

Orange County Public Schools

Lancaster 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	22

Lancaster Elementary

6700 SHERYL ANN DR, Orlando, FL 32809

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

Demographics

Principal: Carmen Dottavio

Start Date for this Principal: 2/17/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* 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%)
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	22

Lancaster Elementary

6700 SHERYL ANN DR, Orlando, FL 32809

<https://lancasteres.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 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	94%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	C

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
Clayton, Angela	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Supports the vision and mission of Orange County Public Schools (OCPS) -Provides a strategic vision for the school through the use of data based decision-making -Ensures school resources are maximized to achieve school improvement goals -Monitors student achievement trends, goals, and targets -Coaches and develops teachers and teacher leaders -Serves as instructional leader, overseeing the development and implementation of curriculum and instruction -Administers the school budget and manages fiscal resources -Manage human and material resources to achieve district priorities and support student learning
Rumph, Barbara	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Supports the vision and mission of OCPS -Supports the school's common vision for the use of data based decision-making -Supports and implements practices to address the goals and targets within the School Improvement Plan - Conducts classroom walkthroughs and observations to monitor instructional trends and practices and provides feedback to teachers - Collaborates with instructional coaches and grade level teams to ensure instruction is aligned to the standards and best practices are used -Supports operational functions of the school
Rosenberger, Nicole	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Collaborates with staff to ensure students' needs are being met and school improvement goals are being addressed -Provides professional development to teachers and staff -Supports teachers through the coaching cycle in science content -Facilitates and supports data collection, interpretation, and enrichment activities -Provides support and guidance to teachers in Science planning and instruction -Supports students through intervention groups
Casamento, Joan	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Supports the vision and mission of OCPS -Provides instructional resource support to teachers -Promotes the growth and development of teachers within their first two years of teaching -Serves as collegial and emotional support for new teachers and their mentors -Assists with curriculum implementation -Facilitates district and state assessments -Supports students through intervention groups
Campbell, Toyka	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provides professional development to teachers and staff -Collaborates with staff to ensure students' needs are being met and school improvement goals are being addressed

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Supports teachers through the coaching cycle in ELA content -Facilitates and supports data collection, interpretation, and enrichment activities -Provides support and guidance to teachers in ELA planning and instruction -Supports students through intervention groups
Cintron, Marybelle	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Supports teachers in ensuring ESE students receive the services they are entitled to based on their IEP -Meets with teachers and family members to align student services -Parent communication and relationship development
Harpe, LaJuana	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Collaborates with staff to ensure students' needs are being met and school improvement goals are being addressed -Supports teachers through the coaching cycle in Math content -Facilitates and supports data collection, interpretation, and enrichment activities -Provides support and guidance to teachers in Math planning and instruction -Supports students through intervention groups
Seda, Radames	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Welcomes, provides support and monitors the progress of ELL students -Ensures implementation and support of ELL students and ESOL compliance -Collaborates with staff to ensure students' needs are being met and school improvement goals are addressed -Supports parents in understanding the unique needs of ELL students -Provides support to teachers in implementing ESOL strategies
Rodriguez, Anabel	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provides character education instruction -Serves as the school mental health contact -Conducts individual and small group counseling -Provides referrals to outside agencies as needed for the social/emotional concerns -Serves as the lead contact person for SEDNET and other outside resources counseling -Conducts Child Safety Matters lessons throughout the school year -Assists students in peer relationships, coping strategies, and the use of effective social skills, communication skills, problem-solving techniques and conflict resolution strategies. -Collaborates with staff, the Alpha Counselor, and the Social Worker to ensure students' needs are being met -Provides bullying awareness and character education
Rodriguez, Elizabeth	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Encourages parent and community involvement -Coordinates monthly family events -Coordinates community events

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Coordinates Partners in Education -Collaborates with staff to ensure students' needs are being met and school improvement goals are addressed
Ellison, Gwen	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Collaborates with staff to ensure students' needs are being met and school improvement goals are addressed -Supports students through intervention groups -Provides coaching and support to students on best practices in behavior management -Supports teachers with best practices in inclusive education -Supports MTSS implementation and monitoring -Provides support and coaching to teachers through leadership team liaison -Supports students through intervention groups

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 2/17/2020, Carmen Dottavio

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.*

1

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

49

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%

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* 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%)
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	32	97	122	127	146	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	647
Attendance below 90 percent	3	31	26	28	37	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	42	105	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	37	77	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	31	84	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/4/2020

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	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

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

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	
	(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	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%
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%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
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	52
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	53
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	60
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	53
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.

Due to no testing data for the 2019-2020 school year, 2018-2019 FSA data is still being considered for the 2020-2021 School Improvement Plan. Fifth grade science was the lowest data component for the 2018 - 2019 assessment administration. Historically, student performance in science is lower than ELA and mathematics. Student performance decreased by 12 percentage points 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. The 2018-2019 third grade data will be used in calculating the 2020-2021 school grade, a closer look at that grade level is warranted. For third grade, the vocabulary component of ELA had the lowest performance. Some contributing factors to this performance include language acquisition and the need for additional focus on daily vocabulary instruction. Our SWD is the lowest performing ESSA subgroup.

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

Due to no statewide testing occurring for the 2019-2020 school year, there were no declines in any components.

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.

Based on 2018-2019 FSA Data, 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%. In addition to focusing on the close reading strategies, other components of reading such as phonics, phonemic awareness and fluency need to be present in the intermediate grades' literacy instruction. Teachers need support in effectively implementing standards based instruction.

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

Based on 2018-2019 FSA data, 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 using test item specifications to help with refining plans and resources to more closely align to grade level content standards, 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?

Based upon the EWS data, two areas of concern 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, was 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
2. Social Emotional Learning
3. Learning Gains of Lowest Quartile
4. Science Proficiency
5. ESSA (Students with Disabilities)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: We 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.

Measurable Outcome: By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning we will see an improvement in our early warning systems indicator data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Angela Clayton (angela.clayton@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL CORE Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, 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 students' social emotional needs and improve student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Add an Art teacher to staff to support students' social-emotional development, which will give students different ways to develop and use skills, such as empathy and perseverance (July 31, 2020)

Person Responsible: Angela Clayton (angela.clayton@ocps.net)

Work with the Neighborhood Children for Families to support providing wraparound services to meet the unique needs of families in the community. (July 31 and ongoing throughout the school year)

Person Responsible: Anabel Rodriguez (anabel.rodriguez@ocps.net)

School administration and instructional staff will participate in a social and emotional learning overview course (July-Aug 2020)

Person Responsible: Joan Casamento (joan.casamento@ocps.net)

Plan and implement a cycle of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data (Aug-Dec, 2020).

Person Responsible: Angela Clayton (angela.clayton@ocps.net)

Plan and implement a second cycle of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice and examination of impact data (Jan-April 2020)

Person Responsible: Angela Clayton (angela.clayton@ocps.net)

Provide position within the special area rotation to address communication and social skills training for all students.

Person Responsible Angela Clayton (angela.clayton@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

In order to ensure that all students are able to learn to his/her potential, we must provide students with quality instruction that removes barriers to student's academic progress. Based on 2018-2019 data, 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. Continued support to build the capacity of faculty and staff to ensure consistent standards-aligned instruction is delivered across grade levels and content areas is needed.

Measurable Outcome:

Student achievement in ELA proficiency, ELA learning gains, ELA learning gains of the lowest quartile, and ELA gains of the students with disabilities subgroup will each increase by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Clayton (angela.clayton@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers use small learning groups to accommodate learning differences, promote in-depth academic related interactions and teach students to work collaboratively.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will utilize common planning time to create standards based lessons and common assessments using backwards design. The team will continue to build on effective progress monitoring strategies. (Teachers, Instructional Coach, Administration – August 3, 2020 and weekly thereafter)

Person Responsible

Joan Casamento (joan.casamento@ocps.net)

Instructional Coach and ESE Teachers will engage in job embedded professional development during PLCs to develop instructional plans and progress monitor students (ESE Teachers, Administration)

Person Responsible

Gwen Ellison (gwendolyn.ellison@ocps.net)

Classroom walk-throughs with feedback will be conducted regularly. Look-fors will include evidence of the use of instructional practices aligned to the intent of the standards. (Instructional Coaches and Administration – September 1 and weekly thereafter)

Person Responsible

Barbara Rumph (barbara.rumph@ocps.net)

The Instructional Coach and Staffing Specialist will provide professional development on the use of small learning groups to accommodate learning differences, promote in-depth academic related interactions and teach students to work collaboratively. (Instruction Coach and Administration - September 2020 and ongoing as needed)

Person Responsible

Toyka Campbell (toyka.campbell@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

BPIE data indicated a need to provide the necessary job embedded professional development on best practices for inclusive education for students with disabilities. We will increase the use of a multi-tiered system of student supports (MTSS) and problem-solving process by school personnel to ensure progress in the general education curriculum, across all grades and settings, for all students with and without disabilities. This need will be addressed through PLCs and professional development to focus on all 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.

Lancaster Elementary School builds a positive school culture and environment by encouraging parental and community involvement. Our Partners in Education Program is used to establish and maintain relationships with local businesses and community members. Through mutual partnerships, the school is able to expand its resources to better serve the students and staff. Once partnerships are established, our partners are invited to community events and are able to volunteer or donate resources towards initiatives that support students and the community. Each year, partnerships are discussed and renewed. School Advisory Council meetings are held throughout the school year and input is welcome by all. Lancaster will be starting a PTA group this year in order to encourage parental involvement and build strong working relationships among parents, teachers, and the school in support of students. These provide stakeholders with the opportunity to participate in the decision making process on a broad scale. Additionally, Lancaster seeks to provide curriculum nights and extracurricular opportunities for students and families.

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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$140,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

		120-Classroom Teachers	0851 - Lancaster Elementary	General Fund		\$140,000.00
			<i>Notes: Created positions within special area rotation to address communication, social skills training, and art.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$40,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0851 - Lancaster Elementary	General Fund		\$30,000.00
			<i>Notes: Provide targeted tutoring</i>			
		140-Substitute Teachers	0851 - Lancaster Elementary	General Fund		\$10,000.00
			<i>Notes: Provide common planning mid year to teachers with coaching support</i>			
Total:						\$180,000.00