

Lake County Schools

Tavares Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Tavares Elementary School

720 E CLIFFORD ST, Tavares, FL 32778

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

Demographics

Principal: Stacia Werner

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2021

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 (52%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Tavares Elementary School

720 E CLIFFORD ST, Tavares, FL 32778

<https://tel.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	53%

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.

It is the mission of Tavares Elementary School to ensure high levels of learning for all students. Through mutual respect within the school community, our children will grow and learn in a positive atmosphere where faculty, staff, students, and families are enthusiastic about the teaching and learning process.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that the most effective strategy for achieving the mission of our school is to develop our capacity to function as a professional learning community. We envision a school in which staff:

- work together to achieve a common purpose
- seek and implement effective strategies for improving student learning on a continuous basis
- monitor each student's progress on a frequent basis
- demonstrate a personal commitment to the academic success and general well-being of all students.

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
McKinney, Durenda	Principal	<p>The Principal directs the school leadership team which is composed of Administration and our Instructional Coaches. The key responsibilities of this team is to ensure the mission, vision, and collective commitments of our school are implemented to the fullest extent. The target areas are literacy, and intervention both academically and behaviorally.</p> <p>Progress monitoring of these areas is the function of the instructional coaches along with Administration. Each month students are monitored for progress and appropriate action will be taken. The Leadership team utilizing the Professional Learning Process reviews the school wide goal progress to determine a course of action to correct any deficits to include professional development, improving instructional strategies or providing the necessary intervention.</p> <p>Finally, the Leadership Team promotes parent and community involvement facilitated by our Family School Liaison who oversees our Title 1 program. Parent involvement is academically focused, centering on improving student achievement, which the Leadership team is charged with ensuring its success.</p>
Elliott, Dawn	Assistant Principal	Leadership team participant and Instructional administrator for grades K-2
Peppers, Carol	Assistant Principal	Leadership team participant and Instructional administrator for grades 3-5
Le Moyne, Judith Ann	Instructional Coach	Instructional support for teachers with specialization in ELA instruction
Lowery, Lisa	Instructional Coach	Instructional support for all teachers with a specialization in Math

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 8/1/2021, Stacia Werner

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

69

Total number of students enrolled at the school

865

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

6

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

8

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	100	128	150	153	115	166	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	812
Attendance below 90 percent	0	40	38	52	24	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	192
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	8	4	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	5	3	5	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	14	30	36	46	64	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	264

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	2	2	9	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/8/2021

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	90	121	122	103	132	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	705
Attendance below 90 percent	10	5	2	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	1	4	9	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	9	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	3	10	11	17	22	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	90	121	122	103	132	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	705
Attendance below 90 percent	10	5	2	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	1	4	9	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	9	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	3	10	11	17	22	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				54%	58%	57%	56%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	57%	58%	43%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	49%	53%	36%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				64%	60%	63%	65%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	56%	62%	50%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	39%	51%	32%	41%	47%
Science Achievement				52%	54%	53%	52%	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	52%	60%	-8%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	60%	-8%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	59%	-6%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	67%	62%	5%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	65%	61%	4%	64%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	57%	-1%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	50%	56%	-6%	53%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring data for Reading, and Math were provided by:

K -3 iReady for Fall, Winter, and Spring all groups and subgroups

3-5 iReady for Fall, Winter all groups and subgroups

4-5 FSA for Spring Reading, Math and Science

5th Grade Science Fall and Winter were provided by District Science Quarterly

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33/22%	59/49%	88/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33/22%	59/49%	88/59%
	Students With Disabilities	1/18%	2/11%	5/28%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/14%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22/15%	55/37%	92/62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22/15%	55/37%	92/62%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	4/22%	10/56%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/14%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34/23%	56/37%	83/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34/23%	56/37%	83/55%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	3/11%	6/22%
	English Language Learners	1/13%	2/25%	3/38%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15/10%	30/20%	73/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/10%	30/20%	73/49%
	Students With Disabilities	2/7%	3/11%	7/26%
	English Language Learners	1/13%	2/25%	2/25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41/31%	65/53%	81/66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	41/31%	65/53%	81/66%
	Students With Disabilities	2/6%	4/12%	12/35%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13/11%	43/35%	62/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/11%	43/35%	62/50%
	Students With Disabilities	2/6%	4/12%	10/29%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38/24%	56/35%	41/45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38/24%	56/35%	41/45%
	Students With Disabilities	2/6%	3/9%	3/8%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23/14%	58/36%	58/36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/14%	58/36%	58/36%
	Students With Disabilities	1/3%	3/9%	3/8%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32/24%	53/29%	45/45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/24%	53/29%	45/45%
	Students With Disabilities	1/3%	2/6%	10/35%
	English Language Learners	1/13%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27/20%	47/35%	41/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27/20%	47/35%	41/51%
	Students With Disabilities	1/3%	5/15%	5/18%
	English Language Learners	1/3%	2/25%	0/0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	64/47%	118/87%	51/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	64/47%	118/87%	51/51%
	Students With Disabilities	7/21%	26/76%	10/29%
	English Language Learners	2/25%	6/75%	3/40%

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	16	36	38	18	21	20	22				
ELL	20	45		24	36		50				
BLK	35	38		32	17	30	36				
HSP	41	54		39	31		52				
MUL	55			41							
WHT	54	49	45	65	38	38	64				
FRL	40	47	45	43	31	27	51				
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	18	28	29	33	45	33	22				
ELL	29	42		64	74		27				
BLK	46	51	25	53	58	38	42				
HSP	36	38	36	60	54	38	24				
MUL	58	63		59	65						
WHT	62	60	52	70	60	42	62				
FRL	47	54	44	56	54	40	49				
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	26	21	28	30	21	32				
ELL	33	25		57	50						
BLK	39	39	38	40	27	18	25				
HSP	48	42	35	58	55	35	24				
MUL	67	75		73	56						
WHT	61	41	28	73	55	38	61				
FRL	49	43	36	58	44	30	45				

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	366

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	40
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	31
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	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	48
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	50
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	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

- ELA achievement trends are going down.
- 5th grade Math was impacted significantly this year with a 17% difference between the school and the district.
- Grades 1-5 using i-ready scores from BOY to EOY/FSA shows an average 32% growth in student proficiency data. The lowest growth occurred in grade 2 ELA.
- Students with Disabilities continues to score below ESSA level with 30% proficiency.
- ELL subgroup in grades 3-5 show little growth.

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

- The data component with the greatest need for improvement is our ELA achievement (41%) which is 11% points below the District. Individual grade level scores 3-5 support this deficit with an average school to district deficit of 6% points. Over three years ELA achievement has been on a decline.
- Students with Disabilities shows a need for improvement as our school has not met ESSA requirements for this subgroup in two years.

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

- Inconsistency due to hybrid instructional model
- Inconsistency in intervention delivery due to hybrid instructional model
- ELA deficits span two school years

New or continued actions include:

- School-wide focus on intervention time with monitoring and feedback
- intense focus on 1st grade intervention planning and monitoring of instruction delivery.
- Grade level goals related to improving ELA achievement
- PLC process embedded into ELA planning/monitoring with new curriculum implementation
- Monitor 5th grade Math to ensure student learning is showing growth.

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

- FSA Math in grades 3 & 4 continue to trend upward as compared to the District
- Science proficiency remained equal to the District despite instructional inconsistency
- ELL students in grade 2 showed the most improvement (25%) from the BOY to the EOY.

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

- Math instruction was more conducive to a hybrid instruction
- Science instruction was structured with intense small groups
- ELL students received direct instruction

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

- Monitoring of intervention
- Implementation of the PLC process by adding common assessment to ELA instruction
- Focused monitoring on 1st grade intervention with feedback cycle.

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.

- Common Assessment planning and implementation of the PLC process
- How to use data to drive instruction
- Wit and Wisdom curriculum training

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

- Tutoring school-wide

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus	Our ELA achievement data shows a three year decline. ELA achievement data was identified as a critical area of focus because trend data shows a continued decline and the data for the current year is the lowest achievement percentage. (avg. 41% grades 3-5).
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	By Focusing on ELA achievement school-wide we will increase our ELA achievement scores a minimum of 10% points to 51%.
Monitoring:	This area will be monitored using the PLC process emphasizing common assessments and data reviews. Additionally, monitoring through District curriculum implementation and framework use.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Durenda McKinney (mckinneyd@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Review of common assessments to monitor student learning through the year will be done through planning and team meetings. Instructional Coaches, and Teacher Leaders will conduct data chats to determine the level of student mastery, interventions needed as well as changes to instructional delivery (framework)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By monitoring student learning through common assessments and instructional delivery using the District Framework, then targeted interventions and changes to instructional delivery can be made to ensure student achievement increases.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teacher Leaders will utilize the PLC process during grade level planning to design common assessment, interventions and appropriate instructional delivery methods using the District Framework.

Person Responsible Judith Ann Le Moyne (lemoynej@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Coaches will attend grade-level planning to provide support and ascertain professional development opportunities. Grade-level planning occurs weekly and is attended by Coaches who monitor the implementation of the PLC process. Lesson plan designs and implementation are monitored through Administration Learning walks.

Person Responsible Lisa Lowery (loweryl@lake.k12.fl.us)

School calendar will provide for data review meetings per unit to discuss student mastery of spotlight standards for the development of intervention and acceleration.

Person Responsible Durenda McKinney (mckinneyd@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with Disabilities ELA achievement was 35% which is below the ESSA guidelines. This is a three year trend.
Measurable Outcome:	The school goal for our Students with Disabilities is to increase the subgroup's ELA Achievement by 6% points to ensure compliance with the ESSA standards of 41% proficiency.
Monitoring:	Grade levels will monitor Students with Disabilities mastery of spotlight standards using common assessments and data reviews to identify interventions, modifications in Individual Education Plans as well as instructional delivery professional development needs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jamie Hawkins (hawkinsj@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of the PLC process with common assessments Implementation of Leveled Literacy intervention for grades 3-5 and SIPPS intervention for grades K-2. Targeted small group instruction (tutoring)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies focus on reading instruction and intervention. Grade levels will identify students who need intervention with the unit of standards (common assessments) as well as those students who need "gap intervention" (I-ready diagnostic tests) to close the one or two years of reading deficit. Targeted small groups will be assigned to SIPPS intervention (K-2) and LLI intervention (3-5).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Master schedule reflects intervention/acceleration four times a week in all grade levels.

Person Responsible Durenda McKinney (mckinneyd@lake.k12.fl.us)

2, Utilization of new Reading curriculum to identify spotlight standards and develop common assessments to monitor student mastery.

Person Responsible Judith Ann Le Moyne (lemoynej@lake.k12.fl.us)

3. Accurately identify all students with reading needs and create instructional groups for SIPPS, LLI and targeted instruction within the classroom. Student lists will be based on i-ready testing, SIPPS screeners, LLI screeners, common assessments and IEP goals.

Person Responsible Judith Ann Le Moyne (lemoynej@lake.k12.fl.us)

4. Use a systemic approach to monitoring data gathered during LLI and SIPPS intervention groups to support the MTSS process. Intervention team and teachers will meet with our instructional coaches and guidance counselors weekly to discuss individual student progress.

Person Responsible Judith Ann Le Moyne (lemoynej@lake.k12.fl.us)

5. ESE teachers will create schedules in conjunction with FIN guidelines of providing support and services based on students individual needs. ESE teachers will review IEP plans to identify targeted ELA instruction for our students.

Person Responsible Jamie Hawkins (hawkinsj@lake.k12.fl.us)

6. SAI targeted assistance action plan includes funds for after school tutoring (curriculum and salaries) in ELA for all students to close the achievement gap.

Person Responsible Dawn Elliott (elliotttd@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: School Leadership will focus on the tenets of Professional Learning Communities with specificity in the development and utilization of common assessments to accurately monitor student learning. Using the PLC process to provide the foundation for instructional delivery, accountability system, collective efficacy and high expectations for all students.

Measurable Outcome: By using the PLC process teachers will provide a foundation for their instructional delivery and increase their teacher efficacy. Developing and using common assessments for monitoring student mastery in a consistent manner will directly improve student achievement in all content areas. Finally the PLC process will set high expectations in all lesson delivery to impact student learning and to increase student achievement.

Monitoring: Leadership, Instructional Coaches and Teacher Leaders will guide the implementation and monitoring of the PLC process. Grade-level SMART goals will be related to improving ELA achievement school-wide for all groups will be monitored monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carol Peppers (peppersc@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Development of SMART goals
Utilization of common assessments

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By implementing and monitoring our PLC process school-wide we then will make a direct impact on our student achievement in all areas.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Guiding coalition will direct and monitor the use of the PLC process and goal achievement school-wide.

Person Responsible Durenda McKinney (mckinneyd@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Teacher leaders will lead the PLC process in each grade level. SMART goals related to school-wide goals will be developed along with identification of monitoring tools.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

3. School-wide calendar to reflect grade level team meetings to discuss student mastery on common assessments.

Person Responsible Durenda McKinney (mckinneyd@lake.k12.fl.us)

4. Instructional Coaches will attend grade-level team meetings and monitor the implementation of the PLC process, identifying areas for the Guiding coalition to address as well as professional development needs.

Person Responsible Lisa Lowery (loweryl@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on Early Warning Systems data our attendance school-wide exceeded the District threshold of less than 10%. Ours was 28% of our student population exceeded the less than 10%. Though the instructional delivery method of Lake Live may have contributed to the increase in the amount of students missing school, it is imperative to monitor attendance this year to prevent further decline.

Measurable Outcome: Maintain attendance for all students is less than 10%
Increase use of Restorative practice methods to reduce suspension consequences

Monitoring: Attendance Committee meeting tracks students whose attendance exceeds 10%
Behavior Threat Team meeting to track students whose behavior is impeding their learning for intervention or MTSS referral

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Bonita R. Gilchrist (gilchristb@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Use of our Attendance monitoring system
Improve our Positive Behavior Support program to include varied delivery of rewards
Utilize PASS and Mental Health Liaison for early intervention and restorative practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Early intervention is key to changing behavior so monthly tracking and intervention for attendance and behavior to ensure students remain in school will lead to increased student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students who have attendance or behavior factors. Address monthly by discussing progress and parent contact.

Person Responsible Carol Peppers (peppersc@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Continue use of PBIS electronic monitoring system.

Person Responsible Candy Holcombe (holcombec@lake.k12.fl.us)

3. PASS and Mental Health Liaison to provide professional development to teachers emphasizing alternative to controlling student behavior in their classroom.

Person Responsible Jennifer Flood (floodj@lake.k12.fl.us)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	Based on 2020-2021 FSA data, students in grades 3, 4 and 5 scored less than 50% proficiency level in ELA. Students in grades K-3 scored less than 50% proficiency level in ELA based beginning of the year progress monitoring (i-Ready) data.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Increase percentage of 3rd grade students scoring level 3 or higher on 2022 ELA standardized assessment from 41% to 44%; Fourth Grade from 45% to 48% and the same for Fifth Grade 45% to 48. Utilizing i-Ready data for Grades K-3, the following outcomes are expected: Kindergarten-27% to 30%; First Grade 14% to 17%; 2nd Grade 30% to 33% and 3rd Grade 42% to 45%.
Monitoring:	Focus areas will be monitored for the desired outcome utilizing ongoing progress monitoring data from the following: i-Ready, APM, SIPPS, LLI and common assessments. Quarterly data chats will be held to ensure instruction is aligned to student's needs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Durenda McKinney (mckinneyd@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>In order to achieve our expected outcomes the following evidence-based strategies will be implemented and monitored:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implement core ELA materials aligned to the science of reading and integration of content-rich texts. Specifically K-2 components of reading and grades 3-5 the science of reading and integration. - Implement an intervention program using progress monitoring data and strategic use of the LCS K-12 Reading Decision tree to ensure interventions are specific to student needs. - Grade level common assessments and discussions to determine student instructional needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If these evidence based strategies are implemented and monitored then our student proficiency in ELA grades 3-5 as well grades K-3 on i-ready will increase 3-4%.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify Intervention groups using Diagnostic and screening results from i-ready, SIPPS, and LLI.

Person Responsible Judith Ann Le Moyne (lemoynej@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Implement dedicated intervention time based on the master schedule four times per week. Teachers and Intervention Team schedules created.

Person Responsible Judith Ann Le Moyne (lemoynej@lake.k12.fl.us)

3. Monitor data using the LCS K-12 Reading Decision Tree through Tier 2 and Tier 3 data meetings scheduled weekly and grade level common assessment data during scheduled planning meetings.

Person Responsible Durenda McKinney (mckinneyd@lake.k12.fl.us)

4. Utilize the PLC process during grade level planning to ensure student achievement is monitored and instructional practice is adjusted as necessary.

Person Responsible Durenda McKinney (mckinneyd@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.

Based on the SafeSchools for Alex, Tavares Elementary has a ranking of moderate. Though below the statewide incident of 1.0 per 100 our school showing .6 incidents per 100 students, this is an increase. Our focus area of reducing suspensions will address this increase in incident ratios as well.

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.

Tavares Elementary School believes in involving parents in our Title 1 programs. Parents comprise at least 50% of our SAC committee who help to finalize the School Compact. All parents are given the opportunity and access to all meeting minutes which are posted on the school website each month. Flexible meeting times and the availability of using remote meeting programs ensure all parents have the opportunity to attend. Communication is sent home in a language parents are able to understand. Monthly newsletters produced by our Family School Liaison assist with the family to school connection.

Throughout the year, parent and student activities will be scheduled whether in person or virtually. The events are posted on our marquee and social media outlets. At each event the Parent Resource room is available for parents to check out items for assisting their students.

Parents are vital to our IEP meetings and accommodations are made to conduct meetings which are flexible for parent schedules.

Social and emotional needs of our students are being met through small groups led by our Guidance counselors and Mental Health Liaison. Additionally, our Mental Health Liaison addresses family referrals and small group counseling sessions. Our PASS teacher meets with students who are struggling with their behavior in order to provide strategies for self-control as well a meeting with the teacher to strengthen teacher- student relationships

At Tavares Elementary our Voluntary Pre-K program continues to run at full capacity bridging the gap for our four-year old students. To assist with their transition as well as students new to our school, we host a

kindergarten orientation night (Kindergarten Round-up) Finally, articulation meetings are held for our fifth graders and students with disabilities who are transitioning to middle school. These meetings focus on academics and support both behaviorally and emotionally.

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

Teacher Leaders
SAC members
PTO
Family School Liaison
Community Partners
Winn Dixie
Office Depot
Bealls
JAM - First United Methodist Church of Tavares

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				\$6,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0551 - Tavares Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$6,000.00
			Notes: Quarterly Writing Teams			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$9,000.35
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	100-Salaries	0551 - Tavares Elementary School	Other		\$8,159.79
			Notes: Extended School Learning Opportunities			
	5100	520-Textbooks	0551 - Tavares Elementary School	Other		\$840.56
			Notes: Extended Learning Opportunities Curriculum			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems				\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
Total:						\$15,000.35