

Orange County Public Schools

Lakemont Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Lakemont Elementary

901 N LAKEMONT AVE, Winter Park, FL 32792

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

Demographics

Principal: Karl Fox

Start Date for this Principal: 2/15/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2019-20 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: B (59%)
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	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Lakemont Elementary

901 N LAKEMONT AVE, Winter Park, FL 32792

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	52%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	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 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.

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
Fox, Karl	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provide a common vision for the use of data based decision-making, collaborative lesson planning and effective instructional practices and intervention -Manage 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 -Oversee high quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and student achievement to include the implementation of year one of Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership; emphasis on the use of distributive leadership with social and emotional learning strategies and resources to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise -Maintain communication with all stakeholder groups -Assist in data analysis to identify trends and challenges and to adjust instruction based on findings -Monitor the fidelity of Fundamental Basic Skills; ie. differentiated interventions
Clark, Cynthia	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Ensure that the school based team is implementing MTSS and addressing goals and targets in the SIP -Ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation -Monitor common assessment data assisting with data analysis and make recommendations for modifying instruction through Professional Learning Communities -Provide professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regards to data-based instructional planning -Support the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP -Collaborate with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP -Provide guidance with K-12 Math Plan -Facilitate Math Enrichment Program -Facilitate after school tutoring and STEM program
Thompson, Emily	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provide professional development to teachers and staff regarding data management and use to drive instruction -Collaborate with staff to ensure student needs are met and SIP areas of focus are addressed -Provides guidance with K-12 ELA Plan -Monitor common assessment data and make recommendations for modifying instruction through Professional Learning Communities -Provide professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regards to data-based

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>instructional planning; Facilitate the Coaching Cycle as determined by teacher needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Support the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP -Collaborate with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP
Pinner, Marta	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Support ELL students with assessments and strategies for ELL assistance and compliance -Facilitate and supports data collection activities -Assist in data analysis and monitors students in the MTSS process -Support the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP -Provide interventions for students needing Tier II and Tier III support
Rosa, Brad	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provide professional development to teachers and staff regarding data management and use to drive instruction -Ensure that the school based team is implementing MTSS and addressing areas of focus in the SIP -Ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation -Ensure adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation -Communicate with parents regarding school based MTSS plans and activities -Monitor discipline and provide alternate strategies for behavioral interventions -Assist in data analysis to identify trends and challenges and to adjust instruction based on findings -Monitor the fidelity of Fundamental Basic Skills; ie. differentiated interventions
Bowers, Kenya	Instructional Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provide guidance with K-12 ELA Plan -Manage school social media accounts -Assist in planning grade level field trips that align with standards -Manage K-5 Literacy program -Manage Accelerated Reader program -Manage property inventory -Supervise the Battle of the Books -Co-supervise the WLOS morning news program
Erhardt, Luke	Teacher, ESE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Facilitate and supports data collection activities -Monitor Students With Disabilities Data as part of the ESSA and the identification as a school of Targeted Support and Improvement -Support the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address goals

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>identified in the SIP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Document interventions and provides follow-up to ensure student success -Collaborate with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP -Ensure practices are in place for the best practices in inclusive education

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 2/15/2017, Karl Fox

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.*

4

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2019-20 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students

School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: B (59%)
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 .	

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	14	93	123	102	133	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	571	
Attendance below 90 percent	5	16	22	10	19	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	

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	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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

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	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	

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	
	(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	65%	55%	10%	58%	7%
	2018	75%	55%	20%	57%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	57%	16%	58%	15%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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%				
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				

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
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				
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	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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%	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	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	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	74
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance based on 2019 iReady MOY data was the Math Lowest 25%. Although this data increased from 7% at the beginning of the year to 19% at the middle of the year, this 12% increase was the lowest performing area. For the 2019-2020 year, students in the lowest 25% lacked basic number sense based on iReady MOY data.

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 greatest decline in performance based on 2019 iReady MOY data was ELA overall proficiency. This data went from 68% to 63% (5% decrease). When diving deeper into the data, we identified that the same group of students from 3rd to 4th grade dropped 11 percentage points in overall proficiency. One factor causing this decline was our structure within the FBS block. As we prepare for the 20-21 school year, we will have a greater emphasis on ability grouping and progress monitoring the students specific needs.

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.

When we compare the FSA Science data for the 2018-2019 state (53%) to our 2019-2020 OCPS Science progress monitoring assessment #3 (71%), Lakemont was on the trajectory to outperform the state average by 18%. One of the contributing factors to this is the execution of instruction across all grade levels to include hands on experiments aligned with the state standards; a planned STEM evening that involved staff, students and the community; common assessments across all grade levels; and increased exposure to community professions in the field of science and technology.

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

When we compare the FSA Science data for the 2018-2019 state (53%) to our 2019-2020 OCPS Science progress monitoring assessment #3 (71%), Lakemont was on the trajectory to outperform the state average by 18%. One of the contributing factors to this is the execution of instruction across all

grade levels to include hands on experiments aligned with the state standards; a planned STEM evening that involved staff, students and the community; common assessments across all grade levels; and increased exposure to community professions in the field of science and technology. Lakemont focused on vocabulary instruction and hands-on experiments, which also contributed to the success of the Science data.

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

In comparing the prior year data to the current year data, course failure in ELA or Math and level 1 on statewide assessment would be the two areas of concern. However, due to cancellation of statewide testing for the 2019-2020 school year, this data does not accurately reflect the number of course failures or level 1's on statewide testing. Therefore based on the data for current year Early Warning Systems, attendance below 90 percent is the potential area of concern.

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
4. Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership (SELL)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus is to accelerate student performance by increasing the overall proficiency for ESSA subgroup, Students with Disabilities. To increase the overall proficiency of the Students with Disabilities from 25% to 41% 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.

Measurable Outcome: Increase overall student proficiency for Students with Disabilities from 25% to 41% as outlined in the Every Student Success Act

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Karl Fox (karl.fox@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Build our culture of collaboration between professionals (ESE and non-ESE) to increase student success through data-based Professional Learning Communities, common planning, support facilitation, and input in the MTSS process. As a result of this process, both general education and ESE teachers will provide both intensive standards and reading/math instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 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.

Teachers match the intensity of instruction to the intensity of the student's learning and behavioral challenges. Intensive instruction involves working with students with similar needs on a small number of high priority, clearly defined skills or concepts critical to academic success. Teachers group students based on common learning needs; clearly define learning goals; and use systematic, explicit and well-paced instruction. They frequently monitor students' progress and adjust their instruction accordingly.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaboration between ESE and non-ESE teachers to support student learning through intensive standards-based reading/math instruction

Person Responsible: Karl Fox (karl.fox@ocps.net)

2. Monthly data meetings with administration to monitor the implementation of instruction as assessed through common assessments. Trend data will allow students to be identified for Tier II interventions as part of the initial MTSS process. Interventions are then implemented in both small group and FBS. Data is collected and monitored for the effectiveness of the intervention.

Person Responsible: Karl Fox (karl.fox@ocps.net)

3. Common planning and data-driven PLCs that allow teachers to collaborate and identify trends to adjust instruction/interventions.

Person Responsible Emily Thompson (emily.thompson@ocps.net)

4. Students properly identified and monitored through the MTSS process. As data is collected on the Tier II students, interventions are monitored for their effectiveness. If the intervention is deemed ineffective, a change of instruction/intervention will be identified and implemented. This information will be processed through the MTSS Coach, who will then monitor for possible Tier III interventions.

Person Responsible Marta Pinner (marta.pinner@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**Area of Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

Lakemont will build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a positive culture for social and emotional learning, we will consequently see an increase in student achievement and student discipline issues will decrease.

Measurable Outcome:

During the 2020-2021 school year, the specific measurable outcome we would like to see an overall decrease in would be threats to others reported. With the increased focus on social skill groups and the new SELL initiative, we anticipate a 5% drop from 17 to 15.

Lakemont will also use a cycle of professional learning, establish a plan for continuous school improvement that integrates academics and social and emotional learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brad Rosa (brad.rosa@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Using distributive leadership and social emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to foster the whole child. Our school will plan and implement cycles of professional learning guided by the district SELL plan to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by the data we collect.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In order to achieve this task, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor, measure and modify SELL implementation as needed via SELL Site Team Walks

Person

Responsible Karl Fox (karl.fox@ocps.net)

2. Establish a common language to support a school culture of social and emotional learning with all stakeholders. Lakemont will use PBIS as a means of creating a common language for school-wide expectations.

Person

Responsible Brooklyn Hancock (brooklyn.hancock2@ocps.net)

3. Determine relevant strategies and resources to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration across Lakemont while also understanding the relationship between distributive leadership and social and emotional learning

Person Responsible Karl Fox (karl.fox@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

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% for the 2018-2019 school year. The learning gains for ELA for the lowest 25% at Lakemont decreased 7% from 2018 to 2019. Based on 2019-2020 iReady MOY data, we were on the trajectory to have 26% of our students in the bottom 25% make learning gains.

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%. Based on 2019-2020 iReady MOY data we were on the trajectory to have 15% of our students in the bottom 25% make learning gains.

Students systematically engage in processing content to generate conclusions through collaborative interactions with other students in small groups and utilize effective cognitive skills necessary to interact with new knowledge as well as practice and deepen knowledge.

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 cognitive skills necessary for understanding and interacting with other students.

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.

During the 2020-21 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 as 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 as well as 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. The PTO recently provided funding to support the purchase of new technology for the news studio. The news crew will be able to highlight the positive activities that are happening on the campus and throughout the community.

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 hosts 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.

The Parent Teacher Organization in conjunction with the Lakemont staff hold multiple events throughout the year to promote the partnership between the school and community. These events include curriculum nights such as Literacy and STEAM; an international night to promote and recognize the diversity within the school population; family events such as Morning with Mom and Donuts with Dad; and fundraisers such as Boosterthon and Carnival. In addition, several retired Lakemont teachers actively volunteer as Additions to work with struggling students in order to help close the achievement gap. Lakemont also partners with additional volunteers through the Read2Succeed program. Read2Succeed is a program that supports first and second graders on their reading journey. Reading volunteers are matched with first and/or second grade students at participating OPCS elementary schools to improve their vocabulary, reading fluency and reading comprehension. Through these events as well as the collaboration with the School Advisory Council, Lakemont is able to achieve the Golden School Award for volunteerism and the Five Star School Award.

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.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$73,417.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0561 - Lakemont Elementary	General Fund		\$70,717.00
			<i>Notes: VE Teacher</i>			
		500-Materials and Supplies	0561 - Lakemont Elementary	General Fund		\$2,700.00
			<i>Notes: Additional SIPPS intervention program K-12</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$71,717.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0561 - Lakemont Elementary	General Fund	650.0	\$71,717.00

		500-Materials and Supplies	0561 - Lakemont Elementary	General Fund		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Sanford Harmony Curriculum grades K-5</i>			
Total:						\$145,134.00