

Sumter District Schools

Lake Panasoffkee Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Lake Panasoffkee Elementary School

790 CR 482N, Lake Panasoffkee, FL 33538

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Nicole Wade

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sumter 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Lake Panasoffkee Elementary School is committed to ensuring that each student has the opportunity to acquire the skills necessary for becoming a responsible, productive citizen able to cope with changing social and economic conditions. High academic achievement by students enrolled at Lake Panasoffkee Elementary is of the utmost concern to the school's primary stakeholders, which includes parents, families, teachers, community partners, and leaders, elected officials and administrators. The staff of Lake Panasoffkee Elementary works to meet the individual needs of each student, taking into consideration their unique attributes and capabilities.

Provide the school's vision statement

SOARING HIGHER-Lake Panasoffkee Elementary School will strive to provide students with an environment conducive to developing a positive self-image and the learning skills needed throughout a lifetime.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wade, Nicole	Principal	
Hunt, Shelly	Teacher, K-12	
James, Connie	Teacher, K-12	
Randolph, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12	
Sherman, Landrea	Guidance Counselor	
Wojnarowski, Rosemary	Teacher, K-12	
Davin, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Williams, Deserae	Teacher, ESE	
Peacock, Jeanine	Instructional Media	
Rockey, Stephen	Assistant Principal	
Ashley, Sissy	Teacher, K-12	
Lamb, Danielle		

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Nicole Wade

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

6

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

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

29

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

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

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	79	62	82	100	77	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	486
Attendance below 90 percent	1	4	10	10	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	3	5	9	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	0	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	0	2	2	3	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	9	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/27/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	73	100	107	85	83	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	539
Attendance below 90 percent	5	17	14	10	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	2	7	1	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	10	11	5	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	4	3	1	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	2	10	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	2	10	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	73	100	107	85	83	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	539
Attendance below 90 percent	5	17	14	10	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	2	7	1	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	10	11	5	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	4	3	1	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	2	10	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	2	10	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	66%	56%	57%	72%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	71%	58%	58%	66%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	51%	53%	39%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	68%	61%	63%	79%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	71%	68%	62%	76%	53%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	55%	51%	72%	45%	47%
Science Achievement	63%	62%	53%	79%	65%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	66%	-4%	58%	4%
	2018	67%	67%	0%	57%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	62%	8%	58%	12%
	2018	73%	71%	2%	56%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	63%	65%	-2%	56%	7%
	2018	70%	61%	9%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	66%	64%	2%	62%	4%
	2018	72%	67%	5%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	72%	8%	64%	16%
	2018	80%	71%	9%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	58%	69%	-11%	60%	-2%
	2018	81%	67%	14%	61%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison		-22%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	65%	66%	-1%	53%	12%
	2018	78%	68%	10%	55%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	43	70	57	47	65	42	42				
BLK	48	69		57	55						
HSP	71	94		65	87						
WHT	67	67	43	69	70	52	65				
FRL	57	69	57	62	67	45	60				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	42	48	37	52	64	61	50				
BLK	47	42		63	75						
HSP	62	78		69	67						
MUL	88	45		75	64						
WHT	74	67	38	81	78	77	82				
FRL	66	63	31	74	73	69	73				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	446
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	57
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	79
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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 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	62
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	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends

Our area of lowest performance was 5th grade math. The main contributing factor was a lack of support/mentoring for new teachers to learn the test item specifications and grade level standards which precipitated lower than normal achievement on the FSA test.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline

Our area of greatest decline was 5th grade math. The main contributing factor was a lack of support/mentoring for new teachers to learn the test item specifications and grade level standards which precipitated lower than normal achievement on the FSA test.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

5th grade math had a gap of 2% compared to the state. Last year we were 7% above the state average. The factors contributing to this gap appear to be focused on lack of support/mentoring for new teachers to learn the test item specifications and grade level standards. With continuity in place; this year looks to be much better.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data component which showed the most improvement were the ELA gains for the bottom quartile. This data component increased 17 points from 2018. The ELA teachers focused on the state standards using collaborative teaching methods, Achieve 3000, Moby Max and the purposeful, teacher and student directed use of small groups.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

The main area of potential concern is attendance below 90%. Students who are not in attendance are not learning. this factor had to do with lowered achievement by our students.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year

1. Math Learning gains of our black students- Down 20 points
2. Science achievement-Down 16 points
3. Bottom Quartile math achievement-Down 19 points
4. Students with disabilities Learning gains of the bottom quartile- Down 19 points
5. 5th grade math achievement-Down 11 points

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Our overall mathematics proficiency score dropped 9 points from 2017-2018, with 5th grade dropping 22 points.

Measureable Outcome:

Increase the math proficiency in 3rd grade from 62% to 73%.
 Increase the math proficiency in 5th grade from 60% to 75%.
 Increase the math lowest quartile in 5th grade from 25% to 70%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephen Rockey (stephen.rockey@sumter.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will use I-Ready assessments, Moby Max skill builder data and XtraMath for facts fluency to monitor progress towards goal with all students in grades K-5. Fidelity of all programs will be monitored weekly by administration.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. I-Ready meets the criteria for ESSA Level 3: Promising Evidence, with favorable effects.
2. I-Ready diagnostic provides teachers with a detailed, customized evaluation of every student.
3. Diagnostic results help teachers better understand their students' individual needs.
4. Teachers will submit lesson plans weekly into their OneNote notebook.
5. Administration will monitor plans.
6. Administration will conduct walk-throughs and provide feedback to teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will utilize the LFS instructional sequence to build background knowledge and key vocabulary prior to releasing students to read and analyze complex text.
2. Teachers will use Moby Max and i-Ready with fidelity to build skills and reinforce concepts.
3. Teachers will be provided professional development in Core Connections.
4. ELA and Math professional learning communities will meet biweekly to review standards, conduct data chats, and share best practices for instruction.
5. Teachers will facilitate daily small group instruction using data from IReady for flexible grouping.
6. Utilize use of P.E. waiver for additional ELA instruction with the teacher.

- 7. Students who fall in the bottom quartile work with the teacher on targeted reading skills.
- 8. Quarterly school-wide AR incentives.
- 9. Utilize MyOn reading program.
- 10. Teachers in grades K-1 will utilize the Saxon Phonics program as an instructional tool and curriculum to help students build a solid foundation in phonemic awareness, phonics, and other literacy skills.
- 11. Teachers will encourage math talk as a conduit to seek to develop mathematical understanding.
- 11. Teachers will encourage math talk as a conduit to seek to develop mathematical understanding.

Person Responsible Allen Ashley (allen.ashley@sumter.k12.fl.us)

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measureable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Increased tracking of Bottom Quartile ELA students

Focused use of MyOn Reading in grades 3, 4 & 5

MyOn books assigned for Science and Social Studies

Peer Review for writing

Communication across grade levels for expectations

Math

Emphasize collaboration and developing social capital.

Note Taking

Departmentalization of grades 4 and 5

LFS Focus on Higher Order Thinking

PLC/Data Chats/Lesson Development & Collaboration

Deconstruct standards

Study test item specs

Science

Study Island 3rd and 4th grade review, 60 book challenge, Science Superstars,

Explore

Learning Gizmos, frequent hands on instruction, Coach book, formative testing,

Blue Ribbon

challenge in Study Island grade level standards.

PLC's - data chats and analyzing test item specs to drive lesson development and collaboration

Participate in district STEM advisory team and district science meetings

Hands-on experiments in classrooms for each lesson

60 Book Non-Fiction Challenge for 5th Grade

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Lake Panasoffkee Elementary School Culture Plan for the 2020-2021 School Year.

- ? Tier 1 Programs
(Universal/School wide)
- ? Attendance.
- ? Mentoring

- ? Teachers have a sign on their door of the college they attended
- ? Teachers also are asked to encourage students to have a growth mindset
- ? SEL
- ? Trauma Sensitive Classroom training.
- ? Social Emotional Learning using the Sanford Harmony
- ? October is considered “Anti-bullying” month.
- ? The last week in October is “Red Ribbon” Week.
- ? Anti-bullying-The school counselor provides anti-bullying e
- ? The Olweus Survey is given each fall by the school counselor.
- ? Character Education (Tier I only – can be curriculum based or event/activity based, or both –
- ? Classroom teachers will teach patriotism, responsibility, citizenship, kindness, respect for authority, life, liberty, and personal property, honesty, charity, self-control, racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance, and cooperation.
- ? PBS Expectations, rules, and appropriate ways to behave are taught.
- ? Focus is placed on desirable behavior with the goal to teach appropriate skills and reward appropriate behavior.
- Tier 2 Programs
- ? Attendance: Students who miss between 10% and 20% of school time will receive Tier 2 interventions and will be on a “watch list”.
- ? Mentoring
- ? ? Using early warning indicators, and staff and parent recommendations, students who are identified as needing increased support are referred to the Mental Health Problem Solving Team.
- ? Students identified as making a threat to others or themselves are referred to the Threat Assessment Team.
- ? Anti-bullying-All reports of bullying are thoroughly investigated by administration.

- ? Tier 3 Programs, including details for each (Intensive/Individual)
- ? Attendance-? Students who have missed more than 20% of the school days will receive Tier 3 interventions. These students will receive a daily check with an attendance mentor (may be assistant principal or other mentor).
- ? These students will also be referred to Youth and Family Alternatives to support the family in removing the barriers to improve attendance.
- ? Mentoring (At Tier 2 and 3, mentoring may be used as a response or intervention for areas such as attendance or bullying. Please list that info here)
- ? Anti-bullying-All reports of repeated bullying or victims of repeated bullying are thoroughly investigated by administration.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget			
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00