

Orange County Public Schools

# Lake Weston Elementary



2020-21 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>15</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>19</b> |

# Lake Weston Elementary

5500 MILAN DR, Orlando, FL 32810

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Meigan Rivera**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2018

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (57%)<br>2017-18: F (31%)<br>2016-17: D (40%)<br>2015-16: F (23%)  |
| <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>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A   |
| * 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>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>19</b> |

# Lake Weston Elementary

5500 MILAN DR, Orlando, FL 32810

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

## School Demographics

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School<br/>PK-5</p> | <p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p> | <p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>              | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>          | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>94%</p>                |

## School Grades History

| Year  | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B       | B       | F       | 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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

| Name                    | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Leslie, James           | Principal           | Building Administrator          |
| Brooke, Nicole          | Other               | Curriculum Resource Teacher     |
| Lemon-Brookins, Shayana | Assistant Principal | Building Administrator          |
| Ayala, Lauren           | Other               | ELA Interventionist             |
| Diaz, Edgardo           | Other               | Math Coach                      |
| Hejtmanek, Heather      | Other               | ELA Interventionist             |
| Rodriguez, Maria        | Instructional Coach | Instructional Coach             |
| Scheff, Jessica         | Instructional Media | Media Specialist                |
| Szymanski, Kelly        | Other               | ELA Interventionist             |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/25/2018, Meigan Rivera

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

2

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

10

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

37

**Demographic Data**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (57%)<br>2017-18: F (31%)<br>2016-17: D (40%)<br>2015-16: F (23%)  |
| <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>  |   |



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

## 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               | 40          | 76 | 94 | 98 | 94 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 472   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 16          | 13 | 27 | 21 | 14 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 102   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0  | 9  | 6  | 2  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0  | 0  | 13 | 11 | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 31    |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 22 | 2  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5  | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 6 | 17 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 48    |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/8/2020

### Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |     |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1   | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 98          | 103 | 94 | 83 | 73 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 526   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 30          | 26  | 22 | 13 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 112   |
| One or more suspensions         | 6           | 8   | 7  | 4  | 6  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 42    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 29          | 23  | 8  | 9  | 4  | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 88    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0   | 0  | 11 | 22 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 62    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

**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 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |     |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1   | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 98          | 103 | 94 | 83 | 73 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 526   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 30          | 26  | 22 | 13 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 112   |
| One or more suspensions         | 6           | 8   | 7  | 4  | 6  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 42    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 29          | 23  | 8  | 9  | 4  | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 88    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0   | 0  | 11 | 22 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 62    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

**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 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

## 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%   | 32%    | 54%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 66%    | 58%      | 58%   | 44%    | 58%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 61%    | 52%      | 53%   | 47%    | 53%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 56%    | 63%      | 63%   | 38%    | 61%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 71%    | 61%      | 62%   | 47%    | 64%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 55%    | 48%      | 51%   | 43%    | 54%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 45%    | 56%      | 53%   | 30%    | 50%      | 51%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) |     |     |     |     |     | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|           | K                                 | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   |       |
|           | (0)                               | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

### Grade Level Data

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

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 39%    | 55%      | -16%                       | 58%   | -19%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 33%    | 55%      | -22%                       | 57%   | -24%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 52%    | 57%      | -5%                        | 58%   | -6%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 32%    | 54%      | -22%                       | 56%   | -24%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 20%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 19%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 39%    | 54%      | -15%                       | 56%   | -17%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 24%    | 55%      | -31%                       | 55%   | -31%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 15%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03    | 2019 | 53%    | 62%      | -9%                        | 62%   | -9%                     |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                       | 2018 | 40%    | 61%      | -21%                       | 62%   | -22%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 13%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 56%    | 63%      | -7%                        | 64%   | -8%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 38%    | 62%      | -24%                       | 62%   | -24%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 18%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 16%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 53%    | 57%      | -4%                        | 60%   | -7%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 14%    | 59%      | -45%                       | 61%   | -47%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 39%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 15%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 43%    | 54%      | -11%                       | 53%   | -10%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 27%    | 53%      | -26%                       | 55%   | -28%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 16%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 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                                       | 15       | 67     | 64          | 10        | 50      | 47           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 47       | 73     |             | 63        | 85      |              | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 44       | 67     | 53          | 53        | 63      | 41           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 48       | 67     | 71          | 62        | 84      | 77           | 56       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 45       | 66     | 69          | 56        | 70      | 60           | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |

  

| 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       | 27     | 29          | 6         | 9       | 13           | 13       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 26       | 32     | 25          | 38        | 45      | 27           | 20       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 26       | 33     | 38          | 27        | 26      | 21           | 20       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 34       | 39     | 25          | 35        | 35      | 20           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 38       |        |             | 31        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 29       | 36     | 38          | 29        | 31      | 23           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       | 15       | 26     | 23          | 14        | 32      | 42           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 20       | 43     | 47          | 29        | 46      | 64           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 28       | 39     | 38          | 37        | 40      | 28           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 35       | 47     | 50          | 43        | 57      | 53           | 14       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 36       |        |             | 29        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 32       | 44     | 44          | 40        | 47      | 41           | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |

**ESSA Data**

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

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | N/A  |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 58   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 65   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 464  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                | 42 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

**English Language Learners**

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                | 65 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

**Native American Students**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

| Asian Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                    | 51  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 66  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0   |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                | 0   |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                  | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           | 0   |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   |     |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| 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% | 0   |

**Analysis**

**Data Reflection**

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

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

ELA and Science proficiency were our lowest areas of performance, at 45%. However, this was a 15% increase in ELA and 16% increase in Science over the previous year's scores. Contributing factors are a lack of foundational skills and knowledge of prerequisite standards.

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

N/A - all performance areas showed significant improvement over the previous year.

**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 showed the largest gap when compared with the state average (12%). The contributing factors are those mentioned in the section above. However, it is important to note that ELA proficiency increased 15% over the previous year's scores.

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

Math learning gains showed the greatest increase (29% to 71%). With the continuation of a new administration and leadership team, there was also a more intense focus on standards based planning, instruction and assessment.

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

An additional area of concern would be our attendance data. There are still a significant number of students with an attendance rate below 90%.

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. Science Proficiency
3. Math Proficiency
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

We will increase the overall ELA proficiency and learning gains by implementing high-quality literacy strategies, providing additional common planning opportunities, a placing a strategic focus on writing and targeted support for differentiating instruction. This area of focus was selected as 45% of our students were proficient on the ELA portion of the 2019 Florida Standards Assessment and 66% of all students demonstrated a learning gain. Although this was a significant increase from the prior year, ELA was one of our lowest performance areas. As a result of the school closures due to the pandemic, we are anticipating an increased level of regression that will need to be addressed.

**Measurable Outcome:**

The intended outcome is to increase the percentage of students scoring proficient and demonstrating a learning gain on the ELA portion of the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

James Leslie (james.leslie@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Professional Learning Communities, Professional Development opportunities and strategic coaching support focused on data analysis and differentiating instruction will be utilized to support this area of focus.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

These strategies will be used in an effort to strengthen instructional practice, specifically with differentiating instruction, which will result in improved instructional effectiveness, ultimately resulting in increased student achievement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide professional development opportunities that target:
  - a. Strategies to differentiate instruction
  - b. Effective writing instruction
  - c. Using PLCs to analyze data and focus instruction

**Person Responsible**

Shayana Lemon-Brookins (shayana.lemon-brookins@ocps.net)

2. An increased focus on the use of instructional strategies to improve student achievement during structured common planning sessions.

**Person Responsible**

Shayana Lemon-Brookins (shayana.lemon-brookins@ocps.net)

3. Provide strategic coaching support focused on data analysis and differentiating instruction, to include modeling, side by side teaching and actionable feedback.

**Person Responsible**

Maria Rodriguez (maria.rodriguez8@ocps.net)



## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

We will increase the overall math proficiency and learning gains by closely monitoring for student comprehension during instruction, providing additional common planning opportunities, with a focus on addressing learning gaps and/or regression, and targeted support for differentiating instruction.  
 This area of focus was selected as 56% of our students were proficient on the math portion of the 2019 Florida Standards Assessment and 55% of our lowest 25% demonstrated a learning gain. Although this was a significant increase from the previous year, we want to see a continued increased in math achievement, particularly with our lowest 25%. As a result of the school closures due to the pandemic, we are anticipating an increase in learning gaps that will need to be addressed.

**Measurable Outcome:**

The intended outcome is to increase the percentage of students scoring proficient and demonstrating a learning gain on the math portion of the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

James Leslie (james.leslie@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Professional Learning Communities, Professional Development opportunities and strategic coaching support focused on data analysis and differentiating instruction will be utilized to support this area of focus.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

These strategies will be used in an effort to strengthen instructional practice, specifically with differentiating instruction, which will result in improved instructional effectiveness, ultimately resulting in increased student achievement.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development opportunities that target:
  - a. Strategies to differentiate instruction
  - b. Using PLCs to analyze data and focus instruction to address learning gaps that may have occurred as the result of school closures.

**Person Responsible**

Shayana Lemon-Brookins (shayana.lemon-brookins@ocps.net)

2. An increased focus on the use of instructional strategies to improve student achievement during structured common planning sessions.

**Person Responsible**

Shayana Lemon-Brookins (shayana.lemon-brookins@ocps.net)

3. Include time for math intervention within the daily schedule.

**Person Responsible**

Edgardo Diaz (edgardo.diaz@ocps.net)

4. Provide strategic coaching support focused on data analysis and differentiating instruction, to include modeling, side by side teaching and actionable feedback.

**Person Responsible**

Edgardo Diaz (edgardo.diaz@ocps.net)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** We will increase our focus on Social Emotional Learning, including positive behavioral interventions, opportunities for staff development, and counseling, as a means to provide additional supports and interventions for students in need. This area of focus was selected as there were 91 discipline referrals, 41 suspensions and 31 threat assessments during the 2019 – 2020 school year. This was an increase over the previous year.

**Measurable Outcome:** The intended outcome is to decrease the number of discipline referrals, suspensions and threat assessments for the 2020-21 school year as compared to the 2019 – 20 school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** James Leslie (james.leslie@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Professional development opportunities that focus on Social Emotional Learning, including CHAMPS, conflict resolution and de-escalation, equity, and acknowledging and appreciating social diversity will be utilized to support this area of focus.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** These strategies will be used in an effort to develop teachers’ behavioral management techniques and increase appreciation and understanding of social diversity.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide professional development opportunities that target:
  - a. Behavior Management (CHAMPS)
  - b. Improving School Culture and Climate (Appreciating Social Diversity)

**Person Responsible** James Leslie (james.leslie@ocps.net)

2. Provide more comprehensive and structured counseling services for students to included My Brother’s Keeper, small group and individual counseling sessions.

**Person Responsible** Karen Paul (karen.paul@ocps.net)

3. Create opportunities for the behavioral team to monitor and analyze discipline data.

**Person Responsible** Shayana Lemon-Brookins (shayana.lemon-brookins@ocps.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Our guidance counselor and assistant principal will coordinate efforts to address improved attendance. These efforts will include, attendance monitoring and parental meetings, referring parents to appropriate agencies for support and enlisting the support of our social worker and the Neighborhood for Children and Families.**

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

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

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

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

Lake Weston provides yearly surveys to stakeholders, including staff, students and parents. The surveys include opportunities for stakeholders to provide input, which is analyzed and considered as we make efforts to improve our culture and environment. We focus on creating an environment at Lake Weston where every student feels safe to try their best. We want students to not be pressured by the results, but proud of the effort and process. We want students to take pride in themselves, their school and community.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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

**Part V: Budget**

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

|          |               |   |   |                |     |                   |
|----------|---------------|---|---|----------------|-----|-------------------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>  |   |                |     | <b>\$5,000.00</b> |
|          | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21           |
|          |               |   | 0651 - Lake Weston Elementary   | TSSSA          |     | \$5,000.00        |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: Funds from TSSSA will be used to provide opportunities for additional common planning, data analysis and staff development.</i> |                |     |                   |
| <b>2</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>   |   |                |     | <b>\$5,000.00</b> |
|          | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21           |
|          |               |   | 0651 - Lake Weston Elementary   | TSSSA          |     | \$5,000.00        |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: Funds from TSSSA will be used to provide opportunities for additional common planning, data analysis and staff development.</i> |                |     |                   |
| <b>3</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports</b> |   |                |     | <b>\$5,000.00</b> |
|          | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21           |
|          |               |   | 0651 - Lake Weston Elementary   | TSSSA          |     | \$5,000.00        |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: Funds from TSSSA will be used to purchase SEL materials and provide opportunities for staff development.</i>                    |                |     |                   |

|  |                                  |
|--|----------------------------------|
|  | <b>Total:</b> <b>\$15,000.00</b> |
|--|----------------------------------|