Lakemont Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lakemont Elementary

901 N LAKEMONT AVE, Winter Park, FL 32792

https://lakemontes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Karl Fox   Start Date for this Principal: 4/24/2018

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2020-21 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%)
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	

* 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

Lakemont Elementary

901 N LAKEMONT AVE, Winter Park, FL 32792

https://lakemontes.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	72%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fox, Karl	Principal	-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 two 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 -Provide teachers with the resources, professional development, and support needed to provide students with grade level work in order to accelerate learning -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 -Support the growth of teacher leaders
Thompson, Emily	Instructional Coach	-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 -Provide professional development on Culturally Responsive Standards-Based Teaching, as well as the MAO Initiative, Jump Start Acceleration -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 instructional planning; Facilitate the Coaching Cycle as determined by teacher needs -Support the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP -Member of Literacy Leadership Team
Hennessey, Lauren	Curriculum Resource Teacher	-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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		regards to data-based instructional planning -Provide professional development on Culturally Responsive Standards-Based Teaching, as well as the MAO Initiative, Jump Start Acceleration -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
Bowers, Kenya	Instructional Media	-Member Literacy Leadership Team -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 and textbook inventory -Supervise the Battle of the Books -Supervise the WLOS morning news program
Erhardt, Luke	Staffing Specialist	-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 identified in the SIP -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 -Provide professional development to support ESE compliance
Hancock, Brooklyn	School Counselor	-Member of the School Threat Assessment Team and Mental Health Designee -Facilitate district expectations of the Social Emotional Learning Leadership Team -Provide guidance services for students to include small group and individual counseling -Implement lessons on Child Safety Matters, Character Education, and Sanford Harmony -
Stewart, Amanda	Assistant Principal	-Input Master Schedule into Skyward and update class and student rosters as needed -Provide professional development to teachers and staff regarding data

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		management and use to drive instruction -Provide curriculum support through Professional Learning Communities in which leadership will work collaboratively with instructional coaches to facilitate common planning, disaggregate common assessment data to identify opportunities for support during small group instructions and interventions/enrichment -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 -Support the growth of teacher leaders

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 4/24/2018, 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.*
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.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

Total number of students enrolled at the school
530

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	11	85	95	116	93	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	517
Attendance below 90 percent	5	21	24	17	16	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	11	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/27/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				71%	57%	57%	72%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	58%	58%	64%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	52%	53%	49%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				72%	63%	63%	75%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				69%	61%	62%	68%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	48%	51%	50%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				70%	56%	53%	68%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	65%	55%	10%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	73%	57%	16%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	56%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	68%	62%	6%	62%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	77%	63%	14%	64%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2021					
	2019	66%	57%	9%	60%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	66%	54%	12%	53%	13%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Orange County Public Schools utilized the I-Ready beginning, middle and end of year diagnostic assessments for Grades 1-5 as the progress monitoring tools for both ELA and Mathematics. They utilized the beginning, middle and end of year Grade 5 PMA Progress Monitoring tool for Science.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	38%	59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	35%	57%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	11%	27%
	English Language Learners	20%	33%	43%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19%	32%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	25%	48%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	33%	45%
	English Language Learners	40%	17%	29%

Grade 2			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19%	33%	49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	23%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	21%	21%	29%
	English Language Learners	8%	17%	23%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10%	24%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	18%	32%
	Students With Disabilities	26%	21%	29%
	English Language Learners	8%	0%	23%

Grade 3			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31%	50%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	43%	49%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	50%	67%
	English Language Learners	0%	15%	8%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11%	20%	49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7%	16%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	50%	50%
	English Language Learners	8%	8%	15%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21%	32%	36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	23%	27%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	15%	16%
	English Language Learners	8%	24%	22%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5%	18%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3%	10%	30%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	5%	20%
	English Language Learners	8%	27%	24%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21%	26%	30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	23%	23%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	9%	20%
	English Language Learners	17%	0%	20%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13%	28%	41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8%	18%	29%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	10%
	English Language Learners	17%	40%	40%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70%	65%	67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60%	60%	57%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	18%	22%
	English Language Learners	50%	67%	40%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	21	33	30	29	58	50	9				
ELL	32			36							
ASN	86			86							
BLK	39	46		39	46		38				
HSP	56	59		50	52		52				
WHT	70	56		71	62	33	69				
FRL	51	47	7	47	50	43	49				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	20	39	36	10	33	36					
ELL	51	56	41	58	61	60	46				
ASN	82	82		94	82						
BLK	54	56	30	56	56		50				
HSP	60	56	42	65	59	48	58				
WHT	82	76	54	80	76	71	80				
FRL	58	60	39	63	66	55	61				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	13	33	27	10	24	29					
ELL	38	46	47	54	58	46					
ASN	87			87							
BLK	58	54	42	56	54	27	57				
HSP	59	57	48	70	71	59	59				
MUL	73	70		64	60						
WHT	82	71	58	82	71	50	77				
FRL	62	61	44	67	64	48	60				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&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	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	435

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

As the data is analyzed from 2019 to the current school year using I-Ready projected performance indicators and FSA assessments, overall proficiency in both ELA and math demonstrate a decline for students with disabilities as well as grades 4 and 5. In addition, the students identified in both the learning gains and lowest 25% learning gains, demonstrate a decline, most notably due to the number of students with disabilities making up these two groups.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based off both progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, the students with disabilities demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. With the current FSA scores, Lakemont will now demonstrate three years of less than 42% proficiency in the ESSA subgroup for the students with disabilities.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Some contributing factors that cause the need for improvement with the students with disabilities are adequate systems of support and appropriate intervention materials.

In order to ensure proper systems of support are in place, the VE teacher will work with the

appropriate personnel to identify whether support facilitation or resource will be most effective for specific students and groups of students. Appropriate instructional space has been allocated to ensure there is not a loss of support due to transition time. As a school, SIPPS will be used one of the school-wide interventions. Planning time will be provided for the ESE teachers to collaborate with the general education teachers during Professional Learning Communities. And MTSS meetings will be monitored to analyze student progress, determine the effectiveness of intervention/support, and if needed a change of intervention/support will be made in order to identify the system of support.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based off the progress monitoring data and 2019 state assessments, the Hispanic and ELL subgroups demonstrated the greatest growth in ELA with 27% increase amongst Hispanics and 28% increase amongst ELLs. This was also true in Math with the Hispanic subgroup demonstrating a 33% increase and the ELL subgroup demonstrating a 17% increase. Third grade scores also demonstrated an increase.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Some actions that contributed to this increase were the implementation of a Tier III intervention teacher, Imagine Learning for students newly identified as ELL, and the restructuring of the MTSS process.

New actions that will occur this year are going to include intentional planning for small group instruction during Professional Learning Communities, SIPPS implemented school-wide, walk to interventions implemented grades 1-5, and continued monitoring of the MTSS process. By ensuring our teachers are supporting students with intentional small group instruction that is differentiated based on data they will directly impact students at their specific targeted level. Not only will this occur during the ELA 90 minute reading block but also during the FBS walk to intervention time.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

The 1st strategy that will be implemented to support students with accelerated learning is the implementation of the Minority Achievement Office's initiative for acceleration of instruction in second and third grades. Lessons have been added to the shared drive in order to make reference for teachers easier to access. The next strategy will be to incorporate the acceleration tutoring model for after school tutoring. Teachers will also be provided strategies that support specific instructional practices that promote student learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

As we enter the 2021-2022 school year, our focus will be directly connected to student achievement. Our professional development will be ongoing throughout the year and will be based on the following areas:
-Book study "The Energy Bus" by Jon Gordon
-Social Emotional Learning and Leadership (year 2)
-Kagan Cooperative Learning Refresher

Through our Professional Learning Communities we will focus on the following areas: small group instruction and center activities, data analysis, acceleration of instruction, MTSS, the guided math model, and the B.E.S.T. standards.

As a leadership team, the principal, assistant principal, instructional coach and curriculum resource teacher have identified differentiated levels of support for teachers based on change of grade level, previous classroom observations, and new teacher induction plan. A classroom walkthrough form will be used to identify trends to include: instruction/tasks aligned to standards, small group/center activities, student engagement and pacing. Based on these informal observations targeted support will be provided to specific teachers through modeling, the coaching cycle, and planning/delivery of instruction.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

In order to ensure sustainability of improvement, Lakemont will implement the SIPPS (Systematic instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and SIght Words) curriculum school-wide in order to close the gaps in literacy. This is achieved through a structured literacy approach to foundational skills instruction through explicit instructional routines. These routines are focused on phonological awareness, spelling-sounds, and sight words that are immediately applied to reading connected text and spelling. Data collected from the implementation of the program will be monitored through the MTSS framework.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Lakemont will continue to promote a culture of social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students through the Sanford Harmony and Second Step SEL curriculums. 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. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2021-2022 school year, the specific measurable outcome we would like to see is an overall decrease in would be threats to others reported. With the increased focus on social skill groups and the continued implementation of the SELL initiative, we anticipate a 5% drop from 9 to 8. Lakemont will also use a cycle of professional learning, establish a plan for continuous school improvement that integrates academics and social and emotional learning.
Monitoring:	The Area of Focus will be monitored through the monthly School Threat Assessment Team meeting.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karl Fox (karl.fox@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 Plan as needed through collaboration between the SELL team and School SELL Site team.

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

2. 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)

3. Prioritize SEL instruction with students by implementing evidence-based instructional strategies utilizing SEL competencies to promote standards-based learning.

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

#2. 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. The targeted goal is to increase the overall proficiency on FSA assessments of the Students with Disabilities from 14% 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 14% to 41% as outlined in the Every Student Success Act
Monitoring:	The ESSA subgroup, Students with Disabilities, will be monitored through weekly Professional Learning Communities to ensure small group instruction is specifically targeted to meet the individual needs of these students. Students in are most fragile groups will work with a designated staff member during FBS/intervention time. In addition, a Tier I support facilitation teacher will be assigned to the primary grades as well as to the intermediate grades. This person will support core instruction. A monthly progress report will be created to monitor student progress towards individual IEP goals.
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 Emily Thompson (emily.thompson@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

When reviewing the discipline data on the school safety dashboard for Lakemont Elementary, there were a reported 1.2 incidents per 100 students. This data placed Lakemont in the high category for school incident ranking, with a ranking of 1,043 out of 1,395 elementary schools statewide. The comparative data statewide listed on the school safety dashboard reflects 2.5 incidents per 100 students in Florida. The area representing the most incidents is threats or intimidation. When looking at historical data, in 2019-2020, there were 17 incidents reports as threats to others as documented in the school threat assessment team meetings. The specific measurable goal for the 2020-2021 school year was to decrease by 5% from 17 incidents to 15. The actual outcome was 9 documented incidents as recorded in the school threat assessment team meetings. The goal for the 2021-2022 school year is to decrease by an additional 5%, which would be a decrease from 9 to 8.

One of the areas of focus for Lakemont's plan for improvement is culture and environment specifically relating to social emotional learning. As part of year two of the Social Emotional Learning and Leadership professional learning, Lakemont will continue to create intentionally structured opportunities for adults to integrate and monitor resources and strategies to grow and support students academically, socially, and emotionally. This will be established by continuing to implement cycles of professional learning while establishing a plan for continuous improvement that integrates academics and social and emotional learning. This in turn allows classrooms to build supportive relationships that promote the integration of SEL to build and sustain a caring classroom and ultimately a school community. As a result, students establish a set of norms, values, behaviors and interactions that reflect an overall sense of social and emotional learning as part of the school culture.

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.

During the 2021-2022 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 an electronic copy of 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 news crew uses the school newsroom to highlight the positive activities that are happening on the campus and throughout the community, as well as provide daily updates of activities on campus.

Lakemont staff are currently participating in the OCPS initiative for Social Emotional Learning and Leadership. During the 1st year, the school community stakeholders and the SELL Site Team collaborated to develop a SELL implementation plan based on school priorities, goals, and needs that aligned with the School Improvement Plan, and OCPS mission, vision, and objectives. Resources such as Sanford Harmony are provided to support SEL strategies in the class. This year, the Second Step curriculum will also be added to support SEL instruction/strategies in the classroom. Through this ongoing cycle of professional development and continuous improvement, adults will continue to embed SEL competencies to strengthen dynamics and cultivate supportive, equitable learning environments to promote social emotional learning for students.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The school leadership team spent the summer reading, "The Energy Bus," by Jon Gordon as part of a book study. Each staff member will be provided a copy of the book as well during preplanning to guide us in building a positive team and culture in which we can overcome negativity and obstacles to perform at our highest potential.

The SELL and SELL Site Team continue to share information learned from the cycles of professional learning to establish, monitor and modify the SELL implementation plan for continuous school improvement that integrates academics and social emotional learning. They have provided access to various resources

through a shared drive folder to support the implementation of SEL instruction and strategies in the classroom as well as part of the Health block.

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.

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 OCPS elementary schools to improve their vocabulary, reading fluency and reading comprehension.

The School Advisory Council works closely with the school principal to monitor the goals set for the in the school improvement plan. They meet monthly to discuss various topics to include budget, staff, student assessments, curriculum, data and progress towards school improvement goals.

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				$82,013.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3362	239-Other	0561 - Lakemont Elementary	General Fund		$875.00
			Notes: Purchased "The Energy Bus" by Jon Gordon for all staff as a book study			
	2110	100-Salaries	0561 - Lakemont Elementary	General Fund		$77,138.00
			Notes: Guidance Counselor to support SELL			
	2110	140-Substitute Teachers	0561 - Lakemont Elementary	General Fund		$1,000.00
			Notes: Substitute for SEL and SEL Site team to collaborate			
	5900	500-Materials and Supplies	0561 - Lakemont Elementary	Other		$3,000.00
			Notes: Internal accounts used to purchase student incentives			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$80,263.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	2110	100-Salaries	0561 - Lakemont Elementary	General Fund		$73,263.00
			Notes: VE teacher to support student services			
	2110	100-Salaries	0561 - Lakemont Elementary	Other Federal		$7,000.00
			Notes: Acceleration tutoring to support the loss of learning			
					Total:	$162,276.00