing and maintaining a positive culture and climate, we expect to see attendance for students increase from an average of 92% up to at least 95%. By consistent implementation and monitoring of the school-wide Early Warning Systems by Mr. Tomassian, the Instructional Dean who oversees the EWS Team, student academic achievement will increase as measured by state and district assessments.
Monitoring:	EWS Data: Tardies, Attendance, i-Ready Diagnostics, LSA Quarterly Science Assessments, FSA
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy of Restorative Practices, in conjunction with the Sanford Harmony curriculum, will be implemented and monitored by the Social/Emotional Learning Team. Home visits will be completed by the School Social Worker and one of the School Administrators or Instructional Dean to help with communication and attendance concerns in an effort to increase attendance of the students with 20 or more missed days of school. The PASS teacher will conduct lessons using Sanford Harmony and Restorative Circles in addition to providing academic supports and acceleration. The EWS team will monitor behavior infractions, attendance, and grades during bi-weekly team meetings, providing feedback to teachers as needed. The school will host monthly family nights to increase opportunities for students and families to engage in fun learning activities that boost student and family efficacy and build positive relationships with faculty and staff.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By utilizing the Sanford Harmony curriculum and the use of Restorative Practices, teachers and students will be empowered with problem-solving skills using effective communication skills and building connections to resolve conflict, resulting in an increase in student engagement with learning. Sanford Harmony and Restorative Practices will both be utilized within the PASS classroom as the curriculum piece to support students with social-emotional needs. This will decrease the number of disciplinary issues within classroom lessons and increase student attendance, resulting in higher academic student achievement. By monitoring grades and course failures each quarter, interventions can be put into place to help reduce the number of students at risk. By holding monthly family nights, we expect to build positive relationships among all school stakeholders, from student and families to cafeteria, custodians and teachers, with each person collectively contributing to a culture of belonging and success for all.

Action Steps to Implement

Ongoing professional development will be provided by the district on Sanford Harmony curriculum, Restorative Practices and PBIS.

Person Responsible	Diane Blozis (blozisd@lake.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will use Sanford Harmony weekly and Restorative Circles daily to improve student efficacy.

Person Responsible	Juan Dillon (dillonj@lake.k12.fl.us)

EWS data will be reviewed at monthly faculty meetings and/or weekly team meetings to ensure everyone is informed and are actively monitoring and supporting students identified at risk.

Person Responsible Clifford Tomassian (tomassianc@lake.k12.fl.us)

All school based personnel will greet students first thing in the morning and throughout the day. This will increase positive adult interactions for the students throughout the day. Students will demonstrate a more cooperative attitude towards the school and increase their desire to stay in school.

Person Responsible Clifford Tomassian (tomassianc@lake.k12.fl.us)

We will use PBIS and Challenger Cash to celebrate positive behaviors each week.

Person Responsible Diane Blozis (blozisd@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Through data-driven, small group, intervention, and tutoring teachers will plan and deliver targeted academic, research based instruction for struggling students as well as implement opportunities for acceleration for students showing mastery of grade level standards. This area of focus was identified as a critical need from reviewing the ESSA subgroup data as well as the statewide assessments and district progress monitoring tools. The data showed that student achievement was significantly below grade level, with little or no growth for our students with disabilities, English Language learners, and African American students.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on school-wide, data-driven, research based intervention and acceleration during WIN Time we expect to see student achievement in ELA and Mathematics increase in every subgroup, as evidenced by I-Ready Math and Reading, state assessments, and ESSA subgroup data.
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome during collaborative team time, quarterly data chats with teachers, interventionist, administrators, instructional coaches, and MTSS support. We will review the data to determine if the interventions/acceleration set in place are meeting the needs of all learners and decide if students have shown mastery. If students have shown mastery to the desired level in a particular W.I.N. (What I Need) group, the team would discuss the next steps and what intervention/acceleration group would continue to help them grow academically.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Dillow (dillowm@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of SIPPS Groups will be utilized for the intervention focus. SIPPS Mastery tests will be reviewed weekly by the interventionist and the team to determine proper placement within the SIPPS program. Implementation of LLI groups will be used to increase comprehension and fluency of struggling students during W.I.N. time. Weekly data will be analyzed to determine the effectiveness and the proper placement of students within the program. Teacher led small group instruction will be utilized to increase mathematics proficiency for all students. Students will be placed in small groups according to areas of need and acceleration. To monitor the instruction, classroom walkthroughs with a focus on intervention and acceleration will be utilized.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By implementing, monitoring, and supporting the LLI, SIPPS, and mathematics small groups, we will see an increase in both Math and ELA student achievement across all subgroups. LLI was chosen because the research based program has a record of increasing student growth two years within one-year. SIPPS was chosen as proven research-based to address phonics and phonemic awareness to help increase student reading fluency and comprehension.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create schedule for all kindergarten, first and second grade students; along with targeted third through fifth grade students to be screened for phonologic awareness using SIPPS screener. The Reading Coach and intervention team will complete this screening.

Person Responsible	Lorelei Sivek (sivekl@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Create schedule for targeted small group instruction and implementation based on SIPPS screener results for SIPPS instruction in all K-2 grades and targeted students in 3-5 grades.
the 3-5 groups will be built from iReady Diagnostic data indicating deficiency in phonics. The Reading Coach and intervention team will create tthe groups.

Person Responsible   Lorelei Sivek (sivekl@lake.k12.fl.us)

3. The Reading Coach will provide SIPPS training for new teachers and a follow-up training for teachers needing further support to ensure that all teachers are providing accurate and timely instruction on a consistent basis.

Person Responsible   Lorelei Sivek (sivekl@lake.k12.fl.us)

4. We will utilize the LLI program in grades 3-5 as small group pull-outs to support vocabulary, comprehension and fluency as identified as areas of need for our ESE, African American Males, Pacific Islanders, and Economically Disadvantaged ESSA subgroups. Groups are created by ability level and kept in groups of 4 or less to provide targeted reading remediation. They are held in the W.I.N. (What WE Need) Lab and monitored by 3-5 interventionists.

Person Responsible   Lorelei Sivek (sivekl@lake.k12.fl.us)

5. Weekly progress monitoring will be done with assessments to monitor the effectiveness of the interventions provided. All teachers meet with the MTSS team as scheduled to discuss student progress and achievement. This is monitored by the MTSS Team and Reading Coach.

Person Responsible   Lorelei Sivek (sivekl@lake.k12.fl.us)

6. Weekly monitoring of formative assessments, classroom assessments, and small group instruction assessments. The grade level collaborative teams and the Math Coach will discuss student progress and achievement to determine next steps,.

Person Responsible   Alexa Goodwin (goodwina@lake.k12.fl.us)

7. Through the use of SAI dollars, before and during school tutoring opportunities will be provided to increase student achievement in math. Students in the bottom quartile will be enrolled in these tutoring opportunities utilizing Success Coach Math Curriculum for reteach opportunities in focus standards.

Person Responsible   Alexa Goodwin (goodwina@lake.k12.fl.us)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Teacher Recruitment and Retention	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Through ongoing professional learning, coaching cycles, partnering with UCF, and shared leadership opportunities, the administration team will build the capacity of leaders, teachers, and support staff to ensure the fidelity and constant growth for all. With several teachers retiring, staff members moving into leadership roles and some teachers changing career paths, we have resulted in a high turnover. By retaining quality personnel and reducing instructional turnover, we will be able to go deeper into building effective instructional practices throughout all classrooms. Student achievement will improve with more effective teaching and learning in all grade levels. By providing opportunities to grow teacher leaders and coaches, we will create a school culture of high expectations and student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on increasing teacher retention and building capacity, we expect to see increases in the following areas of student achievement: From 40% to 51% proficient in English Language Arts From 55% to 60% of all students making learning gains in English Language Arts From 43% to 51% of students in the lower quartile making learning gains in English Language Arts From 45% to 52% proficient in Mathematics. From 37% to 49% of all students making learning gains in Mathematics From 17% to 36% of students in the lower quartile making learning gains in Mathematics. From 41% to 51% of 5th Grade students proficient in Science.
Monitoring:	Instructional coaches, teachers and administration will be building their capacity through weekly collaborative planning as an environment to build appropriate lessons and by providing and modeling effective instructional practices.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement	
The administration, the leadership team and selected teacher leaders will attend district professional learning opportunities to advance their professional skill set, resulting in sharing that knowledge to build the capacity of all teachers and increase instructional effectiveness.	
Person Responsible	Melissa Dillow (dillowm@lake.k12.fl.us)
Utilize coaching cycles to work with teachers, to analyze classroom data, opportunities for co-teaching and to support teachers with their instructional practices. Coaches will conduct monthly challenger academy meetings to check in with new teachers.	
Person Responsible	Alexa Goodwin (goodwina@lake.k12.fl.us)

The literacy coach will assist in the reading endorsement process and coaching teachers in effective reading instructional practices. The literacy coach will also collaborate with teachers and staff to ensure all ELA teachers that are in need of support and endorsement are provided the support they require.

Person Responsible Rikki Parisoe (parisoer@lake.k12.fl.us)

We will use learning walks with provided feedback, by administration and instructional coaches ,weekly collaborative planning sessions, the use of common assessments and district mini assessments, and monthly data chats with administration as multiple means to discuss student achievement and make adjustments based upon any trends per grade level.

Person Responsible Dawn Brown (brownd@lake.k12.fl.us)

We will host district and state visitors for organized learning walks and instructional reviews in an effort to increase professional feedback related to the improvement of overall school systems and classroom instruction, resulting in higher student achievement.

Person Responsible Melissa Dillow (dillowm@lake.k12.fl.us)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on ELA proficiency below 50%, if teachers implement instruction using content-rich, research-based, aligned materials during ELA Literacy Block and Intervention/Acceleration Block, then students overall reading proficiency will improve. ELA adopted materials included Great Minds Wit & Wisdom, Wilson Fundations, and Geodes. Intervention materials will include LLI and SIPPS. Professional development with curriculum resources and implementation. Utilizing Literacy Coach to support with collaborative planning for ELA and coaching cycles to support ELA teachers based on learning walk data will improve instructional practice to improve ELA proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Students in grade 3, 4, & 5 will score at or above 50% proficiency on the Florida Standards Assessment for ELA.
Monitoring:	Attendance in Professional Learning Opportunities offered by district and school related to ELA Curriculum Resources and BEST Standards. Attendance and Participation within Collaborative Planning for ELA instruction utilizing aligned curriculum resources and evidence based instructional practices based on what is learned through professional development opportunities. Formative Assessment data from aligned curriculum resource assessments. Learning Walk data documenting level of implementation of research based curriculum and instructional strategies during ELA and Intervention Blocks. Literacy Coach will log Coaching Cycle data related to instructional practice and resource implementation in ELA. Intervention data from SIPPS/LLI groups. i-Ready Reading Diagnostic Data and APM Data demonstrating increasing proficiency levels.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dawn Brown (brownd@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Aligned instruction utilizing research-based ELA curriculum materials (Fundations for phonemic awareness and phonics instruction, Geodes for fluency and accuracy with reading foundational skills, and Wit and Wisdom for vocabulary, comprehension, and writing skills). Differentiated instruction utilizing research-based reading intervention materials (SIPPS and LLI) for intervention/acceleration provided by Reading Endorsed Instructional Teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If teachers provide aligned instruction in ELA using research-based curriculum materials with integrity, reading proficiency will increase. Our district has adopted new ELA curriculum resources aligned to the BEST standards for ELA that are research-based and grade appropriate. Explicit professional development opportunities are being provided and follow up support from regional curriculum specialist to support implementation has been provided to support Administrators, Literacy Coaches, and Teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development on ELA BEST Standards and newly adopted curriculum materials: Fundations, Geodes, and Wit & Wisdom. Literacy Coach will assist teachers with registering for upcoming professional development and provide follow up support to teachers during planning and instruction.

Person Responsible	Rikki Parisoe (parisoer@lake.k12.fl.us)

Collaborative Planning using the PLC framework, Lake County Schools Curriculum Blueprints and Scope and Sequence documents to plan for implementation of ELA BEST Standards through research-based curriculum materials for ELA.

Person Responsible   Rikki Parisoe (parisoer@lake.k12.fl.us)

Intervention utilizing research evidence-based reading intervention curriculum resources (SIPPS and LLI) provided by a Reading Endorsed Instructional Teacher.

Person Responsible   Lorelei Sivek (sivekl@lake.k12.fl.us)

Implementation and monitoring of formative assessments to drive instruction and remediation opportunities. Data from these assessments will be reviewed during collaborative planning time by teachers, administrators, and instructional coaches to plan for remediation/acceleration opportunities to meet students needs.

Person Responsible   Rikki Parisoe (parisoer@lake.k12.fl.us)

Learning Walks will be conducted by Administrator, Literacy Coach, and Instructional Coach to collect data related to implementation of instructional strategies and curriculum resources. Data from these walks will be utilized to develop next steps for Coaching Cycles by Instructional Coaches and Targeted Feedback Cycles with Administrators.

Person Responsible   Dawn Brown (brownd@lake.k12.fl.us)

Progress monitoring assessments will be scheduled at BOY, MOY, and EOY to measure student growth toward proficiency using i-Ready Reading Diagnostics & APM ELA Assessments.

Person Responsible   Rikki Parisoe (parisoer@lake.k12.fl.us)

Professional development on ELA BEST Standards and newly adopted curriculum materials: Fundations, Geodes, and Wit & Wisdom. Literacy Coach will assist teachers with registering for upcoming professional development and provide follow up support to teachers during planning and instruction.

Person Responsible   Rikki Parisoe (parisoer@lake.k12.fl.us)

Collaborative Planning using the PLC framework, Lake County Schools Curriculum Blueprints and Scope and Sequence documents to plan for implementation of ELA BEST Standards through research-based curriculum materials for ELA.

Person Responsible   Rikki Parisoe (parisoer@lake.k12.fl.us)

Intervention utilizing research evidence-based reading intervention curriculum resources (SIPPS and LLI) provided by a Reading Endorsed Instructional Teacher.

Person Responsible   Lorelei Sivek (sivekl@lake.k12.fl.us)

Implementation and monitoring of formative assessments to drive instruction and remediation opportunities. Data from these assessments will be reviewed during collaborative planning time by teachers, administrators, and instructional coaches to plan for remediation/acceleration opportunities to meet students needs.

Person Responsible   Rikki Parisoe (parisoer@lake.k12.fl.us)

Learning Walks will be conducted by Administrator, Literacy Coach, and Instructional Coach to collect data related to implementation of instructional strategies and curriculum resources. Data from these walks will be utilized to develop next steps for Coaching Cycles by Instructional Coaches and Targeted Feedback Cycles with Administrators.

Person Responsible Dawn Brown (brownd@lake.k12.fl.us)

Progress monitoring assessments will be scheduled at BOY, MOY, and EOY to measure student growth toward proficiency using i-Ready Reading Diagnostics & APM ELA Assessments.

Person Responsible Rikki Parisoe (parisoer@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

After reviewing the discipline data and comparing it to the state data, an area of concern would be the number of suspensions, both in school and out of school. We will work to build relationships with our student using Sanford Harmony lessons across all grade levels and Restorative practices to improve behaviors and provide an alternative to suspensions.

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.

Our mission and vision drives our passion to create and maintain a positive school culture and a welcoming environment where all students feel safe to learn. Fruitland Park Elementary plans multiple opportunities for students, teachers, parents and community stakeholders to work together and create an academic and family focused environment centered on student success. These opportunities include meet the teacher night, curriculum night, literacy night, STEAM night, parent conferences, Dads Bring Your Kid to School Day, Muffins with Moms and Student Advisory Council. Another way Fruitland Park will increase a positive school culture and environment will be by celebrating all student achievements. We will hold quarterly honor roll celebrations and recognize B.U.G. awards (Brining Up Grades), perfect attendance and STAR students. Our school administrators work hand in hand with our stakeholders to build long lasting relationships that

further improve our positive climate, building a self sustaining reputation. One of our biggest supporters is our community. We have a wide variety of members from churches, the town of Fruitland Park, our recreation department and local businesses that makeup a group called Bless Fruitland Park. Bless Fruitland Park gives back to our school in a variety of ways which help our students, families, faculty and staff feel valued and included. Teachers will support our students first and foremost by believing that all the students at Fruitland Park Elementary are their students and that all students can learn and succeed given the right tools. Teacher will use services such as Sanford Harmony and Restorative Practices to support the social emotional growth of all students and establish positive relationships with their students. Teachers will use resources that include character development, conflict resolution, building communication skills and problem solving, fostering a judgement free zone. All of our stakeholders will strive to identify the differences among us that makes our school unique and showcase our individual strengths that make us one team. We will also use a variety of communication methods to reach all stakeholders such as School Messenger Call-Out System, daily student folders, newsletters, social media, teacher/parents communication apps and the school webpage. In addition we have translators at school to help with any language barriers. Establishing open lines of communication and transparency will create trust that will continue to improve our school culture and climate.

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

*Bless Fruitland Park: Helps by fundraising and donating to support our school, students, families, faculty and staff needs.
*PTO: Helps fundraise for the school
*SAC: Contributes to decision making for Title I budget/plan and school inititatives
*Students: utilizing skills learned through Restorative Practices and Sanford Harmony Lessons
*Families: Supporting school initiatives, attending school events, joining SAC and PTO
*Faculty/Staff: Creating welcoming environments, positive relationships with students and families, restorative practices, Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS), and Sanford Harmony Lessons

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				$132,955.05
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0101 - Fruitland Park Elem. School	Title, I Part A	766.0	$65,021.03
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0101 - Fruitland Park Elem. School	Title, I Part A	766.0	$67,934.02
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				$295,055.79
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0101 - Fruitland Park Elem. School	Title, I Part A	766.0	$84,947.00
	5100	150-Aides	0101 - Fruitland Park Elem. School	Title, I Part A	766.0	$33,936.79

	5100	150-Aides	0101 - Fruitland Park Elem. School	Title, I Part A	766.0	$24,319.81
	5100	150-Aides	0101 - Fruitland Park Elem. School	Title, I Part A	766.0	$27,862.98
	5100	150-Aides	0101 - Fruitland Park Elem. School	Title, I Part A	766.0	$28,312.57
	5100	150-Aides	0101 - Fruitland Park Elem. School	Title, I Part A	766.0	$28,605.30
	5100	150-Aides	0101 - Fruitland Park Elem. School	Title, I Part A	766.0	$30,681.33
	5100	150-Aides	0101 - Fruitland Park Elem. School	Title, I Part A	766.0	$27,568.01
	5100	520-Textbooks	0101 - Fruitland Park Elem. School	School Improvement Funds	766.0	$2,352.00
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0101 - Fruitland Park Elem. School	School Improvement Funds	766.0	$5,425.00
	5100	210-Retirement	0101 - Fruitland Park Elem. School	School Improvement Funds	766.0	$590.00
	5100	220-Social Security	0101 - Fruitland Park Elem. School	School Improvement Funds	766.0	$420.00
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	0101 - Fruitland Park Elem. School	School Improvement Funds	766.0	$35.00
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Leadership: Teacher Recruitment and Retention**				**$0.00**
5	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$428,010.84**