Mascotte Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mascotte Elementary School

460 MIDWAY AVE, Mascotte, FL 34753

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

Demographics

Principal: Tiffany Mayhugh Rego

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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: D (38%) 2020-21: (43%) 2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 8/15/2022.

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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership
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
Mayhugh-Rego, Tiffany	Principal	
Bultema, Leah	Assistant Principal	
Coleman, Tony	Assistant Principal	
McMillan, Mary Lou	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Newman, Wendi	Reading Coach	
Kieft, Robyn	Instructional Coach	
Kovacsev, Jason	Dean	
Ramkissoon, Anita	Staffing Specialist	
Cousins, Jodi	Guidance Counselor	
Ortiz, Cynthia	Guidance Counselor	
	Math Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Tiffany Mayhugh Rego

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.*
26

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.*
18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
54

Total number of students enrolled at the school

860

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

4

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

6

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	157	137	139	126	115	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	799
Attendance below 90 percent	3	39	47	33	34	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	189
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	7	29	27	31	43	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169
Course failure in Math	5	15	10	9	21	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	17	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	28	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	14	14	10	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

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	2	10	9	10	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	7	7	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/1/2022

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	24	9	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	10	24	9	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	45%			48%			52%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	45%			37%			44%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%			30%			40%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	43%			51%			51%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	39%			53%			51%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	24%			35%			24%	39%	51%
Science Achievement	35%			45%			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	62%	60%	2%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	60%	-11%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	42%	59%	-17%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

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	50%	62%	-12%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	61%	-9%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	53%	-1%
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	22	38	23	22	31	26	29				
ELL	33	39	42	35	29	14	36				
BLK	38	35		33	17		31				
HSP	44	46	30	41	34	17	31				
MUL	67			58							
WHT	47	44	35	50	55	50	41				
FRL	43	43	35	40	40	24	33				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	31	22		40	33		29				
ELL	22	26	36	36	35		30				
BLK	66	60		45	50						
HSP	42	23	17	48	52	33	36				
MUL	64			45							
WHT	52	52		60	58		60				
FRL	42	30	35	45	46	37	38				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	35	25	22	30	29	26	31				
ELL	31	27	36	38	42	28	26				
BLK	61	53		46	53		64				
HSP	46	39	36	48	43	21	42				
MUL	60			30							
WHT	57	46	42	56	60	30	62				
FRL	46	37	39	46	49	22	43				

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	329
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	31
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	39
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	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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

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	46
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?

5th grade proficiency fell in all content areas.
Math proficiency in 5th grade decreased from the previous year's 5th grade students 51% 35%. In addition, the math proficiency of students in 5th grade decreased from 39% when they took the FSA assessment in 4th grade to 35% as 5th graders.
Reading proficiency decreased from 43% to 31% for 5th grade. The performance level from 4th to 5th decreased from 40% to 31%.

4th grade math proficiency increased from 2021 to 2022 from 39% to 43%. That was a decrease from the proficiency in 3rd grade.
4th Grade reading proficiency increased from 40% in 2021 to 45% in 2022. The students proficiency decreased from 3rd to 4th grade.

3rd math proficiency decreased from 56% in 2021 to 49% in 2022.
3rd grade reading remained at 52% proficient for both years with a 1 scale score point increase.

Math Learning Gains as a school decreased from 53% to 39%, while the lower quartile decreased from 35% to 24%
ELA had Learning gains increase from 37% to 45% . The lower quartile learning gains increased from 30% to 33%

ELA - our ELL students improved in all three areas, achievement 22%-33%, learning gains 26% - 39% and lower quartile 36% - 42%. Math indicated decreases in all areas.

ELA - SWD students decreased in proficiency 31%-22%, increased in learning gains 22% to 38% . The lower quartile we have no data for 2021 and 23% for the 22022 school year.

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

Learning gains of lowest 25% for all groups except our ELL in ELA.
Math Learning gains and lower quartile for all subgroups.
Based on progress monitoring and FSA data, Math performance, Science performance, and ELA performance show the need for the greatest 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?

Absences of both students and support staff contributed to creating gaps in learning and the need for improvement. The absences hindered the ability to provide consistency in instruction and implementation of intervention programs. Fidelity of B.E.S.T. standards implementation in grades 3-5 for both ELA and Math and instructional time on task will assist with mastery of benchmarks for all. In analyzing our FSA data there were 15 students in reading and math that were bubble students, meaning they were 2 scale score points or less away from being considered proficient. Those students will be targeted for intervention in the 2022-2023 school year.

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

Based on progress monitoring and the FSA results, students that received the LLI intervention showed the most movement in students from Level 1 to Level 2.

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

Based on progress monitoring and the FSA results, students that received the LLI intervention showed the most movement from students from Level 1 to Level 2. LLI provides prompting questions that have contributed our our students being better able to analyze and discuss text.

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

The new B.E.S.T standards in grades 3-5 will be implemented this year. Core ELA curriculum is Benchmark Advance. Teachers will also utilize Daily 5 for ELA instruction and Daily 3 for Math and Science. Teachers in K-1 will be implementing Heggerty Phonemic Awareness resources and strategies. Bridging the Gap will be utilized in the 2nd grade Intensive Reading Classroom, 3rd grade Intensive Reading Classroom, ESE and ELL students. ESE teachers will be providing push-in services in the classroom to assist the students during Math instruction. ELL TA's will also be providing services to our ELL students in the classroom. Instructional Coaches will be visiting classrooms on a daily basis. Fountas and Pinnell LLI is utilized for intensive Reading Intervention for our ESE and Tier 3 ELA students.

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.

Teachers will participate in the workshops provided by Benchmark Advance to become familiar with this new curriculum and the best ways to utilize this curriculum to meet the needs of students. Teachers have been aligning the B.E.S.T standards, utilizing rubrics in the classroom, and choosing appropriate assessments to assess the B.E.S.T standards. Kagan training is also being offered to assist teachers in using Thinking Strategies to engage all learners in the classroom. Daily 5 ELA will be implemented in the classrooms along with Benchmark Advance. Daily 3 for Science and Math will also be used to help organize student learning in the classroom. ESE teachers will be participating in Orton Gillingham

training to meet the needs of our Exceptional Education students. Secret Stories training will also be provided for teachers Pre-K-2, including ESE teachers, Media Center and the Art teacher so they can implement Secret Stories in their daily instruction. 2nd & 3rd grade teachers will be participating in Reciprocal Teaching training. K-5 will participate in training in Annotating texts to help improve our students comprehension skills. Teachers and administrators will be participating in a book study on How to Motivate Students that Don't Care.

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

Benchmark Advance is the ELA curriculum. Daily 5 ELA will be implemented in the classrooms. Daily 3 for Science and Math will organize student learning in the classroom. Secret Stories will be used in grade K-2 plus intervention classes to increase phonics proficiency. Heggerty Phonemic Awareness will be used with students K-1. Heggerty Bridging the Gap will be used with students in the 2nd and 3rd grade Intensive Reading Classroom, and with ESE and ELL students. Two ELL TA's will be working with our ELL students in the classroom focusing on Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, and Comprehension skills. An ESE Resource Room and teacher has been added this year to work with students to provide support. Foundational Literacy instruction focusing on Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, and Vocabulary will be used with Tier 3 ELA students. Some ESE and Tier 3 ELA students will receive interventions and instruction using Fountas & Pinnell LLI program. ESE teachers will be providing push-in services in the classroom to assist the students during Math instruction. ELL TA's will be providing services to ELL students in the classroom. A Math Coach will be working with struggling students to increase math skills and strategies as well as providing support for teachers. We have a Math TA to provide support for bubble students in the 4th and 5th grade classrooms. 4th and 5th grade students will be using strategies and organizational techniques provided through the AVID program. 5th grade students will be participating in Service Learning.

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	FSA and progress monitoring data indicates that the ELL population is struggling in grades 3-5. Instructional practices are needed that will strengthen the achievement and Learning Gains of the ELL population in both ELA and Math.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The number of ELL students scoring at or above the 50th percentile on FAST and STAR will increase to 48% percent in both reading and math. 60% of our ELL students will make learning gains in both reading and math.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	To monitor this focus area, instructional coaches will facilitate weekly data analysis and help teachers with developing lessons to differentiate instruction on essential standards to lead students to mastery. Principal and Assistant Principals will conduct learning walks to look for transfer of common planning, standards-aligned instruction and student assignments. The leadership team will review progress monitoring data from STAR Reading, STAR Math, Science PMA, Mini-Benchmarks, Freckle ELA & Math, Zearn, Writing and F.A.S.T. assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	ELA- Systematic Explicit Instruction will occur day using our core curriculums, Benchmark Advance and Eureka Math. Secret Stories and Heggerty PA will be used for all K & 1 students, Heggerty's Bridging the Gap and Secret Stories will be used intensive instruction in grades 2-5. In addition all classrooms will use the a Daily 5 for reading and Daily 3 for math to provide and consistent routine of Reading, writing and phonics/morphology/ vocabulary instruction. Eureka math with support from Zearn, online support, will be used with fidelity in all math classrooms. Each student had been provided with a math manipulatives kit to provide concrete practice of math skills. Teachers and TA's will provide

implemented for this Area of Focus.	small group instruction to increase students mastery of the B.E.S.T. standards and achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The Curriculum team researched effective strategies for ELL students. Core and supplemental curriculum was selected that would facilitate student achievement and learning gains.

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 all students that are included in our ELL subgroup.

Person Responsible	Cynthia Ortiz (ortizc@lake.k12.fl.us)

Provide teachers with student data and expected learning gains.

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

Monitor students in class instructional strategies and additional support opportunities.

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

Analyze student progress monitoring data and classroom performance.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
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 data, it is evident that we have students on varying levels and many who need more small group/differentiated support to meet their individual needs in Mathematics. It is important that we are providing our students with the opportunity to build understanding in the area of mathematics, as well as, enrichment experiences when necessary. This will allow the students to effectively translate their knowledge of concrete models and examples to applying this knowledge to the abstract symbols and procedures in mathematics.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	70% of students will score at or above the 50th percentile on our progress monitoring assessments. 70% of students will make at least 1 year's growth according to progress monitoring assessments.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	This will be monitored through daily classroom visits by the administrative team and instructional coaches. Administration and teachers will monitor assessment data, as well as, STAR PMAs throughout the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Direct explicit instruction with small group support and math manipulative kits for students to have hands on practice with concrete models for math skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	These strategies have been used effectively in prior years. Re-emphasizing and monitoring these practices should produce the desired outcomes. In addition, the discussions that students and teachers are able to have in small groups gives teachers insight into student thinking so they can better support student learning. Students need the opportunity to build their understanding by utilizing manipulatives or representations. Small groups are the perfect time to use math manipulatives in a more controlled environment.

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.

Provide professional development sessions in the areas of data analysis, data-driven instruction, and planning for Daily 3.

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

Use classroom visit form to document classroom activities.

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

Teachers will have the opportunity to attend collegial planning with their grade level colleagues to analyze data and plan for effective implementation of Math Daily 3.

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

Provide coaching and feedback to improve instructional practices in classrooms as needed.

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

Teachers will have monthly data chats with individual students in order to set goals, discuss progress, and inform students of areas of strength and areas of growth. Students need to know and understand their goal, their progress, and what they are working towards, then they are more likely to buy-in and engage during instruction and meet their individual learning targets.

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

#3. 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.	FSA data indicates that though ELA achievement level dropped to 22%, learning gains increased by 16 points, from 22% to 38%. In math there was a drop in both achievement and learning gains.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	ELA Learning gains for SWD students will increase to 45% on the F.A.S.T. and 40% SWD students will score at or above the 50th percentile on STAR Reading. Math Learning gains will increase to 45% and 50% of SWD will score at or above the 50th percentile on STAR Math.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Classroom assessment and Progress monitoring will be analyzed after each assessment cycle.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Lou McMillan (mcmillanm@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	LLI is used to provide explicit small group instruction. Students are tested and receive instruction on the correct reading level. LLI has an excellent prompting guide that gives the students the skills necessary to analyze and discuss text. SWD students receive in class assistance provided by a VE teacher to increase student understanding. In addition students receive small group instruction provided by the classroom teacher.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The What Works Clearinghouse research indicates that LLI has a positive effect on Reading Achievement.

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.

Students will be BAS tested for correct instructional level and be placed in an LLI group.

Person Responsible	Robyn Kieft (kieftr@lake.k12.fl.us)

LLI groups will be scheduled for 4 days per week for 30 minutes.

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

LLI groups and VE push in math assistance will be monitored by the administrative team for fidelity and engagement using a form for documentation.

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

VE teachers will be assigned students for push in math assistance.

Person Responsible	Anita Ramkissoon (bajrangia@lake.k12.fl.us)

Progress monitoring and class data will be analyzed by the leadership each monitoring cycle. Adjustments will be made in order to maximize student learning.

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

#4. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our data indicated a downward trend across all content areas that needs to be reversed.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our school will improve achievement in Reading, Math and Science to 55%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	To monitor this focus area, instructional coaches will facilitate weekly data analysis and help teachers with developing lessons to differentiate instruction on essential standards to lead students to mastery. Principal and Assistant Principals will conduct learning walks to look for transfer of common planning, standards-aligned instruction and student assignments. The leadership team will review progress monitoring data from STAR Reading, STAR Math, Science PMA, Mini-Benchmarks, Freckle ELA & Math, Zearn, Writing.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego (mayhugh-regot@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Our teachers will use Daily 5, for ELA and Daily 3 for Math and Science. This approach provides a structure for practice to increase stamina and achievement in the content areas. It also provides daily practice for skills and time for small groups to provide assistance for our students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	We have seen the effectiveness of this strategy in a few of our classrooms in the past few years. Those teachers were considered to be highly effective. Implementing this strategy schoolwide will provide each of our students with the opportunity to gain the stamina and skills necessary to be successful in the classroom.

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.

Purchase The Daily 5 book.

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

Create a Book Study PLC for Daily 5

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

Conduct PD with staff on Daily 5

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

Monitor implementation in classroom visits. Use data form for documentation.

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

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	The lack of achievement across the content area indicated the need for a focus on the B.E.S.T. Standards.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our school achievement in Reading, Math and Science will be 55%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Daily class visits and professional development
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Providing a clear focus on the object will improve achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	

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.	

Purchase B.E.S.T. Standards resource guides for each teacher for Reading and Math..

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

Provide professional development in house and through Uncomplicate Ed.

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

Provide professional development for the Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards and the ELA Expectations. Provide student copies of both as a resource during instruction reflection.

Person Responsible	Robyn Kieft (kieftr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Conduct daily classroom visits to monitor the implementation of the B.E.S.T. Standards in reading and math classrooms.

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

Conduct data analysis after progress monitoring assessments to check student achievement.

Person Responsible	Mary Lou McMillan (mcmillanm@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.

Postive connections and relationships with families and community members are supported and organized throughour school's Title 1 Family Engagement Plan. Mascotte Charter School hosts multiple events throughout the year involving families and community members in both academic and creative experiences at the school. events include: Family Science Night, the Annual Storybook/Vocabulary Parade, Kindergarten signing day, Family Art Night, Parent Conferences, The Parent Institute, and Family Literacy Nights. The school has programs in place such as Accelerated Reader to promote reading as a priority. As a Growth Mindset Model School, positive relations and interactions are promoted between students, staff, and parents through school-wide initiatives and training. Mascotte Charter School encourages volunteerism by community members by have a dedicated volunteer coordinator responsible for recruitment, placement and training of volunteers.
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site and on the school's website.

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

Mascotte Charter School Governing Board:
Chair-JoAnn Jones
Co-Chair-Elizabeth Villanueva
Member-Stacy Gaines
Member-Rich Backus
Member/Parent-Eric Leibert

School:
CEO/Principal-Tiffany Mayhugh-Rego
Finance Officer-Tarsha Jacobs