Lancaster Elementary

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
students
mission
family and community involvement
school improvement
ambitious
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
needs assessment
success
resources
areas of focus
instruction
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
growth

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lancaster Elementary

6700 SHERYL ANN DR, Orlando, FL 32809

https://lancasteres.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 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	95%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	B	C	D	D*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title
Suggs, Lisa	Principal
Moore, Sigrid	Instructional Coach
Wubbena, Amanda	Instructional Coach
Rosario, Sarah	Instructional Coach
Rumph, Barbara	Assistant Principal
Cannon, Whitney	Instructional Coach
Rivera, Maira	Instructional Coach
Young, Charonn	School Counselor

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Lancaster's Leadership team includes the principal, assistant principal, staffing coordinator, guidance counselor, reading coaches, math/science coach, testing coordinator and dean. The team meets regularly to discuss and analyze the percentage of students who are meeting the tier expectations, by grade level and individual teacher. Using the data the team will plan out strategies to adjust and share with the grade level or teacher. The team will continuously plan, implement, revise and monitor the data during team meetings to share and brainstorm ideas to reach the maximum potential of each teacher and student.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	28	29	33	28	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	4	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	53	58	96	126	79	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	472
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	54	45	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	20	19	30	64	43	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214

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	3	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	5	3	6	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

Date this data was collected

Tuesday 7/10/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	32	28	28	23	19	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	2	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	49	50	38	112	46	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	422
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	87	47	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	271

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	17	17	13	73	32	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	243

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	32	28	28	23	19	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	2	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	49	50	38	112	46	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	422
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	87	47	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	271

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	17	17	13	73	32	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	243

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Fifth grade science was the lowest data component for the 2017 - 2018 assessment administration. Historically, student performance on FCAT Science 2.0 is lower than ELA and mathematics. Student performance improved by 19% from the prior year.
It appears that there may be some correlation between students' FSA ELA and FCAT Science 2.0 performance. Forty-nine or 41% of fifth grade students were proficient (3+) on the ELA and 45% were proficient (3+) on the science assessment. Additionally, 25% of fifth grade students scored a level 1 on the ELA and 29% scored level 1 on the science assessment.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Learning gains for ELA and ELA lowest quartile possessed the greatest decline from the prior year. Both data components declined by 10%. A decline across all subgroups of -6% or more for ELA learning gains except for SWD which improved by 7%. A decline across all subgroups of -10% or more also occurred for ELA lowest quartile students.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

When comparing each data component to the state, the area that Lancaster possessed the biggest gap in student performance was in ELA proficiency. The state's ELA proficiency was at 56% whereas Lancaster's ELA proficiency was at 48% or a -8% gap in performance. Additionally, grade level school to state comparison revealed a gap of -11% for grade three, -14% for grade 4 and -13% for grade 5.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

When the trends from 2015-16 through 2017-18 were analyzed, the data component that had consistently improved each year was student performance for mathematics gains. Gains improved by 38% in 2016, 20% in 2017 and 7% by 2018. Each year, overall performance is improving, however, the rate of improvement is declining. A highlight from the grade level data was grade 4 outperforming the district by 3% and the state by 3%.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Departmentalization allowed teachers to focus on planning for instruction in fewer content areas. Time was built into the master schedule to allow for common planning. Grade level math teams met as a professional learning community to discuss effectiveness of plans and make adjustments as appropriate, assessment development and data discussions. The math coach met with the teams during planning to serve as a resource to help facilitate discussions and district/school curriculum and instructional expectations. Implementation of plans included whole and small group instruction. Through the continuous improvement cycle, teachers reviewed student data to determine if needs could be met through reteaching or small group instruction. Students were provided an opportunity to work at their instructional level on iReady Math or complete specific lessons assigned by the teacher.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	48%	56%	56%	33%	53%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	55%	55%	35%	52%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	48%	48%	37%	42%	46%
Math Achievement	62%	63%	62%	39%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains	64%	57%	59%	38%	54%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	46%	47%	31%	41%	46%
Science Achievement	45%	55%	55%	34%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	28 (32)	29 (28)	33 (28)	28 (23)	18 (19)	17 (36)	153 (166)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	1 (1)	2 (3)	4 (2)	4 (2)	2 (7)	13 (16)
Course failure in ELA or Math	53 (49)	58 (50)	96 (38)	126 (112)	79 (46)	60 (127)	472 (422)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	54 (87)	45 (47)	39 (137)	138 (271)

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	2018	46%	55%	-9%	57%	-11%
	2017	37%	57%	-20%	58%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
	2017	53%	57%	-4%	56%	-3%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2018	42%	55%	-13%	55%	-13%
	2017	30%	51%	-21%	53%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	56%	61%	-5%	62%	-6%
	2017	65%	63%	2%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	65%	62%	3%	62%	3%
	2017	61%	64%	-3%	64%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2018	47%	59%	-12%	61%	-14%
	2017	32%	56%	-24%	57%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	41%	53%	-12%	55%	-14%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	12	38		20	50	60					
ELL	39	54	60	57	62	67	21				
BLK	50	60	80	64	68	64	50				
HSP	47	55	61	61	61	70	43				
WHT	50	36		56	57						
FRL	49	55	64	61	62	63	44				

2017 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	11	31		21	31	30					
ELL	33	60	73	54	57	49	23				
ASN	90			90							
BLK	48	71	94	54	59	57	14				
HSP	37	63	71	55	56	48	26				
WHT	52	59		70	59		36				
FRL	42	65	73	56	58	50	26				

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Invest in Human Capital
Rationale	In order to ensure that all students are able to learn to his/her potential, we must provide students with quality instruction that removes barriers to student's academic progress. Learning gains in English/Language Arts (ELA) declined by 10% from the prior year. Although proficiency levels are consistent between subgroups, Black students significantly scored better than white students in learning gains (60% - 36%). Structures are needed to ensure a clear focus on standards-based instruction and research-based practices that support literacy across the content areas for all students. A cycle of professional learning is needed to build the capacity of faculty and staff to ensure consistency and coherence between members of grade level teams as well as across grade levels and content areas.
Intended Outcome	As a result of sending a school-based team to participate in the District Professional Learning Community (DPLC), the school-based team will bring back specific expertise to the faculty/staff and grade level teams. The school-based team will facilitate engagement in cycles of professional learning geared towards strengthening protocols for collaboration, streamlining planning and instruction and building peer capacity in research-based literacy practices that promote academic growth in content areas. Improved student performance in comprehension in literary and informational text and vocabulary should be evident.
Point Person	Lisa Suggs (lisa.suggs@ocps.net)
Action Step	
Description	Members of the school-based DPLC will attend planned District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) meetings. The team will create and implement an action plan outlining each cycle of professional learning. Grade level teams will have a DPLC representative or an instructional coach present at planning meetings to disseminate grade-specific learning, collaboratively develop assessments and units of study. Coaches will engage in targeted coaching cycles to allow for differentiated professional development. Opportunities for peers to observe classrooms, including ghost walks, will be available. Classroom walk throughs with feedback will be conducted regularly by leadership team.
Person Responsible	Lisa Suggs (lisa.suggs@ocps.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Sign-in sheets will be maintained for each school-base cycle of professional learning. The reading specialist or instructional coach will participate in planning sessions, monitor lesson plans, observe classrooms, provide feedback and follow up to monitor for progress in professional practice. Notes and feedback provided within the iObservation tool will be examined. Collaborative monitoring of student data will also be tracked and discussed to determine effectiveness of planning and quality of instruction meeting the needs of all students. Data gathered from BPIE and AdvancEd surveys will also be examined to ensure best practices are in place to meet the varying needs of the students in which we serve.
Person Responsible	Lisa Suggs (lisa.suggs@ocps.net)

Activity #2	
Title	Accelerate Student Performance
Rationale	The purpose of focusing on standards-based instruction is to provide guidance to teachers in the planning, implementation and assessment of student learning. It is important for teachers to know and understand what students should know, be able to do and implement a plan for multi-tiered support for those students who are performing below the expectations. Teaching to the demand of the standard will help guide choices made regarding instructional methods of delivery and assessment. Through the investment of time, resources and support, a culture of continuous learning and high performing teams can flourish.
Intended Outcome	Teachers will have access to multiple resource personnel to help build capacity in planning rigorous, standard-based lessons with aligned assessment(s). Instructional planning will embed strategies that support the learning of English Language Learners (ELL) and exceptional education students (ESE). Formal and informal assessments of learning will drive instructional decisions. Students will have increased access to more rigorous curriculum and instruction as well as time to interact with the learning targets to deepen their understanding of the standards. The student referral rate will decrease due to the investment of resource personnel to address character education and conflict resolution.
Point Person	Lisa Suggs (lisa.suggs@ocps.net)

Action Step	
Description	Coaching and peer support will be utilized to build teacher capacity. Professional learning will occur through targeted, differentiated coaching cycles, facilitated planning meeting(s), peer observations and other professional development opportunities. Teachers will continue to deepen their understanding of instructional best practices to support ELL students. Teachers will engage in a book study entitled, "A Close Look at Close Reading." Classroom walks will be conducted to monitor implementation and provide actionable feedback through the iObservation tool and/.or face-to-face. Implement and integrate the Culturally Responsive School Plan to address students' social-emotional needs. The leadership team will meet weekly to discuss trends.
Person Responsible	Lisa Suggs (lisa.suggs@ocps.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Sign-in sheets and PLC notes will be recorded for each school-based DPLC cycle of professional learning. The instructional coaches will monitor lesson plans to ensure instructional strategies, activities, resources and assessments are aligned with the standard(s). Notes and feedback provided within the iObservation tool will be examined. Student performance on common assessments, iReady diagnostics, Access for ELLs and progress monitoring activities (PMAs) will also be tracked to determine effectiveness of planning and instruction. Monthly review of referral data to determine if a reduction of student referrals for disciplinary action had occurred from the prior year.
Person Responsible	Lisa Suggs (lisa.suggs@ocps.net)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Lancaster has a Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL) to facilitate parent involvement activities on campus. Parents have opportunities to participate in activities such as the School Advisory Council (SAC), Parent Teacher Organization (PTO), Multilingual Parent Leadership Council (MPLC), Annual Title 1 meeting, curriculum-based nights and social events such as dances and student performances. Home-to-school communication is provided in English, Spanish and Haitian Creole. Translators are available for meetings in Spanish, Haitian-Creole and other languages can be interpreted by the Language Line provided by the district. Lancaster will continue to encourage parents to participate in the district's quarterly Parent Academies and will offer transportation to one of the academy events.
Lancaster will continue to foster its relationships with its Partners in Education (PIE). Each year we contact our partners to renew our partnerships and determine activities that are mutually beneficial for both organizations. Our collaboration with the Neighborhood Center for Families (NCF) is ongoing which includes a full-time Alpha counselor and partial funding for an exceptional education teacher.

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

At Lancaster we have two character education programs. This year Lancaster will be implementing a new health curriculum that will be taught by all grade levels. Twenty-five minutes has been allocated each week for the implementation of the new health curriculum for all grade levels. The guidance counselor will make referrals to an outside counseling agency, SEDNET (Severely Emotionally Disturbed Network) as needed. Additionally, through our partnership with the Neighborhood Center for Families (NCF), an Alpha counselor will work primarily with one grade target grade level. We also have a guidance counselor on staff who will make referrals to an outside counseling agency, SEDNET (Severely Emotionally Disturbed Network) as needed.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Lancaster's Pre-K teacher is part of the kindergarten team to assist in a smooth transition for our students. Throughout the year our Pre-K class will join kindergarten classrooms in activities to become familiar with the expectations. Our Pre-K class follows the Orange County Pre-K adopted curriculum to ensure kindergarten readiness and to foresee any problematic areas a student might have when entering kindergarten. When our students first enter kindergarten we assess the students' knowledge using the initial Journey's assessment. Within the first month of school, our kindergartners are assessed using FLKRS (Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener). We also use the Home Language Survey to ensure proper placement after immediate assessments. Our exiting fifth grade students tour Walker Middle School. Information about magnet programs and schools of choice are also made available to all interested.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Lancaster utilizes previous iReady data, Journey's and Common Assessments, as well as Performance Matters to monitor student progress and assist with the formation of tier groups. Teachers and the leadership team will meet once a week to review and discuss student data and make instructional changes based on student needs. Groups are fluid depending upon student growth and performance in an area of identified weakness or strength. Based upon the large number of students needing intervention, the leadership team will pull the Tier 3 groups for additional support.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Lancaster has a partnership with Oakridge High School's Elevate Orlando program. This partnership affords each fifth grade student a mentor for the year. The Oakridge students visit Lancaster's campus weekly to meet with our students. We also participate in the Junior Achievement Program.

Part V: Budget

Total:	$0.00