

Orange County Public Schools

Lancaster Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	20

Lancaster Elementary

6700 SHERYL ANN DR, Orlando, FL 32809

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

Demographics

Principal: Carmen Dottavio

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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 below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: D (35%) 2014-15: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	20

Lancaster Elementary

6700 SHERYL ANN DR, Orlando, FL 32809

<https://lancasteres.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 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	C	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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Suggs, Lisa	Principal	
Moore, Sigrid	Instructional Coach	
Wubben, Amanda	Instructional Coach	
Rumph, Barbara	Assistant Principal	
Cannon, Whitney	Instructional Coach	
Rivera, Maira	Instructional Coach	
Rosenberger, Nicole	Instructional Coach	
Shamieh, Dana	Instructional Coach	
Kebbel, Jacqueline	Instructional Coach	
Diaz-Ortiz, Michele	Instructional Coach	

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	110	123	128	154	133	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	775
Attendance below 90 percent	38	29	27	31	23	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	53	58	66	126	78	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	469
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	51	31	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135

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	20	16	19	63	37	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	216

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	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

50

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/15/2019

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	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 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	20	19	30	64	43	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214

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	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 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	20	19	30	64	43	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214

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	45%	57%	57%	42%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	58%	58%	65%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	52%	53%	73%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	69%	63%	63%	56%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	61%	62%	58%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	48%	51%	50%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	33%	56%	53%	26%	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	110 (0)	123 (0)	128 (0)	154 (0)	133 (0)	127 (0)	775 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	38 (28)	29 (29)	27 (33)	31 (28)	23 (18)	29 (17)	177 (153)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	2 (1)	3 (2)	1 (4)	4 (4)	5 (2)	15 (13)
Course failure in ELA or Math	53 (53)	58 (58)	66 (96)	126 (126)	78 (79)	88 (60)	469 (472)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	51 (54)	31 (45)	53 (39)	135 (138)

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	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	57%	-5%	58%	-6%
	2018	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	33%	54%	-21%	56%	-23%
	2018	42%	55%	-13%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	68%	62%	6%	62%	6%
	2018	56%	61%	-5%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	63%	14%	64%	13%
	2018	65%	62%	3%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				
05	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%
	2018	47%	59%	-12%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	32%	54%	-22%	53%	-21%
	2018	41%	53%	-12%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
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	27	24	29	46	47	14				
ELL	42	53	56	69	64	57	30				
BLK	47	50	30	71	64	54	38				
HSP	44	51	57	70	64	60	29				
WHT	37	69		63	79						
FRL	43	53	57	68	64	56	32				

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				

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	54
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	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	432
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	53

English Language Learners	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
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	53
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	60
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	53
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.

Fifth grade science was the lowest data component for the 2018 - 2019 assessment administration. Historically, student performance on FCAT Science 2.0 is lower than ELA and mathematics. Student performance decreased by 12% from the prior year. It appears that there may be some correlation between students' FSA ELA and FCAT Science 2.0 performance. Forty-four or 44% of fifth grade students were proficient (3+) on the ELA and 33% were proficient (3+) on the science assessment. Additionally, 33% of fifth grade students scored a level 1 on the ELA and 30% scored level 1 on the science assessment.

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

ELA lowest quartile possessed the greatest decline from the prior year with a decline of 13%. ELA learning gains had a decline of 4% and math lowest quartile decreased by 5%. A factor impacting growth of students within the lowest quartile can be attributed to poor attendance to the morning tutoring program. Tutoring was provided for one hour daily and most lowest quartile students were often very tardy to the program which did not allow for the opportunity to close some of the academic gaps in Reading/Language Arts.

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.

ELA proficiency had the highest gap when compared to the state average (-12%). Lancaster's ELA proficiency was 45% and the state average for ELA proficiency was 57%. Lancaster has a high percentage of students who made failing grades in Reading/Language Arts. In addition to focusing on the closed read strategy, other components of reading such as phonics, phonemic awareness and fluency needs to be present in the intermediate grades' literacy instruction.

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

Mathematics proficiency showed the most improvement with an increase of 6% from the year prior. Departmentalization allowed teachers to focus on planning for instruction in fewer content areas. In common planning, teams focused on refining plans and resources to more accurately reflect the standards using the test item specifications, which helped to increase student proficiency to the rigor of the standards.

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

Based upon the EWS data, two areas of concerns are attendance and course failures. Approximately 23% of students school-wide had an attendance rate less than 90%. In grades three through five, approximately 20% of students had an attendance rate less than 90%. Course failure had a direct correlation to attendance. School-wide, approximately 61% of students had failed a reading, math or both courses. In grades three through five, approximately 70% of students had failed a course(s). As a result, students proficiency levels were below expectations and growth as measured by learning gains were negatively impacted since a fifth or 20% of students do not attend school regularly.

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

1. ELA Proficiency and Lowest Quartile: Data reflected that students who were proficient in the prior year, did not maintain their level of proficiency, thus negatively impacting learning gains. Need to increase ELA proficiency to at least 50%, ELA Learning Gains to 70% and ELA Lowest Quartile to 70% to reach current year goals.
2. Science: In order to positively impact student performance in science, a dedicated Science Coach was hired to help build teacher capacity in planning, teaching and learning. Integration of best practice in literacy instruction will be utilized to help students access critical content and be better able to think critically.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Narrowing the Achievement Gap
Rationale	<p>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. English/Language Art (ELA) Lowest Quartile possessed the greatest decline of 13% from the prior year. Additionally, ELA learning gains declined by 4% and Science proficiency declined by 12% from the prior year. 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.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>The DPLC team will continue to work towards deepening its understanding of the use of the closed reading strategy as a tool for analyzing and comprehending complex text. Based on student performance data, the area of focus will be to increase the percentage of students who meet the criteria for ELA proficiency, learning gains, lowest quartile and Science proficiency. Teams will strengthen protocols for collaboration, streamlining planning and instruction and building capacity in research-based literacy practices that promote academic growth across all content areas. This will include our BPIC indicator #16 focus of providing the necessary job embedded professional development on best practices for inclusive education for students with disabilities. Improved student performance in comprehension and vocabulary should be evident. The goal is to meet and/or exceed the ELA lowest quartile of 70%.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lisa Suggs (lisa.suggs@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Students generate inferences and elaborate to provide evidence that demonstrates understanding of learned content.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>The purpose of focusing on ensuring that students are skilled at generating valid conclusions based on content is because it is important to provide students with ample opportunities to practice and demonstrate their ability to deconstruct text for understanding. As evidenced by iObservation and ghost walks, student work is often over scaffolded which results in most student work samples reflecting whole group discussion(s) instead of independent work. Additionally, Reading iReady data reflects an area of growth is needed in the comprehension of both literary and informational text. It is necessary for students to understand that processes and strategies learned within Reading/Language Arts can and should be used as a tool to increase understanding in content-based text.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Members of the school-based DPLC will attend planned District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) meetings. 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. (DPLC team: Monthly - September - May) 2. The DPLC team will create and implement an action plan outlining each cycle of professional learning. (DPLC team: Monthly - September - May) 3. Professional Learning Communities will meet weekly to discuss and adjust plans as

appropriate to meet the rigor of the standard as well as reflect instruction that is culturally responsive. Including opportunities for the special education teachers to collaborate to enhance planning for special education students. An instructional coach will be present to support teams, provide feedback and inform administration of needs and concerns that can be barriers to teaching and learning. Special education teachers/professionals will be included in meeting with teams. (Administration, Coaches and Teachers: Weekly - August 12 - May)

4. Coaches will engage in targeted coaching cycles to allow for differentiated professional development. Opportunities for peer observations, including ghost walks and book studies will also be available to enhance teacher competency in literacy instruction. (Administration and Coaches: Monthly - September - April)

5. Provide professional development and ongoing guidance on the MTSS process and best practices for culturally responsive and inclusive education. Time will be allocated in the schedule to meet with teachers regularly view trend data and make timely instructional decisions to impact closing academic gaps and promote proficiency toward the grade level standards. (Administration, MTSS/Staffing Specialist and Coaches: Monthly - September - May)

6. Classroom walk throughs with feedback will be conducted regularly by leadership team. Look fors will include evidence of the use of explicit reading instruction to support students' ability to process, elaborate and analyze grade appropriate text. A balance of modeling and scaffolding with increased opportunities for students to apply concepts to demonstrate proficiency. (Administration and Leadership team: Monthly September - March)

Person

Responsible

Lisa Suggs (lisa.suggs@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Accelerate Student Performance
Rationale	<p>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.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>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.</p> <p>School Goals: ELA Proficiency- 50% ELA Learning Gains - 70% ELA Lowest Quartile - 70%</p> <p>Math Proficiency - 75% Math Learning Gains - 70% Math Lowest Quartile - 70%</p> <p>Science - 50%</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lisa Suggs (lisa.suggs@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Build upon the school's system of analyzing data, analyzing instructional practices and making timely adjustments to positively impact student success.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>The purpose of focusing on building upon the process of continuous improvement for instruction is to provide supports to ensure teachers utilize informal and formal performance data as tools for determining the effectiveness of planning, instruction and student academic growth. Even though teachers collaborate in grade level/content-area Professional Learning Communities (PLC), student performance data reveals that there are inconsistencies between classrooms. When reviewing iObservation data, there appears to be a correlation between the effective use of high yield strategies appropriate to focus standard and higher percentages of students meeting or exceeding proficiency levels.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<p>1. Plan and implement a professional development plan. Subject matter includes the MTSS process and procedures for academics and behavior and the six components of reading/ literacy. (Administration and Leadership Team: Initiated August 5, 2019)</p>

2. Plan and implement mentoring plan to support beginning teachers and teachers new to school. Targeted discussion topics to support teaching and learning and professionalism will occur on a monthly basis. (Administration and Coaches: Initiated August 6, 2019)
3. 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 and ESE students. (Administration, Leadership Team and Teachers: Initiated August 5, 2019)
4. Time will be built into the schedule for teachers to collaborate with the MTSS coordinator to discuss best practices in culturally responsive and inclusive classrooms as well as monitor and track student progress in tiers two and three. (Administration, MTSS/Staffing Specialist and Teachers: Monthly beginning in September)
5. Monitor the implementation of Early Interventions in Reading (EIR) and Heggerty Phonics in the primary grades. Look fors will include flexible grouping and differentiation based upon data to maximize growth in reading foundation skills. (Administration, Coaches and Teachers: Monthly beginning in September 9, 2019)
6. Actionable feedback will be provided through the iObservation tool, face-to-face and during PLC discussions. Ensure that teaching and learning integrates the Culturally Responsive School Plan to address social-emotional needs of students that may impact learning to his/her potential. The leadership team will meet weekly to discuss trends. (Administration and Leadership Team: Weekly beginning August 23, 2019)
7. Provide a Communication/Character Education course to every student within the special area rotation. The purpose is to provide social skills training to improve citizenship thus reducing the referral rate as outlined in the Culturally Responsive plan. (Administration, Dean and Guidance Counselor: Weekly beginning August 12, 2019)
8. Continue the My Brother's Keeper mentoring program to help address students who have barriers to learning such as high absenteeism and/or disciplinary issues. Secure mentors for students whose absentee rate is below 90%. (Administration: Monthly beginning September 3, 2019)

Person Responsible Lisa Suggs (lisa.suggs@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).

NA

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.

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.

PFEF Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEF), 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.

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

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

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 Oak Ridge High School's Elevate Orlando program. This partnership affords each fifth grade student a mentor for the year. The Oak Ridge students visit Lancaster's campus weekly to meet with our students. We also participate in the Junior Achievement Program. Additionally, Lancaster hosts the annual Teach-In event in which community members are invited to speak and interact with students about careers and habits required to be successful in future endeavors.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Narrowing the Achievement Gap				\$65,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	3374	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0851 - Lancaster Elementary	General Fund	50.0	\$30,000.00
			<i>Notes: Provide targeted tutoring for ELA.</i>			
	3376	140-Substitute Teachers	0851 - Lancaster Elementary	General Fund	50.0	\$25,000.00
			<i>Notes: Provide teams opportunity to common plan 1/2 day during the school year.</i>			
	3336	510-Supplies	0851 - Lancaster Elementary	General Fund		\$10,000.00
			<i>Notes: Purchase of iReady supplementary workbook materials.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Accelerate Student Performance				\$75,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	3376	140-Substitute Teachers	0851 - Lancaster Elementary	General Fund	50.0	\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Provide substitutes to provide the opportunity for teachers to participate in peer observations of best practices.</i>			
	6000	120-Classroom Teachers	0851 - Lancaster Elementary		1.0	\$70,000.00
			<i>Notes: Created position within the special area rotation to address communication and social skills training for all students.</i>			
Total:						\$140,000.00