

Lake County Schools

Mascotte 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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Mascotte Elementary School

460 MIDWAY AVE, Mascotte, FL 34753

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

Demographics

Principal: Tiffany Mayhugh Rego

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2018

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 (45%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (44%)
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 was approved by the Lake County School Board on 9/20/2021.

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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Mascotte Elementary School

460 MIDWAY AVE, Mascotte, FL 34753

<https://mse.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	Yes	70%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 9/20/2021.

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.

At Mascotte Charter School, we strive to develop a growth mindset in our students that inspires them to Learn, Grow, and Achieve.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our students will develop the confidence and motivation to explore all of their possibilities.

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
Mayhugh-Rego, Tiffany	Principal	
Coleman, Tony	Assistant Principal	Teacher Evaluations, Facilities, Coaching
McMillan, Mary Lou	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Newman, Wendi	Instructional Coach	
Bultema, Leah	Other	Guidance Potential Specialist
Kieft, Robyn	Teacher, K-12	Reading Intervention
Kovacsev, Jason	Other	
Ramkissoon, Anita	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/1/2018, Tiffany Mayhugh Rego

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.*

31

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.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

Total number of students enrolled at the school

821

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

4

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

10

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	144	133	134	113	119	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	763
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	25	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	25	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	27	26	38	31	25	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	192

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	18	23	14	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	10	24	9	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/10/2021

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	133	138	124	124	110	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	743
Attendance below 90 percent	10	14	11	9	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	7	15	5	9	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	4	8	11	14	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	25	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	23	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	6	20	27	36	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

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	7	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	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	133	138	124	124	110	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	743
Attendance below 90 percent	10	14	11	9	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	7	15	5	9	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	4	8	11	14	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	25	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	23	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	6	20	27	36	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

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	7	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	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				52%	58%	57%	51%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				44%	57%	58%	48%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	49%	53%	46%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				51%	60%	63%	55%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				51%	56%	62%	53%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				24%	39%	51%	34%	41%	47%
Science Achievement				52%	54%	53%	35%	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	62%	60%	2%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	60%	-11%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	59%	-17%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	50%	62%	-12%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	52%	61%	-9%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	53%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Mascotte Charter uses STAR Reading and Math as our Progress monitoring tools. The school also uses HMH Benchmark testing for Science.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31	49	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	47	51
	Students With Disabilities	25	0	25
	English Language Learners	5	0	11
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54	69	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	68	67
	Students With Disabilities	50	75	25
	English Language Learners	32	42	37

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44	51	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	49	55
	Students With Disabilities	0	20	20
	English Language Learners	28	21	37
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	44	55	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	53	66
	Students With Disabilities	40	40	20
	English Language Learners	28	33	35
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35	52	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	51	51
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	5	11	16
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	65	74	71
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	50	63	50
	English Language Learners	28	22	50

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32	33	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	31	36
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	7	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	45	62	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	59	61
	Students With Disabilities	0	18	18
	English Language Learners	7	21	33
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34	33	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	31	45
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	20
	English Language Learners	13	17	22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	50	53	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	50	51
	Students With Disabilities	17	25	33
	English Language Learners	30	30	35
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			45
	Economically Disadvantaged			38
	Students With Disabilities			29
	English Language Learners			30

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	31	22		40	33		29				
ELL	22	26	36	36	35		30				
BLK	66	60		45	50						
HSP	42	23	17	48	52	33	36				
MUL	64			45							
WHT	52	52		60	58		60				
FRL	42	30	35	45	46	37	38				
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	35	25	22	30	29	26	31				
ELL	31	27	36	38	42	28	26				
BLK	61	53		46	53		64				
HSP	46	39	36	48	43	21	42				
MUL	60			30							
WHT	57	46	42	56	60	30	62				
FRL	46	37	39	46	49	22	43				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	19	31	32	31	29	15	12				
ELL	25	41	45	33	38	36					
BLK	67	40		65	79						
HSP	46	52	46	49	49	33	28				
WHT	57	42	42	64	55	29	46				
FRL	47	46	46	50	50	34	32				

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	55
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	37
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	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	56
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	38
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?

Our SWD and ELL groups continue to under achieve in both reading and math. We have students that are counted in both of those subgroups that are not making sufficient gains.

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

Our current fifth grade students need to improve in both reading and math. We have a large ESE group in that grade level.

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

These students had never taken the state assessment before due to school closure because of COVID-19 in the Spring of 2020. Our progress monitoring data for that group had indicated that they were deficient in reading and math.

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

Our Reading MTSS Tier 3 students in 2nd grade made the most gains. 27% of our students consistently scored above the 40th percentile on our progress monitoring assessment.

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

The main contributing factor was the implementation of Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI). We purchased materials and those students received instruction from a reading endorsed teacher 5 days per week.

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

We will continue with the LLI intervention this school year. We have planned 4 days of professional development in order to better implement the program. This year we are focusing in effective questioning and literacy discussion.

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.

We have one day of instruction using the prompting guide. We will have 2 days of trainer coaching, with lesson observation and coaching to improve instruction. Our final professional development day will focus on reflecting and brainstorming ideas to improve our implementation of the program. B.E.S.T Standards training will also assist teachers.

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

We have 5 reading Interventionists dedicated to implementing this program. They hold meeting each quarter to share ideas and issues. As a group they problem solve by developing strategies to improve instruction for our students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ELL population is struggling in grades 3-5. We need to provide instructional practices that will strengthen the achievement of our ELL population.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is for our grades 3-5 ELL population to achieve learning gains of 38 % to 42% or greater.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through lesson plans, observations and our progress monitoring data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Explicit academic language development within interactive vocabulary-rich environments will be provided to students within the general education classroom. For students who need more individualized instruction, language development and vocabulary instruction will also occur during the supplemental support services they receive.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that explicit instruction along with interaction with vocabulary is effective when teaching vocabulary. Using our selected vocabulary in ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies we will implement our strategy in whole group and small group as indicated by the students needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify students that are in the ESSA ELL subgroup and evaluate their progress monitoring data.
Identify students for small group intervention.

Person Responsible Mary Lou McMillan (mcmillanm@lake.k12.fl.us)

Create groups and schedule to provide intervention.

Person Responsible Mary Lou McMillan (mcmillanm@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will intentionally plan for and engage students in standards based instruction with a focus on collaborative learning. If we focus on collaborative learning during standards based instruction, students will have opportunities to apply new learning and consolidate thinking.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in ELA, Math, and Science proficiency. ELA proficiency will increase from 48 to 53%. Math proficiency will increase from 51% to 56%. Science proficiency will increase from 45% to 52%
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored by classroom learning walks, progress monitoring assessments and monthly data chats.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategy of standards based instruction and collaborative learning will create a class environment that fosters a supportive community of learners. Teachers are the facilitator of student centered discussions and problem solving.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy will create a focused look at standards in order to streamline instructional practice in our classrooms. Uncomplicate Ed will be training on our campus in both the fall and spring.

Action Steps to Implement

Consult with Uncomplicate Ed about training that meets our needs. Schedule training days.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)

Implementation and monitoring of strategies in the classroom.

Person Responsible Tony Coleman (colemant1@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evaluate progress monitoring data and make adjustments as indicated by our data.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Mascotte Charter maintains a fully staffed guidance department to support our students' mental health, academic progress, and social well-being. Our two guidance counselors and one potential specialist will provide small group counseling, classroom presentations and interactive virtual lessons that focus on social and emotional learning and growth mindset character traits.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to reduce student conflicts and classroom disruptions by increasing the social/emotional learning opportunities for students during the school day by means of small guidance groups and classroom /virtual lessons.

Monitoring: The Energy Bus by Jon Gordon book study (Schoolwide)
This Area of Focus will be monitored by agendas and sign in sheets from Professional Development, a log book of students recommended for counseling

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Leah Bultema (bultemal@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Two Guidance Counselors and one Guidance Potential Specialist will provide small group lessons for students exhibiting social or emotional difficulties. Counselors will make interactive SEL classroom lessons available to classroom teachers to use with their students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, many students are experiencing emotional issues and loneliness from stay at home guidelines and online instruction options. Providing SEL activities will reduce feelings of stress and isolation.

Action Steps to Implement

Guidance department will provide staff professional development on Social Emotional Learning options.

Person Responsible Leah Bultema (bultemal@lake.k12.fl.us)

Guidance department will implement small group/individual counseling sessions. Teachers and staff may recommend students for counseling groups based on classroom behaviors and individual student needs. Guidance department will develop groups and a schedule for counseling sessions based on the recommendations.

Person Responsible Leah Bultema (bultemal@lake.k12.fl.us)

Guidance department will develop Social Emotional Learning classroom lessons and analyze mid-year discipline data to determine topics for lessons.

Person Responsible Jason Kovacsev (kovacsev@lake.k12.fl.us)

Mascotte Charter School will participate in a book study using "The Energy Bus: 10 Rules to Fuel Your Life, Work, and Team with Positive Energy," and "The Energy Bus for Kids: A Story about Staying Positive and Overcoming Challenges." This will include participation from students, teachers, staff, and administration, to gain insight on positive perspective and implement growth mindset strategies in both academic and social learning.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

School-wide "Growth Mindset Mondays" and monthly character education trait focuses will be implemented to build on the school's growth mindset culture.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA learning gains for our SWD students dropped from 31% in 2018 to 25% in 2019. Decreasing the number of students each VE teacher serves will allow additional time for intervention and more positive outcomes. All mainstreamed students with disabilities will receive intensive reading intervention through the Leveled Literacy Intervention program.

Measurable Outcome: 41% percent of ESSA subgroup students with disabilities will make annual learning gains.

Monitoring: This Area of Focus will be monitored by classroom visits to monitor implementation and our progress monitoring assessments each quarter.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Small group explicit instruction and modeling with Fountas and Pennell Leveled Literacy Intervention. This intervention covers PA, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary and Comprehension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy addresses all 5 areas of reading instruction. Students are evaluated using the BAS. Students are place groups based on their level. Each group has 6 or less students in the group. We selected this resource based on recommendations from teachers in our district. After researching the materials we made plans to purchase the materials. We then reallocated our personnel to meet the learning needs of our students through scheduling.

Action Steps to Implement

Schedule and administer the BAS for all ESE students.

Person Responsible Wendi Newman (newmanw@lake.k12.fl.us)

Develop a schedule and form intervention groups based on the BAS assessment.

Person Responsible Mary Lou McMillan (mcmillanm@lake.k12.fl.us)

Begin groups by the 3rd week of school. Leadership Team will conduct learning walks to assist with any teacher needs.

Person Responsible Tony Coleman (colemant1@lake.k12.fl.us)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Kindergarten-55% on FKLRS 1st Grade-BOY STAR ELA 40% 2nd Grade-BOY STAR ELA 47% 3rd Grade-BOY STAR ELA 45% 4th Grade-BOY STAR ELA 43%- 2021 FSA ELA as 3rd graders-53% 5th Grade-BOY STAR ELA 30%-2021 FSA ELA as 4th graders-40%
-------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Measurable Outcome: By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in ELA proficiency. ELA proficiency will increase from 48 to 53%.

Monitoring: This Area of Focus will be monitored by classroom visits to monitor implementation and our progress monitoring assessments each quarter.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The strategies of questioning and monitoring comprehension will be implemented through the use of Prompting Guides 1 and 2 during instruction to better understand reading behaviors and improve reading conferences and facilitative talk. This will increase student comprehension skills before, during, and after reading. These strategies will support the areas of oral reading, early writing behaviors, and reading comprehension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The use of the Prompting Guides will support students by providing facilitative language that teaches them to focus and expand their thinking through talking and writing before, during, and after reading. When given many opportunities to explain their thinking, all students will build their comprehension, particularly benefiting the struggling readers and ELL students.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide training on Prompting Guides 1 and 2 during ELA PD day 1.

Person Responsible Wendi Newman (newmanw@lake.k12.fl.us)

Provide training on Kagan strategies for cooperative learning and accountable talk.

Person Responsible Wendi Newman (newmanw@lake.k12.fl.us)

Uncomplicated Ed training on standards alignment and matching standards to language in the Prompting Guides.

Person Responsible Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@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.

NA

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.

Positive interactions and relationships with families and community members are supported and organized through our school's Title 1 Family Engagement Plan. Mascotte Charter School hosts multiple events throughout the year involving families and community members in both academic and creative experiences at our school. Events include; **Family Science Night, Eagle Family Picnic, The Annual Vocabulary Parade, Kindergarten Grandparent Reading Day, Family Art Night, Parent Conference Nights, and Family Literacy Nights. Our school has programs in place such as Accelerated Reader to promote and reward students who make reading a priority. As a Growth Mindset school we promote positive relationships and interactions between students and staff through school-wide initiatives and training.

Mascotte Charter School encourages volunteerism by community members by having a dedicated volunteer coordinator responsible for recruitment, placement and training of our volunteers. MSE won the Golden School Award for volunteerism year before last. We're going to have to continue to be creative this year to achieve the same goals as in previous years. We're working on a plan to offer some virtual family engagement opportunities.

**Events subject to change due to Safety Guidelines

****Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

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

Mascotte Charter Board:
 Chairman Dr. JoAnne Jones
 Vice Chairman Elizabeth Villanueva
 Member Stacy Gaines
 Member Richard Backus
 Member / Parent Eric Leibert
 CEO / Principal Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego
 Finance Officer Tarsha Jacobs

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00