

Orange County Public Schools

# Lakemont Elementary



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Lakemont Elementary

901 N LAKEMONT AVE, Winter Park, FL 32792

<https://lakemontes.ocps.net/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Karl Fox**

Start Date for this Principal: 2/15/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: B (59%) 2014-15: A (70%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### 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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

## Lakemont Elementary

901 N LAKEMONT AVE, Winter Park, FL 32792

<https://lakemontes.ocps.net/>

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	53%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

### School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	B

### 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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fox, Karl	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision-making, collaborative lesson planning and effective instructional practices and intervention</li> <li>-Manages school resources, including but not limited to: facilities, budget, personnel, materials and supplies that are designed to support the areas of focus for school improvement</li> <li>-Oversees high quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and student achievement to include the 3rd year of implementation of District Professional Learning Communities</li> <li>-Maintains communication with all stakeholder groups</li> <li>-Assists in data analysis to identify trends and challenges and to adjust instruction based on findings</li> <li>-Monitor the fidelity of Fundamental Basic Skills; ie. differentiated interventions</li> </ul>
Clark, Cynthia	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS and addressing goals and targets in the SIP</li> <li>-Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation</li> <li>--Monitor common assessment data and make recommendations for modifying instruction through Professional Learning Communities</li> <li>-Assists in data analysis</li> <li>-Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regards to data-based instructional planning</li> <li>-Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP</li> <li>-Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP</li> <li>-Provides guidance with K-12 Math Plan</li> <li>-Facilitates Math Enrichment Program</li> <li>-Facilitates after school tutoring and STEM program</li> </ul>
Walls, Jan	Teacher, ESE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Facilitates and supports data collection activities</li> <li>-Monitor Students With Disabilities Data as part of the ESSA and the identification as a school of Targeted Support and Improvement</li> <li>-Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address goals identified in the SIP</li> <li>-Documents interventions and provides follow-up to ensure student success</li> <li>-Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP</li> <li>-Ensure practices are in place for the best practices in inclusive education</li> </ul>



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Thompson, Emily	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Provides professional development to teachers and staff regarding data management and use to drive instruction</li> <li>-Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met and SIP areas of focus are addressed</li> <li>-Provides guidance with K-12 ELA Plan</li> <li>-Monitor common assessment data and make recommendations for modifying instruction through Professional Learning Communities</li> <li>-Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regards to data-based instructional planning; Facilitate the Coaching Cycle as determined by teacher needs</li> <li>-Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP</li> <li>-Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP</li> </ul>
Pinner, Marta	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Supports ELL students with assessments and strategies for ELL assistance and compliance</li> <li>-Facilitates and supports data collection activities</li> <li>-Assists in data analysis and monitors students in the MTSS process</li> <li>-Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP</li> <li>-Provides interventions for students needing Tier II and Tier III support</li> </ul>
Rosa, Brad	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Provides professional development to teachers and staff regarding data management and use to drive instruction</li> <li>-Ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS and addressing areas of focus in the SIP</li> <li>-Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation</li> <li>-Ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation</li> <li>-Communicates with parents regarding school based MTSS plans and activities</li> <li>-Discipline</li> <li>-Assists in data analysis to identify trends and challenges and to adjust instruction based on findings</li> <li>-Monitor the fidelity of Fundamental Basic Skills; ie. differentiated interventions</li> </ul>
Bowers, Kenya	Instructional Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Provides guidance with K-12 ELA Plan</li> <li>-Manages school social media accounts</li> <li>-Assists in planning grade level field trips that align with standards</li> <li>-Manages K-5 Literacy program</li> <li>-Manages Accelerated Reader program</li> </ul>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Manages property inventory</li> <li>-Supervise the Battle of the Books</li> <li>-Co-supervise the WLOS morning news program</li> </ul>

## 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	113	99	115	97	112	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	666
Attendance below 90 percent	19	9	12	11	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	18	2	2	1	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	16	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	5	2	0	4	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

48

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/22/2019

### 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	13	21	5	16	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	20	2	4	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	22	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

#### 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	5	6	1	6	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

#### 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	13	21	5	16	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	20	2	4	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	22	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

#### 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	5	6	1	6	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

## 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	71%	57%	57%	75%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	58%	58%	66%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	52%	53%	41%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	72%	63%	63%	79%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	69%	61%	62%	80%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	48%	51%	70%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	70%	56%	53%	69%	50%	51%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	113 (0)	99 (0)	115 (0)	97 (0)	112 (0)	130 (0)	666 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	19 (13)	9 (21)	12 (5)	11 (16)	8 (11)	10 (9)	69 (75)
One or more suspensions	1 (1)	0 (0)	0 (1)	1 (1)	0 (1)	0 (1)	2 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	18 (9)	2 (20)	2 (2)	1 (4)	10 (11)	17 (10)	50 (56)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	21 (22)	16 (22)	27 (21)	64 (65)

**Grade Level Data**

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

NOTE: An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	55%	10%	58%	7%
	2018	75%	55%	20%	57%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	57%	16%	58%	15%
	2018	68%	54%	14%	56%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	69%	54%	15%	56%	13%
	2018	68%	55%	13%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	68%	62%	6%	62%	6%
	2018	67%	61%	6%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	63%	14%	64%	13%
	2018	80%	62%	18%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	66%	57%	9%	60%	6%
	2018	71%	59%	12%	61%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	66%	54%	12%	53%	13%
	2018	64%	53%	11%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	20	39	36	10	33	36					
ELL	51	56	41	58	61	60	46				
ASN	82	82		94	82						
BLK	54	56	30	56	56		50				
HSP	60	56	42	65	59	48	58				
WHT	82	76	54	80	76	71	80				
FRL	58	60	39	63	66	55	61				
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	13	33	27	10	24	29					
ELL	38	46	47	54	58	46					
ASN	87			87							
BLK	58	54	42	56	54	27	57				
HSP	59	57	48	70	71	59	59				
MUL	73	70		64	60						
WHT	82	71	58	82	71	50	77				
FRL	62	61	44	67	64	48	60				
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	18	18		26	58	60					
ELL	43	57	38	61	71						
BLK	58	57		67	82		50				
HSP	52	57	41	71	77	86	48				
MUL	92			69							
WHT	88	74	41	86	83	57	84				

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
FRL	67	60	39	72	78	64	56				

### 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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
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	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	517
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	74
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## 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.**

The data component that showed the lowest performance based on FLDOE data was the ELA Lowest 25% learning gains. This data decreased from 49% in 2018 to 42% in 2019. For the 2018-2019 year, Lakemont changed the format of the FBS/Enrichment block so that it was not ability

grouped on each grade level. The data demonstrates that by not ability grouping the FBS/Enrichment block, a barrier was created in which teachers were unable to differentiate to meet the needs of all students. This year, Lakemont will focus on formative and common assessment data to identify and monitor fluid groups for interventions and enrichment.

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance based on FLDOE data was the ELA Lowest 25% learning gains. This data decreased from 49% in 2018 to 42% in 2019. This year, Lakemont changed the format of the FBS/Enrichment block so that it was not ability grouped on each grade level. The data demonstrates that by not ability grouping the FBS/Enrichment block, a barrier was created in which teachers were unable to differentiate to meet the needs of all students.

**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.**

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average based on raw data provided by the Florida Department of Education was the Science data. The raw Science data for Lakemont shows 66% proficiency versus 53% proficiency for the state. This data had a +13% point difference to the state average, which was a 4% increase from 2018. This year, Lakemont focused more on STEM initiatives and held after school STEM clubs. In addition, a monthly STEM activity in lower grade levels exposed students to science content and sparked curiosity for the science standards. The implementation of these initiatives, as well as an increase in teacher pedagogy through collaboration and common planning, contributed to Lakemont outperforming the state.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement based on FLDOE data was the Math Lowest 25% data with an increase of 3%. The new actions that Lakemont implemented was an intense focus on Number Talks to increase a greater understanding of number sense, and the implementation of Math Intervention one day a week focused on the trailing standard. In addition, Lakemont incorporated in the Culturally Responsive Plan the acceleration initiatives led by the Minority Achievement Office to include frontloading vocabulary and content to provide scaffolded support.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

The two areas of concern for Early Warning Systems include course failures in ELA or Math and Level 1 on state assessments.

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

1. Overall proficiency for Students with Disabilities (ESSA)
2. ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains
3. Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



#1	
<b>Title</b>	Overall Proficiency for Students with Disabilities-Accelerate Student Performance
<b>Rationale</b>	To increase the overall proficiency of the Students with Disabilities from 25% proficiency as identified by ESSA. Students with disabilities have underperformed the other subgroups for the last two years as identified by ESSA therefore resulting in identification as a Targeted Support and Improvement school.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<p>Outcome #1-Collaboration between ESE and non-ESE teachers to support student learning through standards-based instruction</p> <p>Outcome #2-Data-driven PLCs that allow teachers to collaborate and identify trends to adjust instruction/interventions as needed</p> <p>Outcome #3-Students properly identified and monitored through the MTSS process</p> <p>Outcome #4-Professional development on social and emotional well-being as outlined on the Kognito Gold Standard Mental Health Training</p> <p>Outcome #5-Increase overall student proficiency for students with disabilities from 25% to 41% as outlined in the Every Student Success Act</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Emily Thompson (emily.thompson@ocps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Build our culture of collaboration between professionals (ESE and non-ESE) to increase student success.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Collaboration with general education teachers, paraprofessionals and support staff is necessary to support students' learning toward measurable outcomes and to facilitate students' social and emotional well-being across all school environments and instructional settings. Collaboration with individuals or teams requires the use of effective collaboration behaviors (e.g., sharing ideas, active listening, questioning, planning, problem solving, negotiating) to develop and adjust instructional or behavioral plans based on student data, and the coordination of expectations, responsibilities and resources to maximize student learning.
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hold weekly PLCs</li> <li>2. Adjust instruction based on formative and common assessment data and trends</li> <li>3. Provide differentiated support through small group instruction and interventions</li> <li>4. Collaboration between general education teachers and ESE teachers</li> <li>5. MTSS meetings to document and monitor tiered support and instructional interventions</li> <li>6. Provide professional development on social and emotional well-being as outlined on the Kognito Gold Standard Mental Health Training</li> <li>7. Perform informal and formal classroom observations identifying trending and providing specific actionable feedback as needed</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Karl Fox (karl.fox@ocps.net)

#2	
<b>Title</b>	ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%-Narrow the Achievement Gap
<b>Rationale</b>	To increase the overall proficiency of the ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% which demonstrated gains of 42% compared to the state's average of 50%. The learning gains for ELA for the lowest 25% at Lakemont decreased 7% from 2018 to 2019.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<p>Outcome #1-Teachers will use close reading strategies and use content specific grade level texts to develop text dependent questions</p> <p>Outcome #2-Teachers will implement strategies for participating in rigorous discussions while responding to text dependent questions</p> <p>Outcome #3-Teachers will engage students in collaborative structures to increase student engagement</p> <p>Outcome #4-Teachers will provide instruction on the conative skills necessary for students to effectively interact in small groups</p> <p>Outcome #5-Increase student acquisition of academic vocabulary, comprehension, and test taking strategies</p> <p>Outcome #6-Increase ELA Learning Gains in the Lowest 25% from 42% proficient to 55% proficient</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Emily Thompson (emily.thompson@ocps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Students systematically engage in processing content to generate conclusions through collaborative interactions with other students in small groups and utilize effective conative skills necessary to interact with new knowledge as well as practice and deepen knowledge.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	In order for effective student construction of meaning to occur, learners must be actively engaged in the processing of information through a teaching and learning process that involves an interaction among the teacher, the students, and the content. while utilizing conative skills necessary for understanding and interacting with others students.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide ongoing professional development to teachers while building teacher capacity with literacy strategies (DPLC)</li> <li>2. Hold weekly PLCs</li> <li>3. Adjust instruction based on data analysis from formative and common assessments, as well as I-Ready</li> <li>4. Perform classroom walkthroughs as a leadership team to identify school-wide trends and document using a tracking form</li> <li>5. Debrief with leadership team regarding trends identified on tracking form</li> <li>6. Provide additional support and resources for those staff members needing or requesting additional support</li> <li>7. Provide professional development on the use of the resources Vocabulary A-Z, LAFS, and Motivational Reading materials</li> <li>8. Implement literacy strategies for the resources Vocabulary A-Z, LAFS, and Motivational Reading materials as part of the 90 minute reading block and FBS/ Enrichment time</li> <li>9. Perform informal and formal classroom observations identifying trending and providing specific actionable feedback as needed</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Karl Fox (karl.fox@ocps.net)

#3	
<b>Title</b>	Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%-Narrow the Achievement Gap
<b>Rationale</b>	Lakemont has a high percentage of students that are performing at or above grade level. However, students in the lowest 25% for math continue to struggle to demonstrate the percentage of learning gains comparable to all students eligible to demonstrate a gain. The learning gains for the lowest 25% in math at Lakemont were 53% compared to the state average of 50%.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Outcome #1-Through small group support and continued implementation of the guided math model, teachers will be able to target differentiate instruction to target specific skills. Outcome #2-Provide tutoring opportunities for students that scored a level 1 or 2 as well as students identified in the bottom quartile. Outcome #3- Increased implementation of the use of Number Talks to build number sense starting in Kindergarten Outcome #4- Increase Math Learning Gains in the Lowest 25% from 53% proficient to 60% proficient
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Brad Rosa (brad.rosa@ocps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Students systematically engage in processing content to generate conclusions through collaborative interactions with other students in small groups and utilize effective conative skills necessary to interact with new knowledge as well as practice and deepen knowledge.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	In order for effective student construction of meaning to occur, learners must be actively engaged in the processing of information through a teaching and learning process that involves an interaction among the teacher, the students, and the content, while utilizing conative skills necessary for understanding and interacting with others students.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Make the connection between the use of close reading strategies and grade level complex texts for participating in rigorous discussions (DPLC)</li> <li>2. Provide additional professional development on the use of data to implement the guided math model</li> <li>3. Provide differentiated math interventions to students in need of support using a variety of strategies to meet the needs of all learners</li> <li>4. Frontloading content/vocabulary to provide scaffolding as identified in the Culturally Responsive Plan</li> <li>5. Hold weekly PLCs</li> <li>6. Adjust instruction based on data analysis from formative and common assessments, as well as I-Ready</li> <li>7. Identify students for math tutoring opportunities</li> <li>8. Perform informal and formal classroom observations identifying trending and providing specific actionable feedback as needed</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Brad Rosa (brad.rosa@ocps.net)

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

N/A

## 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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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.**

During the 2019-2020 school year, Lakemont will maintain an active line of communication with all stakeholders to create an optimal learning environment for all students. The school website has vital links to information such the School Improvement Plan, School Report Card, upcoming events, school information, parent and student information, as well as OCPS curriculum. Lakemont provides families with a monthly calendar of events which also includes a school created newsletter. It contains a principal's message, updated event information, recognition of students' of the week and information regarding our business partners. Teachers communicate with families through a variety of means to include student planners, email, phone, in person and Class Dojo. Class Dojo is the teachers' preferred choice of sharing information regarding class activities, student behavior, and school events. Lakemont uses the school marquee to highlight school and district messages.

### 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.**

Through a partnership with the Winter Park Health Foundation, Lakemont offers counseling services through Community Help and Intervention in Life's Lessons (CHILL). The program includes a part-time counselor assigned to Lakemont Elementary. Students are supported by the CHILL counselor through teacher referral or parent requests. The program provides counseling for a variety of emotional concerns. In addition, Lakemont has a full-time guidance counselor on staff. The guidance counselor provides on-site counseling, small group counseling, class check-ins, social-emotional classroom lessons, processes outside counseling referrals and crisis intervention.

Lakemont has a Threat Assessment Team comprised of administration, guidance counselor, School Resource Officer, behavior specialist, and staffing specialist. The team meets each month to review the progress of students that had a threat in which the Threat Response to Suicide or Harm to Self or Others Incident Form was completed. During the meeting, the team discusses whether the plans or supports put in place have been implemented; if the plans and supports are being successful; and if further supports are needed.

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

Lakemont Elementary provides students new to the school with a New Student Orientation prior to preplanning in order to provide a time to acclimate them to new school procedures. Lakemont also host Meet the Teacher prior to the first day of school in order for parents and students to visit their classroom

to get information for the upcoming school year. Students leaving Lakemont at the end of 5th grade are provided an informational field trip to Maitland Middle School, where they are given a tour, provided information on 1:1 devices, and provided more information on elective coursework.

**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.**

Assessment and progress monitoring data are used to align differentiated instruction within Tier 1, 2, and 3 as well as to identify students' needs. Intervention time is built into the daily schedule both through the 90 minute uninterrupted reading block as well as FBS. Students in need of Tier III interventions are pulled for small group instruction. Meetings are held to identify problems as part of the MTSS process. Regular data meetings are held to review and analyze the existing problem and the available data. After a pattern of academic need is established, an instructional/intervention change may be determined to be of need. Plans are then realigned to establish goals. The team then meets again to review and analyze new data. This follows a cyclical approach similar to Plan, Do, Check, Act.

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

Lakemont Elementary School uses a variety of strategies to advance college and career awareness. These strategies support the Four Keys to College and Career Readiness. To support cognitive strategies, Lakemont Elementary embeds AVID strategies in classrooms (particularly fifth grade) to help prepare students for higher learning. To support key content knowledge and learning skills and techniques, Lakemont engages in year round STEM activities, academic field trips, and Teach-In where students can see what they are learning in the classroom in a practical manner. These activities are especially helpful in that students continually understand real world application for their daily classroom activities. To support key transition knowledge and skills, Lakemont's staff and students participate in college spirit days where a variety of higher learning institutions are highlighted and promoted.

## Part V: Budget

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

1	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Overall Proficiency for Students with Disabilities-Accelerate Student Performance</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
2	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%-Narrow the Achievement Gap</b>				<b>\$12,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		100-Salaries	0561 - Lakemont Elementary	Other		\$3,000.00
		<i>Notes: Funds will be provided to provide tutoring programs to support students that scored level 1 or 2 on FSA as well as students in the bottom quartile.</i>				
		590-Other Materials and Supplies	0561 - Lakemont Elementary	General Fund		\$9,000.00
		<i>Notes: Purchase Vocabulary A-Z licenses, LAFS consumables and Motivational Reading consumables for 3rd-5th teachers</i>				
3	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%-Narrow the Achievement Gap</b>				<b>\$3,000.00</b>

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		100-Salaries	0561 - Lakemont Elementary	Other		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Funds will be provided to provide tutoring programs to support students that scored level 1 or 2 on FSA as well as students in the bottom quartile.</i>			
<b>Total:</b>						<b>\$15,000.00</b>