# Clermont Elementary School

## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Clermont Elementary School

### 680 E HIGHLAND AVE, Clermont, FL 34711

### https://cel.lake.k12.fl.us/

## Demographics

## Principal: Jeffery Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 10/3/2016

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Closed: 2023-06-30 |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: C (44%)<br><br>2018-19: C (51%)<br><br>2017-18: 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** | ATSI |
| * 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

# Clermont Elementary School

## 680 E HIGHLAND AVE, Clermont, FL 34711

### https://cel.lake.k12.fl.us/

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | **2021-22 Title I School** | **2021-22 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 | 70% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | C | | C | C |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Clermont Elementary School strives to create a challenging learning community where all members focus on high expectations for success while developing students with individual differences and learning styles. We engage students with challenging academics while promoting a safe, and supportive environment. Every effort is taken to create an inclusive community which actively supports students' learning.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Clermont Elementary School is a place of high expectations that promotes collaboration among staff, parents and students to achieve academic excellence. We strive to develop responsible, caring students who are lifelong learners and are prepared to meet the challenges of a diverse, global society.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| Williams, Jeffrey | Principal | Provides curriculum support to the faculty through the monitoring of the Florida Standards,<br>Progressing Monitoring and Pacing. Ongoing professional development will be provided<br>for the faculty and staff based on needs.<br>Email - WilliamsJ3@lake.k12.fl.us |
| Schichtel, Kevin | Assistant Principal | Provides curriculum support to the faculty through the monitoring of the Florida Standards,<br>Progressing Monitoring and Pacing. Ongoing professional development will be provided<br>for the faculty and staff based on needs.<br>Email - SchichtelK@lake.k12.fl.us |
| Aklan, Michele | School Counselor | Supports the school and families transition needs to and from home. Social and emotional services are provided to our school family as needed.<br>Email - AklanM@lake.k12.fl.us |
| McRoy, Kenneth | Behavior Specialist | Provides ongoing behavior management support to faculty & staff to ensure students are engaged at all times; minimizing off task opportunities.<br>Email - McRoyK@lake.k12.fl.us |
| Barker, Beverly | Administrative Support | Coordinates staffing, placement and reevaluations, develop & support inclusive practices, and model effective teaching strategies to ESE teachers.<br>Email - BarkerB@lake.k12.fl.us |
| Anderson, Karrie | Instructional Coach | MTSS School-Based Coordinator - coordinates meetings and notifies members of dates and times and provides support for the teachers throughout the MTSS process. Models and coaches fellow colleagues using reading, writing, thinking and talking strategies while embracing authentic literacy. Also helps identify strategies, resources, and materials for reading interventions.<br>Email – Andersonk2@lake.k12.fl.us |
| Oliver, Tammy | Instructional Coach | Models and coaches fellow colleagues using reading, writing, thinking and talking strategies while embracing authentic literacy across the curriculum. Identifies strategies, resources, and materials for math academic support and interventions.<br>Email - SorrellsM@lake.k12.fl.us |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Monday 10/3/2016, Jeffery Williams

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

49

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

555

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

5

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

10

**Demographic Data**

## Early Warning Systems

**Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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 | 74 | 86 | 74 | 94 | 84 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 510 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 10 | 38 | 31 | 39 | 26 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 1 | 8 | 30 | 20 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 8 | 30 | 20 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 23 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 22 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 23 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

**Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 8/23/2022

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 5 | 16 | 14 | 30 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 5 | 16 | 14 | 30 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

## 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 | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 40% | 50% | 56% | | | | 57% | 58% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 45% | | | | | | 63% | 57% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 42% | | | | | | 56% | 49% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 40% | 46% | 50% | | | | 52% | 60% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 60% | | | | | | 47% | 56% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | | | | | | 31% | 39% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 33% | 52% | 59% | | | | 48% | 54% | 53% |

**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 |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 60% | -2% | 58% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 60% | -6% | 58% | -4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -58% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 59% | -12% | 56% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -54% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 62% | -11% | 62% | -11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 61% | -12% | 64% | -15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -51% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 57% | -13% | 60% | -16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -49% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 42% | 56% | -14% | 53% | -11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 27 | 42 | 36 | 38 | 60 | | 38 | | | | |
| ELL | 27 | | | 45 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 23 | 41 | 50 | 27 | 37 | 17 | 16 | | | | |
| HSP | 31 | 35 | 30 | 21 | 58 | 71 | 19 | | | | |
| MUL | 43 | | | 36 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | 58 | | 72 | 86 | | 71 | | | | |
| FRL | 31 | 40 | 41 | 33 | 52 | 52 | 29 | | | | |

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 24 | | | 39 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 29 | | | 19 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 17 | 16 | | 20 | 20 | | 21 | | | | |
| HSP | 45 | 25 | | 33 | 23 | | 36 | | | | |
| WHT | 78 | 60 | | 70 | 73 | | 59 | | | | |
| FRL | 34 | 26 | 50 | 32 | 33 | | 25 | | | | |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 43 | 72 | 71 | 36 | 37 | 29 | 43 | | | | |
| ELL | 50 | 67 | | 56 | 59 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 69 | | | 77 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 63 | 69 | 29 | 39 | 33 | 41 | | | | |
| HSP | 52 | 61 | | 52 | 49 | 20 | 48 | | | | |
| MUL | 40 | | | 30 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 71 | 65 | | 66 | 47 | 30 | 52 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 59 | 58 | 40 | 45 | 32 | 39 | | | | |

## ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 50 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 91 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 399 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |

## Subgroup Data

### Students With Disabilities

| | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 40 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

### English Language Learners

| | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 54 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

### Native American Students

| | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

### Asian Students

| | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

### Black/African American Students

| | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 30 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |

### Hispanic Students

| | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 38 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

### Multiracial Students

| | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 40 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

### Pacific Islander Students

| | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |

| Pacific Islander Students | |
|---|---|
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **White Students** | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 71 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Economically Disadvantaged Students** | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 40 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**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?**

Increases in state assessment data were visible in Math Achievement, Math Learning Gains, Math Lowest 25 Percentile, and ELA Learning Gains.
5th Grade Science Achievement was 33% as compared to 39% in 2021.
ELA Achievement was 40% as compared to 44% in 2021.
ELA Lowest 25 percentile was 42% as compared to 50% in 2021.
Multiple subgroups (Students with Disabilities, Black/African American, Hispanic, Multiracial, & Economically Disadvantaged) did not reach the 41% proficiency threshold, however, of the 25 subgroups that reported data for both 2021 and 2022, 60% experienced an increase in proficiency rates.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

ELA Achievement (40%), ELA Lowest 25 Percentile (42%) and Science Achievement (33%) demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

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

Attendance rates were a contributing factor to student achievement data. 35.6% of students missed at least 10% of the school year in 2021-2022. Guidance Counselor will monitor Average Daily Attendance weekly and report anomalies to the Leadership Team.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Proficiency rates in Math showed the most improvement. Math Lowest 25 Percentile had the largest growth of 25 points - 23% - 48%. Math Learning Gains increased 18 points - 42% - 60%, which was our highest School Grade Component area.

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

Providing students the opportunity to Read, Write, Think, and Talk across all subject areas, including Math, was a factor in increasing student achievement in that area. Leadership Teams also modeled and assisted with adjustments to our Panther Challenge Intervention/Acceleration block in grade 3, 4, and 5.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Areas of Focus**
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

**:**

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

| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | Based on FSA data from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section list we have opportunities in reading and science to improve. ELA and Science were identified as a critical areas of Focus because ELA Achievement (44% to 40%), ELA Lower Quartile (50% to 42%) and Science Achievement (39% to 33%) showed decreases over prior year data. |
|---|---|
| **Measurable Outcome:** State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | By focusing on this area, we expect to see performance improvements in i-ready data (EOY/MOY) and end of year Progress Monitoring data. |
| **Monitoring:** Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | Quarterly data chats will be held each Nine Weeks period to review trajectory of student achievement. BOY and MOY i-ready diagnostic data will be analyzed by the Leadership Team along with Grade Levels during weekly PLC meetings to ensure each student has the necessary instructional support to reach both target and stretch growth goals. Common assessments will be created and analyzed by grade level teams during PLC meetings as well. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jeffrey Williams (williamsj3@lake.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. | Establish a common planning/collaboration schedule in which a member of the leadership team will monitor each week. The focus will be on standards, alignment of tasks, pacing, progress monitoring and setting the purpose for learning. Data gathered during this process will be analyzed by the teachers and Leadership Team to make strategic decisions as needed to improve student performance. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. | If we implement, monitor and support weekly collaborative planning with fidelity, we will increase our teachers ability to deliver more rigorous standards based instruction to increase student (ELA) performance to exceed 50% commensurate with previous performance of 57%. |

| **Action Steps to Implement** |
|---|
| List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step. |

1. Standards based instruction will be monitored by common planning and Classroom Learning Walks.
2. Timely feedback, best practices and trend data will be shared with teachers.
3. Teachers will be able to access i-Ready BOY and MOY assessment data to formulate a progressive

plan to close the achievement gap for all students.

4. Administration/Leadership team will consult with teachers on a weekly basis to monitor academic progress using our data matrix and performance matters platforms.

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

| **#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Signs** | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | New staff and existing staff members on campus have varying degrees of experience in using CHAMPS, PBS strategies, Restorative Practices, or Bully Proofing Your School curriculum. Our EWS data reflects average daily attendance and OSS/ISS incidents as being an area of opportunity to improve. Therefore by offering professional development in these areas, all stakeholders will benefit from a safe and conducive learning environment. |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | By focusing on the learning environment there will be academic time devoted to on task learning versus off task learning. This will lead to a decline in classroom disruptions which will minimize students being referred for disruptive behavior; often leading to lost time out of class. Teachers and the Leadership Team will continue to coordinate their efforts by monitoring classroom incident frequency data and providing resources to ensure student learning time is accountable by removing barriers. |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | EWS and Discipline Data will be reviewed on a monthly basis to allow the Leadership Team to make necessary adjustments to ensure all students are given access to quality instruction each day. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kevin Schichtel (schichtelk@lake.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | PBS and Restorative Practices will be used to increase daily positive student interactions and therefore reduce the amount of negative consequences and interruptions to the academic learning environment. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | If we implement, monitor, and support PBS with Restorative Practices then there will be a decrease in student discipline infractions by 10%. |

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. We will review discipline data, OSS rates and ISS rates through Performance Matters once a month.
2. We will continually monitor discipline incidents reported to the office and investigate any imminent concerns immediately.
3. Our school Guidance Counselor will conduct Character Lessons during grade level enrichment classes during Media.
4. Our PASS teacher will meet with identified students on a regular basis and respond proactively in the classroom to support teachers using Restorative Practices.
5. The Teacher Induction Team will work with new teachers and existing staff regarding CHAMPS and classroom management techniques.
6. Our Mental Health Liaison will intervene as needed to support students in crisis.

**Person Responsible**       Kevin Schichtel (schichtelk@lake.k12.fl.us)

| **#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation** |
|---|

| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Based on the school data for ELA Achievement, it is necessary to continue to focus on literacy strands to ensure early literacy is strengthened within the core. This will allow all students to access their learning. Using the District Instructional Framework, purpose driven learning will help students connect with the What, Why, and How. |
|---|---|
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | Students will be exposed to daily attributes of literacy development (phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary development, fluency and comprehension). Teachers will give students the ability to interact with text throughout the day and across all content areas. As a result, students will be prepared with the literacy skills necessary to become successful learners. This effort will minimize retentions (to zero) and increase proficiency (to 65%); closing the achievement gap. |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Quarterly data chats will be held each Nine Weeks period to review trajectory of student achievement. BOY and MOY i-ready diagnostic results along with Progress Monitoring data will be analyzed by the Leadership Team with Grade Levels during weekly PLC meetings to ensure each student has the necessary instructional support to reach both target and stretch growth goals. Common assessments will be created and analyzed by grade level teams during PLC meetings as well. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jeffrey Williams (williamsj3@lake.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being** | Math - Leadership Team will discuss and prioritize students weekly during common planning and Leadership Meetings. Teachers will provide additional measures of skilled instruction as needed to accelerate students learning commensurate with grade level expectations. Supplemental support using the Brain Pop platform will help students to visualize their learning by providing introductory instruction to support expected proficiency of 65%.<br>ELA - We will provide ongoing professional development opportunities to our Primary Grade teachers to implement Fundations Phonics program (K-2) and Leveled Literacy |

| | |
|---|---|
| **implemented for this Area of Focus.** | Intervention (3-5) to strengthen early literacy development. District support personnel will work in conjunction with the faculty/administration to support intermediate literacy development by utilizing the districts recommended 120 minute literacy block and integrating the conferring while interacting with text. By having access to classroom libraries, students will be able to select preferred texts from a wide variety of genres. This will provide teachers the opportunity to monitor students independent practice differentiated by reading level and interest. Student growth will be measured via BOY, MOY, and end of year assessments (Progress Monitoring and i-Ready) to track proficiency targets. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | Math - If we implement, monitor, and support our Intervention/Acceleration block, we will see an increase in student performance which will indicate students are accessing their learning by understanding the rationale. ELA - If we implement, monitor and support weekly collaborative planning with fidelity, we will increase our teachers ability to deliver more rigorous standards based instruction. Student performance in ELA will exceed our existing proficiency rate of 57% to exceed previous performance of 71%. Learning Walk look-fors and trends will help support this focus area. |

### Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Our Intervention/Acceleration block (Panther Challenge) will be offered each week.
2. School data will be analyzed on a consistent basis to determine the need for growth of each student.
3. BOY, MOY and EOY diagnostics along with teacher quarterly data chat information will be used to measure student performance.

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

| #4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because the Federal Index for Multiple Subgroups are below the 41% threshold. Students with Disabilities - 40% Black - 30% Hispanic - 38% Multiracial - 40% Economically Disadvantaged - 40% |
| **Measurable Outcome:** **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in the Math and ELA proficiency rates for our Student Subgroups to exceed 50%. |
| **Monitoring:** **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Student data will be monitored at the BOY, MOY and EOY using the i-ready platform as well as Progress Monitoring scores. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kevin Schichtel (schichtelk@lake.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | BOY results will be analyzed to determine needs and skill deficits across all subgroup areas. Leadership Team will discuss and prioritize students weekly during common planning and Leadership Meetings. Teachers will provide additional measures of skilled instruction as needed to accelerate students learning commensurate with grade level expectations. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | If barriers that impede academic progress are resolved in a timely manner, multiracial student performance will surpass current performance noted above and exceed 50%. |

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. School data will be analyzed on a consistent basis to determine the need for growth of each student.
2. BOY, MOY and EOY diagnostics along with teacher quarterly data chat information will be used to measure student performance.
3. Members of the Leadership Team will regularly meet with Zone Students to track academic achievement across all subject areas.
4. The school will address barriers that may impede academic progress with an expedient resolution.

**Person Responsible**     Kevin Schichtel (schichtelk@lake.k12.fl.us)

## RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

**Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

Evidenced by EOY i-ready reading diagnostic, approximately 62% of (K-2) students were not meeting grade level expectations. Therefore, it is necessary for teachers to provide reading, writing, thinking and talking opportunities everyday to accelerate literacy development. The District Instructional Framework will be used in conjunction to navigate the teaching and learning by building a high degree of teacher efficacy.

**Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

Evidenced by FSA ELA proficiency, approximately 60% of (3-5) students did not meet grade level expectations. Therefore, it will be necessary for teachers to maximize learning experiences by providing daily instruction using reading, writing, thinking, and talking. This will leverage reading development, using grade level text in all content areas.

**Measurable Outcomes:**
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Students will be exposed to daily attributes of literacy development (phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary development, fluency and comprehension). Teachers will give students daily opportunities to practice utilizing literacy development skills in content. As a result, students will be prepared with the literacy skills necessary to become successful learners as they matriculate to secondary learning. This effort will minimize retentions (to zero) and increase proficiency (to 65%); closing the achievement gap.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Students will be exposed to daily opportunities to learn while reading, utilizing literacy skills derived from literacy development (phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary development, fluency and comprehension). Teachers will provide students access to interact with complex text throughout the day and across all content areas. As a result, students will be prepared with the literacy skills necessary to become successful learners. This effort will minimize retentions (to zero) and increase proficiency (to 65%); closing the achievement gap.

**Monitoring:**
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Quarterly data chats will be held each Nine Weeks period to review trajectory of student achievement. BOY and MOY i-ready diagnostic data and Progress Monitoring Assessments will be analyzed by the Leadership Team along with Grade Levels during weekly PLC meetings to ensure each student has the necessary instructional support to reach both target and stretch growth goals. Common assessments will be analyzed by grade level teams during PLC meetings to determine next steps. If the implementation goes as planned, we will reach the target goal of improving our ELA proficiency at rates of 50% or higher.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Anderson, Karrie, andersonk2@lake.k12.fl.us

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Establish a common planning/collaboration schedule in which grade levels will work with the leadership team each week. The focus will be on standards, alignment of tasks, pacing, progress monitoring and setting the purpose for learning. Data gathered during this process will be analyzed by the teachers and Leadership Team to make strategic decisions as needed to improve student performance.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- ◦ Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

If we implement, monitor and support the data generated from the ongoing assessments (iReady /Progress Monitoring) and used the data during collaborative planning to drive instruction, we will increase our teachers ability to deliver on demand instruction to increase student performance in ELA proficiency by 10% or greater.

**Action Steps to Implement:**
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|
| 1. Standards based instruction will be examined in common planning and Classroom Learning Walks. The trend data will be used to identify areas of strengths and improvement opportunities by the leadership team for the sole purpose of adjusting instruction to meet the academic needs of students.<br>2. Timely feedback will be shared with teachers as a method to reflect on their instructional practice<br>3. Teachers will access data from i-Ready BOY, MOY, and Progress Monitoring assessments to formulate a progressive plan to increase proficiency commensurate with a 50% proficiency expectation.<br>4. Administration/Leadership team will meet with teachers on a weekly basis to evaluate student performance tasks in reading to design a plan of action for improvement. Once the plan of action has been established, a definitive approach to increase mastery will be initiated using the intervention resources (such as the iReady toolbox & Progress Monitoring resources). | Anderson, Karrie, andersonk2@lake.k12.fl.us |

## 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

**Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

SAC and PTO meetings are advertised to all school stakeholders.

Social media platforms are updated frequently and invite families and other key stakeholders to become involved in Clermont Elementary School activities. Information is shared to the following platforms - Clermont Elementary School Website ( www.cel.lake.k12.fl.us ), Facebook ( @CESLakePanthers ), Twitter ( @CESLakePanthers ) and Peachjar.

Data Parent/Teacher Conferences - Teachers will discuss each child's assessment results, expectations and goals for the school year.

Literacy Night - Parents will receive materials and modeling of literacy activities that can be used in the home.

Parent Resource Room Conferences/Prescription Pad - Classroom teachers will identify skills that parents can help with at home. The FSL will help parents choose appropriate materials.

iMOM and All Pro Dad - Increased parent involvement and improved student achievement.

Curriculum Family Events - Increased parent involvement and improved student achievement.

End of the year Family Picnic will consist of all parents/guardians of each student to attend a luncheon provided by the school to promote literacy and community partnerships.

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

All members of the Leadership Team play a role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school. Each Leadership Team Member has partnered with multiple classrooms to provide additional support to teachers, students and families.

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

1. Hold an annual meeting for parents to inform them of the Title 1 program.
2. Involve families in developing, writing and/ or revising the Parent Involvement Plan (PIP) school- parent compact

3. Provide trainings and workshops to build capacity with families and staff to raise student achievement and encourage active participation of families in their child's education.

4. Utilize a percentage of the school Title 1 allocation to support the parent involvement program. The School Advisory Council provides input in determining how the Title 1 funds are used.

5. Provide a Family Engagement Center to provide a place where families can find resources to help their child succeed. Materials can include: ipads, laptops, educational games, school supplies, Roseta Stone and food bags.