

Orange County Public Schools

Lakeville Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Lakeville Elementary

2015 LAKEVILLE RD, Apopka, FL 32703

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

Demographics

Principal: Charles Jackson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (47%) 2014-15: B (55%)
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 was approved by the Orange County School Board on 2/11/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Lakeville Elementary

2015 LAKEVILLE RD, Apopka, FL 32703

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	95%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	80%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 2/11/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To lead all students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Swanson, Cynthia	Principal	
Jerrett, Debra	Instructional Coach	
Hayes, Sandra	Instructional Coach	
Wilkerson, Ashli	Administrative Support	
Pemberton, Donna	Administrative Support	
Milton, Robin	School Counselor	
Bustamante, Denise	Instructional Media	
Bien-Aime, Sonny	Attendance/Social Work	
Randall, Archna	Psychologist	
Petit-Frere, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	

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	114	97	113	106	125	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	11	10	18	11	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	9	7	3	9	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	4	1	1	15	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	32	48	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127

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	4	1	1	8	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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

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

43

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/15/2019

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	23	20	14	18	15	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	14	6	2	4	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	51	38	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141

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	3	1	1	16	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	23	20	14	18	15	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	14	6	2	4	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	51	38	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141

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	3	1	1	16	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	47%	57%	57%	47%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	58%	58%	55%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	52%	53%	53%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	55%	63%	63%	60%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	61%	62%	64%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	48%	51%	40%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	56%	53%	50%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	114 (0)	97 (0)	113 (0)	106 (0)	125 (0)	115 (0)	670 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	11 (23)	10 (20)	18 (14)	11 (18)	12 (15)	8 (25)	70 (115)
One or more suspensions	9 (0)	7 (0)	3 (3)	9 (2)	11 (4)	13 (2)	52 (11)
Course failure in ELA or Math	10 (14)	4 (6)	1 (2)	1 (4)	15 (7)	7 (3)	38 (36)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	32 (51)	48 (38)	47 (52)	127 (141)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	55%	-4%	58%	-7%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	57%	-5%	58%	-6%
	2018	43%	54%	-11%	56%	-13%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	34%	54%	-20%	56%	-22%
	2018	43%	55%	-12%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	50%	62%	-12%	62%	-12%
	2018	48%	61%	-13%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	63%	-10%	64%	-11%
	2018	61%	62%	-1%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	52%	57%	-5%	60%	-8%
	2018	52%	59%	-7%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	45%	54%	-9%	53%	-8%
	2018	49%	53%	-4%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	12	24	25	14	47	48	15				
ELL	25	33	25	44	63	55	35				
BLK	40	49	46	48	61	65	42				
HSP	46	42	32	51	67	48	52				
WHT	58	47		69	58		73				
FRL	39	46	36	48	59	51	38				

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	14	45	46	23	43	33	32				
ELL	25	56	56	36	54	44	29				
BLK	38	43	38	46	45	24	36				
HSP	47	56	47	58	62	44	55				
WHT	54	45	31	65	62	60	66				
FRL	40	48	39	51	53	33	46				
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	13	42	46	27	41	24	23				
ELL	24	45	44	39	50	43	40				
BLK	40	49	46	54	61	27	42				
HSP	43	61	56	60	67	58	52				
MUL	55			82							
WHT	62	56	69	64	62	27	64				
FRL	47	55	53	60	64	40	50				

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	53
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	421
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	43

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
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	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

The lowest performance was demonstrated by the lowest 25th percentile of students in ELA, with a proficiency rate of 37%. A contributing factor was lack of consistency with interventions during certain periods of time, such as testing season.

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

The greatest decline from the previous year was in 5th grade ELA, dropping from 43% to 34% proficiency. Three of the six 5th grade ELA classes demonstrated less than 50% proficiency. Changes to staff assignments for the 2019-2020 school year were made based on these results.

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.

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is the lowest 25th percentile for ELA. Lakeville students in this category demonstrated 37% proficiency to a state average of 54%. Inconsistent monitoring of interventions and whole group instruction contributed to this gap.

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

The data component with the most improvement was 4th grade ELA. Professional development was provided for Thinking Maps and was implemented with fidelity. Lakeville grew 8% in math learning gains and 19% in learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile.

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

The greatest area of potential concern with Lakeville's EWS indicators is the number of students in 4th and 5th grade who scored a level 1 on the state assessments.

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

1. Increasing proficiency for the lowest 25th percentile of students in ELA.
2. Increasing proficiency for the 5th grade ELA.
3. Increasing proficiency for Hispanic students.
4. Increasing proficiency for ESE students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Increase ELA Proficiency

Rationale Currently Lakeville is at 47% proficiency to district and state averages of 57%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Lakeville will increase ELA proficiency from 47% to 50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Debra Jerrett (debra.jerrett@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy

The DPLC site team will meet monthly to conduct walks focused on the DPLC evidence of implementation with writing across content areas to inform next steps for building teacher capacity. At weekly PLC meetings, grade level team members will bring writing samples to show evidence that Lucy Calkins strategies are being implemented with fidelity. School-based leadership team members will collaborate to analyze data and tier teachers for targeted coaching support. The leadership team will monitor lesson plans to ensure inclusion of writing instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Lakeville is committed to implementing district DPLC initiatives that will increase our students' capacity to write across content areas.

Action Step

Description

1. DPLC site team members will attend collaborative DPLC sessions six times per year within the North Learning Community.
2. The school leadership team will design a PLC agenda for consistent dissemination of professional development for writing strategies.
3. The Instructional Coach will utilize Lucy Calkins units of study for teaching writing strategies to teachers.
4. Teachers will plan and facilitate opportunities for all students to write across content areas.
5. Teachers will monitor student's writing using Write Score. Teachers will provide ongoing feedback in writing journals.

Person Responsible

Debra Jerrett (debra.jerrett@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Increase Math Proficiency
Rationale	Lakeville is currently at 55% proficiency in math to district and state averages of 63%
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Lakeville will increase proficiency in math from 55% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sandra Hayes (sandra.hayes@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Lakeville will continue to provide small group instruction and monitor data bi-weekly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction in the 2018-2019 school year was effective in increasing math learning gains by 19% for the lowest 25th percentile. Based on this effectiveness, we will apply this strategy to more grade levels.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leadership team and grade level teams will examine data to identify student performance. 2. Leadership team will group students according to areas of need. 3. Leadership team will identify who is providing instruction. 4. Leadership team will monitor instruction weekly and data on a bi-weekly basis.
Person Responsible	Sandra Hayes (sandra.hayes@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Lakeville's Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL) position has been tremendously valuable to our school. Her relationship-building with families through Parent Resource Room, translating school communications in native languages, and assisting administration in planning parent events has made families from all backgrounds feel welcome at Lakeville. This year, we will continue school-wide use of ClassDojo to encourage timely and widespread communication with parents. In addition, multiple other avenues of communication are utilized, including newsletters, calendars, flyers, Facebook, Twitter, Skylert, SAC and PTA meetings. We will continue family social and curriculum-based events, as these are very popular events with our parents and students. Our PTA and new community partnerships, such

as the Kiwanis Club, have helped to sponsor recognition of our students, which has led to additional involvement and pride in our school.

PFEF Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

The school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met by establishing a support network of administrators, teachers, special education professionals, and paraprofessionals. The behavior team meets on a weekly basis and the threat assessment team meets on a monthly basis to share information and provide support for Lakeville students. As members of our school team, Lakeville's guidance counselor and behavior specialist provide a comprehensive guidance program for students in grades K-5, designed to help students achieve success in school. The school counselor and behavior specialist implement the elementary guidance curriculum; counsel small groups and individual students with problems that create barriers to school success; consult with teachers, staff and parents regarding meeting the developmental needs of students. These professionals also refer students with severe problems to appropriate community agencies in consultation with their parents. Topics of small groups include: student success skills, getting along with others, self-esteem, test anxiety and character education. For identified at-risk students, Lakeville mentors students via "Boys Becoming Young Men" and "Girls Empowered & Motivated to Succeed."

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

All VPK and kindergarten classes begin the year with additional support in transitioning into the school environment. On the first day of school, the students are given a tour of the campus. Teachers begin the year with a focus on community building to make them feel welcome. All incoming kindergarten students are assessed using the Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screening (FLKRS)

Fifth grade students attend middle school orientations and meet with the guidance counselors regarding course selection.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

To address the effectiveness of core instruction, the leadership team reviewed data from the previous school year and made recommendations to the principal and assistant principal for staffing and resources for the current school year. Common collaborative planning team meeting format was developed. Teams utilize the countywide curriculum resource materials to plan standards-based instruction. On a bi-weekly basis, the leadership team and grade level Professional Learning Communities will collaborate to look at grade level data and individual class data. Based on the data, decisions will be made regarding the needs of the grade level, individual teachers, and individual students. Based on the need, resources will be provided, along with professional development and/or interventions. The Continuous Improvement Model will be used at each data meeting - Plan, Do, Check, Act. Individual teacher data will be reviewed, areas of excellence will be highlighted and best practices will be shared.

Supplemental Academic Instruction: Funds from this program will be used to provide reading tutoring for

our students who scored a Level 1 or Level 2 in reading and/or math. In the area of reading, students will attend tutoring after school for two days per week for one hour each day. Lessons will be based on identified needs and students will be grouped according to need.

Homeless: Our Homeless Coordinator, Robin Milton, partners with local community organizations to provide shelter, food, and clothing resources for our families in need. In partnership with Christian Services for Central Florida, Lakeville also houses an on-site Love Pantry.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Lakeville participates in the OCPS annual Teach-In event, inviting businesses and individuals to expose students to different career choices and what students need to be doing now to be marketable in the future. In addition, the Apopka Kiwanis Club has provided a resourceful connection to community business partners and mentors.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase ELA Proficiency	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Math Proficiency	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00