

Lake County Schools

Tavares Elementary School



2022-23 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 7/1/2014

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (48%) 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (48%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	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	53%

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.

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

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
McKinney, Durenda	Principal	The principal directs the school leadership team which is composed of administration, instructional coaches and the guidance department. The key responsibility of the principal is to ensure the mission, vision, and collective commitments of our school are implemented with fidelity and consistency, to the fullest extent. The key focus areas are literacy, intervention, and mathematics. The principal is held responsible for ensuring administration and instructional coaches continually progress monitor these areas. Each month students will be monitored for their progress and assist in making sure the appropriate instructional differentiation is implemented within the classroom setting. As a Professional Learning Community, the principal will continually review the school wide goals, assess levels of achievement and progress, and determine any course of action necessary to correct any deficits. This includes creating and implementing professional development for faculty and staff, providing targeted feedback for instructional delivery, and adjusting targeted interventions. The principal promotes parent and community involvement, utilizing the leadership team in ensuring parent involvement is academically focused, centered on improving student achievement, and that all students demonstrate success.
Elliott, Dawn	Assistant Principal	Leadership team participant and Instructional administrator for grades K-2
Werner, Stacia	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.
Luevano, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	Instructional support for all teachers with a specialization in intervention and acceleration support.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2014, Stacia Werner

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

58

Total number of students enrolled at the school

843

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

9

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	115	146	132	171	152	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	844
Attendance below 90 percent	0	82	69	70	55	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	335
One or more suspensions	0	2	16	13	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in ELA	0	10	8	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	8	6	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	6	6	42	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	7	13	16	48	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	2	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/14/2022

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	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

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	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

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	46%	50%	56%				54%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	53%						56%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						38%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	49%	46%	50%				64%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	49%						60%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						40%	39%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	52%	59%				52%	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	52%	60%	-8%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	60%	-8%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	59%	-6%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

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	67%	62%	5%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	61%	4%	64%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	56%	57%	-1%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	50%	56%	-6%	53%	-3%
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	19	49	57	29	45	50	18				
ELL	18	46		30	64						
BLK	33	42	41	35	56	48	29				
HSP	40	47	55	39	48	70	26				
MUL	43	47		44	44		30				
WHT	55	60	68	60	47	29	56				
FRL	38	50	58	43	46	42	30				
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				

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	47
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	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	42
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	54
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	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

- ELA achievement trends have not had any significant changes or increases, remaining lower than pre-Covid 19 achievement levels.
- 3rd grade Math achieved 52% which is aligned with the current district average, however, we scored below the district average in 4th and 5th grade. 5th grade math has increased by 4pts on an upward trend.
- 5th grade Science data showed a significant decline of 11%pts from the previous year.
- Students with Disabilities continues to score below ESSA Federal Index for proficiency requirement.
- ELL subgroup data in grades 3-5 show little to no growth.

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

Based upon final data results, 5th grade Science data indicates a strong need for a focus on curriculum and assessments aligned with the state standards. We will continue to focus on Reading and ELA achievement in order to increase student proficiency levels. Mathematics has become an area of focus in order to raise math proficiency achievement as well.

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

- Conflicting data from the district progress monitoring results versus the state assessment require a wider approach to formal and informal instructional decisions throughout the year.
- We will continue to revise and implement teacher created and standards aligned common assessments utilized on a consistent basis each quarter to assist in accurate Science achievement mapping.
- A focus on elevating ELA achievement due to inconsistent three year data is a major focus and can be supported by teachers incorporating quarterly data chats with students to increase self efficacy and

achievement.

- School-wide focus on intervention time with monitoring and feedback
- Intense focus on 2nd grade intervention planning and monitoring of instructional delivery
- Grade level goals related to improving ELA achievement
- PLC process embedded into all content areas planning/monitoring with curriculum implementation.
- Monitor 4th grade Math to ensure student learning is showing growth through the new curriculum.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 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 from the BOY to the EOY
- Lowest quartile students have been making bigger gains compared to previous years.

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?

- We need to consistently monitor and adjust interventions based upon student performance throughout the school year.
- Continued implementation of the PLC process, embedded in the culture, by adding common assessments to all content areas and discussed during collaborative planning time.
- Focused monitoring on 2nd grade ELA with feedback cycle incorporating teacher feedback from learning walks, but also teachers providing feedback to students on their growth and achievement.

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.

- Collaborative planning and continued support/implementation of the PLC process
- Monthly professional learning for teachers and staff revolving around the evolution of the District Instructional Framework evident in all lessons and units.
- Foundations support and implementation strategies
- How to compare student work and review student data in order to drive instructional decisions
- Wit and Wisdom curriculum training
- Curriculum training on math curriculum "Reveal" with consistent monitoring of implementation of the new Math curriculum

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

Continue after school tutoring, small group instruction, targeted centers with spiral review stations, teacher created acceleration opportunities for centers, instructional feedback based upon trends identified during learning walks.

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.	With high expectations, teachers will plan and deliver standards aligned instruction with a focus on authentic literacy and/or mathematical and numeracy experiences. In ELA, trends across three years of data do not show a significant increase in achievement from 2019 in grades 3-5 and was identified as a critical area of focus. Utilizing the District Instructional Framework supports core content blocks that utilize an explicit focus on student centered learning strategies that incorporate reading, writing, thinking and discussing in every lesson, every day. This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because the 2021-22 data does not show a significant increase in Grades 3-5 ELA/Reading, Mathematics and 5th grade Science. This area of focus will improve student achievement by ensuring teachers are planning and implementing lessons aligned with the B.E.S.T. standards. By ensuring that all lessons are standards aligned and incorporating effective teaching strategies, we will provide all students with independent, collaborative, and hands on learning experiences which will result in student academic success.
--	---

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By focusing on planning standards aligned lessons with consistent implementation, we will increase our ELA, Math and Science achievement scores a minimum of 10% points from the previous year. this will put our ELA achievement at 57%, Math achievement at 61%, and Science achievement at 62%.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area will be monitored using the PLC process emphasizing common assessments and data reviews. Additionally, monitoring through district curriculum implementation and use of the district instructional framework. We will use data collected from both common assessments and district progress monitoring results to identified standards still in need of mastery. The Instructional Coaches and administration will then support directional changes in instruction that align to the scope and sequence of the district and address missed standards. Quarterly data chats will also support teacher reflection where they can compare successful strategies and student work to adjust instruction with what is working best.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

Administration will use Learning Walk data and Targeted Feedback for teachers as a means for maintaining the focus on standards aligned instruction and lesson planning. Teachers and instructional coaches will participate in the revision of common assessments based on learning results and student need; i-Ready and Quarterly teacher led data discussions will be used to ensure data driven decisions are being made as a PLC; Student Goal setting will be used in classrooms to ensure students are a part of the instructional design process.

**implemented
for this Area
of Focus.**

**Rationale for
Evidence-
based**

Strategy:

**Explain the
rationale for
selecting
this specific
strategy.**

**Describe the
resources/
criteria used
for selecting
this
strategy.**

We will be monitoring student learning through common assessments and instructional delivery using the district Instructional Framework. Providing targeted feedback towards adjustments in instructional delivery to teachers will ensure academic student proficiency and success because the focus is unwavering and deliberate.

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.

Teacher Leaders will utilize the PLC process during grade level planning to plan lessons that are aligned to the BEST standards, to design common assessments and scaffolds, and implement appropriate instructional delivery methods using the District Framework.

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

Content Area 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 student mastery of power standards for the development of intervention and acceleration.

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Through small group teacher led instruction, teachers and the instructional support team will plan, deliver and monitor targeted academic, research based, and data-driven instruction through small group and individual interventions for all under performing students and ESSA subgroups. This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need after analyzing state and district assessment data across all grade levels. Reported student achievement was significantly below grade level expectations, with little to no growth for our ESE or African American Male and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. This area of focus will improve learning and success by using evidence based strategies that identify and support struggling students in their areas of deficiency. All intervention strategies are being provided to identified students with fidelity and are reviewed monthly with the MTSS Team and teachers. The students will be monitored and tracked using progress monitoring data that is provided through the intervention programs. Student data points will be analyzed to determine if progress is being made. ESSA subgroup data will be incorporated in monthly data chats to assist teachers with the monitoring of specific trends and areas of focus for instructional planning. When a student demonstrates a lack of appropriate growth, the MTSS team determines if a different research based strategy or layering of tiers will provide the necessary support for academic success, and the MTSS Coordinator/ Interventionist collects and tracks further detailed data.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our students with disabilities subgroup scored below the federal index of 41%. With a sharpened focus on our students with needs, we will demonstrate a growth of ELA achievement from 19% to 25% proficiency, and Math achievement growing from 29% up to 35%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor our SWD subgroup through progress monitoring of district and common assessments. We will also use I-ready progress monitoring growth checks and discussion with teacher observation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Teachers will be using small group lessons to support growth in areas of focus with all students. Varying Exceptionalities teachers will utilize their push-in schedules to support students with disabilities inside the general education classroom to ensure that they are getting grade level and appropriate instruction. They will also provide small group support within the general education classroom, maximizing time on task and focus on grade level learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

By ensuring that students with disabilities remain in the general education classroom and are provided scaffolds and supports in real time, we are ensuring that students are held to high expectations of learning and achievement, moving them closer to proficiency and not just growth.

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.

The master schedule will reflect small group and intervention time.

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

Utilization of LLI, Foundations and SIPPS programs by teachers, teachers assistants and instructional coaches to support student achievement in all grade levels.

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

Accurately identify all students with reading deficits and create instructional groupings to be utilized for any pullout supports and/or classroom push-in support based upon their IEP goals, I-ready results, common assessments and screeners.

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

Review student subgroup data for students with disabilities during leadership meetings and discuss adjustments necessary to groupings, instruction and/or supports.

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

ESE Teachers will create schedules in conjunction with the FIN guidelines of providing support and services based on students with individual needs and goals, reviewing their IEP plans and identifying targeted ELA and Math instruction for students.

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

#3. 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.

Based on Early Warning Systems data, attendance and discipline school-wide needs to improve. Though COVID may have contributed to the lower attendance rates, continued efforts to improve school culture and the learning environment are needed to have a safe learning environment.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Maintain the goal for all students to have attendance of missing less than 10%; Decrease referral rates and Out of School Suspensions by increasing use of Restorative Practice methods and relationship building.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Early Warning Squad, a team of teachers/staff members and administration, will monitor discipline referrals, attendance data and implementation of the new PBIS program.
Behavior Threat Team meetings to track students whose behavior is impeding their learning for intervention or MTSS referral.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Using the EWS data, we will review, revise and consistently monitor the implementation of the PBIS program; Utilize PASS and Mental Health Liaison for early intervention and teacher use of restorative practices

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Early intervention is key to changing behavior, so monthly tracking and intervention for attendance and behavior to ensure students remain in school which will lead to an increase in learning.

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.

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

Person Responsible

Stacia Werner (werners1@lake.k12.fl.us)

Continue use of PBIS and Restorative Practices

Person Responsible

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

PASS and Mental Health Liaison to provide professional development to teachers emphasizing alternatives to controlling student behavior in the classroom.

Person Responsible

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

#4. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback/Walkthroughs**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

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, will positively impact student achievement and proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective 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: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Administrators, Content Area Coaches and Teacher Leaders will guide the implementation and monitoring of the PLC process. Grade-level goals will be related to improving proficiency in all content areas and student groups will be monitored monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacia Werner (werner1@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Development of SMART goals aligned with the BEST power standards
Create and utilize of common assessments

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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

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.

School Guiding Coalition, made up of teacher leaders and administration, will direct and monitor the use of the PLC process and goal achievement school-wide.

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

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

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)

Content Area 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)

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

We implement systematic Phonics instruction, utilizing Foundations, LLI and SIPPS. Teachers use formative assessment to create small groups for targeted instruction. Teacher created centers are implemented that provide extra practice for student independent practice.

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

Results of students in grades 3-5 on state standardized testing show 50%.of students in all 3 grade levels scoring below Level 3 on ELA state standardized tests. Third grade Level 3 results were 46%, Fourth grade 40% and Fifth grade scored 47%. We implement systematic Phonics instruction for striving learners in 3rd and 4th grade, utilizing Foundations. We provide targeted intervention using LLI and SIPPS for many other striving readers in grades 3-5. Teachers use formative assessment to create small groups for targeted instruction. Teacher created centers are implemented that provide extra practice for student independent practice.

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 in Kindergarten will score above 90% proficiency on the end of the year state assessment. Students in First Grade will score 60% proficiency and Second Grade students will increase by 10% also scoring at least 65%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Students in Third Grade will score above 50% proficiency on the end of the year state assessment. Students in Fourth Grade will score 51% proficiency and Fifth Grade students will increase by 10% also scoring at least 44%.

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.

Tavares Elementary will monitor ELA progress of all students throughout the year . Students in VPK-2 will participate in FAST STAR as well as i-Ready Reading three times a year. Students in grades 3-5 will also take i-Ready diagnostic three times per year as well as FAST, the new state assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

McKinney, Durenda, mckinneyd@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?

Tavares Elementary utilizes the district adopted Reading Curriculum Wit and Wisdom for grades K-5. Included in that curriculum is Fun-dations, a phonics based program which is used in grades K-3. Students identified with a reading deficit receive skill specific small group instruction as well as intervention using SIPPS, Systematic instruction in Phonics and Phonemic Awareness or LLI, Leveled Literacy Intervention.

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?

Tavares Elementary utilizes the district adopted Reading Curriculum which was vetted and voted on to address the needs of students to increase reading achievement as measured by end of the year assessments.

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
Participate in RAISE Universal Webinar to increase understanding of evidence-based practices in delivering PreK-5 literacy instruction.	McKinney, Durenda, mckinneyd@lake.k12.fl.us
Teachers will utilize best practices in teaching students Reading standards as outlined in the District Instructional Framework. These strategies will be discussed during weekly Professional Learning Communities, Monitored during Learning Walks and Learning assessed through Common Assessment.	McKinney, Durenda, mckinneyd@lake.k12.fl.us
Teachers will utilize data from i-Ready Reading to drive instructional decisions and provide targeted assistance to students in need of additional support.	Le Moyne, Judith Ann, lemoynej@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.

Tavares Elementary school shares our vision and mission with the entire community. It is created through teambuilding, mutual trust and respect for faculty, staff, student and families alike, and a commitment to clear and high expectations. Through our monthly family engagement events, we ensure that all stakeholders are intentionally welcomed as a part of the TES Family. Every adult on campus is committed to the continued excellence of the school as a whole, as well as all individual students. Monthly Student Advisory Council meetings are held to include the voice of any and all stakeholders in the development and implementation of strategic initiatives for student success. We hold Parent Teacher Organization monthly meetings to continue to build ongoing support and relationships between families and the classroom.

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

The following stakeholder groups are integral for TES continued success:

- School Leadership
- Faculty and Staff
- SAC Members
- PTO Members
- Community Partners such as Winn Dixie, Lake Francis Estates, Fox Run, United Methodist Church of Tavares