

Orange County Public Schools

Lovell Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lovell Elementary

815 ROGER WILLIAMS RD, Apopka, FL 32703

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

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Sarasty

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2019

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (45%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lovell Elementary

815 ROGER WILLIAMS RD, Apopka, FL 32703

<https://lovelles.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 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	84%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	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 to 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
Sarasty, Melissa	Principal	Principal/Assistant Principal - Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communication with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.
Hale, Luz	Assistant Principal	Principal/Assistant Principal - Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communication with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.
Rojas, Jennifer	Dean	To assist the Principal with providing an educational atmosphere that promotes student learning, student achievement, student discipline, safety and technology enhancements. Provides behavior support by conducting observations and making recommendations for behavior interventions. The Dean implements School Board policies and the Code of Conduct designed to maintain proper student discipline. She conducts behavior assessments and creates Behavior Intervention Plans. She provides staff development on various behavior topics, models for staff and teachers specific behavior interventions. She also assists with Progress Monitoring and data collection, and provides classroom consultation services for staff who request it.
Gunter, Kathryn	Instructional Media	Respond to requests for information from the media or designate an appropriate spokesperson or information source. Write press releases or other media communications to promote clients. Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches.
Warkentien, Gina	Reading Coach	Coaches - (Instructional, Reading, Math, and Science) Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches.
Byrd, Tanika	Instructional Coach	Coaches - (Instructional, Reading, Math, and Science) Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rodriguez, Layhonelly	Instructional Coach	Coaches - (Instructional, Reading, Math, and Science) Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches.
Valle, Jessica	ELL Compliance Specialist	Resource to the principal, staff, and parents regarding ESOL procedures, State Board Rules and the Florida Consent Decree. Ensures registration procedures are implemented and followed. Conducts and coordinates ELL Committee Meetings. Monitors students on an Academic Needs Improvement Plan. Conducts aural/oral language testing on students entering the school and follows up on students needing the Reading/Writing Assessment. She assesses, evaluates, and monitors the individual progress of each student in the ESOL program. Coordinates the reevaluation (extension of instruction) process of ESOL students. Follows exit procedures for students that qualify to exit the ESOL program through an ELL Committee Meeting. Coordinates the use of all ESOL forms at the school level including referral, testing, ELL student plans, data entry forms, FTE, and any other forms required by state and/or district policy.
Murray, Lisa	Staffing Specialist	Exceptional Education Teachers/Interventionist - Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers. Staffing Specialist (SSS) coordinates and plans the Individual Education Plans (IEPs), Educational Plans and the MTSS Tier 3 meetings at the school. Attends regularly scheduled (monthly) district training sessions in order to remain current regarding federal and/or FLDOE rules. Facilitates and provides information to the staff relative to ESE procedures, least restrictive environments and other issues involving ESE students. Maintains the 3 years required training/certification in the FLDOE Matrix of Services procedures, state and federal laws, and program services provided by the district. Coordinates and participates in articulation meetings promoting students from 5th grade. Monitors, coordinates and gathers the necessary documentation prior to a student being considered for eligibility under an exceptional education program and/or service. Maintains accurate ESE paperwork and supporting documentation to reflect the appropriate service delivery models, and services for all ESE students as identified on their IEP, etc.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 6/15/2019, Melissa Sarasty

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.*

6

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

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

68

Total number of students enrolled at the school

587

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

2

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

26

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	19	96	108	120	123	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	586
Attendance below 90 percent	7	33	50	50	41	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	223
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	1	8	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/17/2021

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	25	110	116	128	130	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	625
Attendance below 90 percent	6	21	32	21	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	9	20	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	26	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	1	3	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	

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	25	110	116	128	130	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	625
Attendance below 90 percent	6	21	32	21	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	9	20	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	26	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	1	3	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	

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				35%	57%	57%	39%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	58%	58%	54%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	52%	53%	72%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				47%	63%	63%	47%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				61%	61%	62%	59%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	48%	51%	47%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				42%	56%	53%	51%	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	35%	55%	-20%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	32%	57%	-25%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2021					
	2019	32%	54%	-22%	56%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	37%	62%	-25%	62%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	46%	63%	-17%	64%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	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.

Data used is FSA, i-Ready, CRM and PMA's.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11%	13%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	10%	31%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	25%	25%
	English Language Learners	12%	17%	22%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6%	9%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	8%	30%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	25%	13%
	English Language Learners	6%	11%	20%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	5%	12%	21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5%	11%	22%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	4%	10%	27%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2%	5%	9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1%	6%	8%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	2%	8%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8%	13%	25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7%	10%	25%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	9%	9%
	English Language Learners	8%	10%	18%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2%	6%	20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	3%	19%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	9%
	English Language Learners	0%	3%	17%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8%	7%	16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	6%	14%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	10%
	English Language Learners	5%	2%	11%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	1%	5%	21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	3%	19%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	5%
	English Language Learners	0%	2%	9%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2%	6%	6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1%	6%	5%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	3%	5%	7%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1%	1%	14%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1%	0%	15%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	3%	3%	12%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37%	34%	38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38%	36%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	22%	9%
	English Language Learners	36%	23%	28%

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	11	20	25	5	13		10				
ELL	33	41	29	34	20	18	30				
BLK	25	14		35	22		19				
HSP	35	40	33	33	25	21	33				
WHT	51			52			75				
FRL	33	32	28	31	23	11	35				
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	9	44	56	9	46	44	13				
ELL	27	36	59	50	60	72	26				
BLK	28	47		32	53	43	20				
HSP	35	46	61	50	63	69	45				

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
WHT	48	53		52	60						
FRL	30	45	61	42	57	57	34				
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	20	50		6	29	36	17				
ELL	29	48	69	45	54	47	32				
BLK	31	60	79	32	63	56	48				
HSP	38	50	71	51	59	43	51				
WHT	54	60		42	50		50				
FRL	37	53	72	46	58	44	49				

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	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	255
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
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	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	23
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	33
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	59
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	29
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Trends across grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas continue to show low achievement in reading proficiency. This is seen when looking at the 2020-2021 and 2019-2020 i-Ready Middle of the Year data. Tier I Instruction across all grade levels needs to be improved. Students need more time reading and interacting with text at rigorous levels.

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

Data components that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement is proficiency in reading. In this data along with the i-Ready End of Year diagnostic data, we continue to show low academic achievement in reading across grade levels. We are not meeting student needs by differentiating instruction. The learning gaps in reading proficiency get wider as students advance through the grade levels. Therefore, instruction needs to be rigorous with high-level questioning. Teachers need to have higher expectations for all students, including our ELL's while scaffolding to meet the language needs.

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

A contributing factor is differentiating the curriculum for student groups and the provision of a language-rich environment for students. Another contributing factor is the need to improve our small group instruction. We also need to continue to expand the focus from just 3-5 to include K-5.

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

i-Ready EOY for 4th grade demonstrated an increase of 6% for students on or above grade level. i-Ready EOY Math data for 3rd grade demonstrates an increase of 13% for students on or above grade level, 4th grade demonstrates an increase of 4% for students on or above grade level, and our 5th demonstrates an increase of 11% for students on or above grade level

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

We provided additional tutoring throughout the school day through reading and math groups throughout the day, as well as Saturdays and online homework assistance every week.

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

For the coming school year, we will have 18 interventionists that will work with students in every classroom for Tier I and differentiated Tier II standards-based instruction, as well as small group instruction for reading and math. We will increase student engagement and discourse, print-rich environments and students taking an active role in their learning. Students will gain understanding of the concepts and standards in order to verbalize their understanding.

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.

Teachers will receive professional development on the new B.E.S.T K-2 standards, the Wonders reading curriculum, LLI, SIPP, guided reading, and Kagan strategies. We will also continue with common planning twice a week to ensure we are being proactive to match the instructional strategy that will meet our students' needs.

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

Services will include actionable feedback to teachers via classroom walkthroughs and observations, coaching, new teacher training, PLC's, interventionist training, and para support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In starting the 2020-2021 school year with LaunchEd (online) Instruction, we observed that many of our students were not online or as engaged, as they would have been in if they were at school for Face-to-Face instruction. Through parent outreach, we were able to get the majority of our students to return to school Face-to-Face by December. During our classroom walks, we observed that many of our students were struggling and at times, standards-based instruction was not taking place. Questions were provided, but the instruction and scaffolding was not observed. Our i-Ready ELA mid-year data shows an 11% decrease for 3rd grade, an 8% increase for 4th grade, and a 9% decrease for 5th grade compared to the previous year. i-Ready Math mid-year data showed a 3% decrease for 3rd grade, an 8% decrease for 4th grade, and a 9% decrease for 5th grade compared to the previous year. FSA data showed there was a 4% decrease in ELA Achievement from the 2017-18 school to the 2018-19 school year, a 9% decrease in Science Achievement, and no growth (0%) in Math Achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	85% of the lessons observed during classroom walkthroughs will be coded as "yes" for standards-based instruction being seen.
Monitoring:	Use of CWT to monitor instruction. Teachers will receive professional development on standards deconstruction and instructional strategies so they can incorporate research-based strategies to teach students at the rigor of the standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Sarasty (melissa.sarasty@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instructional with interventionist support, ability grouped students in grades K through 5th and adjust according to triangulation data. Enrichment through project-based tasks, Junior Great Books, LAFS supplement, STEM lessons and activities, and Battle of Books for Grades 4 and 5. Lessons will be monitored during delivery using CWT & teachers will be provided actionable and immediate feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale is for teachers to have a better understanding of standards from the previous year and the next year in order to make better decisions on how to teach the current year's standard. These decisions include what instructional strategies will meet the needs of the learner and the cognitive complexity of the standard.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common planning on instructional strategies that can be incorporated into all curriculum areas.
2. Professional development on Wonders, Guided Reading, and new B.E.S.T K-2 standards & benchmarks, and deconstructing of standards to ensure questioning goes deeper into what the standard is and what it is not. Use of vertical alignment of standards across all curricular areas.
3. Classroom walks to look for transfer of instruction with feedback and support provided.
4. Intervention teachers to provide small group instruction throughout all grades and classrooms.
5. Monitoring of how ESE students are responding to the support facilitation model of instruction with a focus on how our students are performing.
6. Monitoring of how our Black students are performing in comparison to all students.
7. Monitoring of data using i-Ready Diagnostics, CRM, and PMA assessments.
8. Individual Teacher Data Meetings to be held.
9. Ensure teachers are providing a print-rich environment.

Person Responsible Melissa Sarasty (melissa.sarasty@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During our classroom walkthroughs last year, we observed a low number of students re-voicing and building on each other's ideas through collaboration, reflection, or academic discourse. A low number of students were able to demonstrate an understanding of content or utilization of strategies through small group instruction to respond to content and/or demonstrate mastery. The percentage of students who made learning gains in ELA decreased 7% from the 2018-19 school year to the 2019-20 school year. The decrease in learning gains was 10% with students in the lowest quartile.
Measurable Outcome:	Walkthrough data will show 85% of the lessons observed will be coded as "yes" for focused small group instruction that includes student engagement, academic discourse and utilization of strategies taught. FSA ELA- Learning gains will increase from 45% to 50% on the 2020 FSA. Learning gains in the lowest quartile will increase from 62% to 65% on the 2020 FSA. FSA Math- Learning gains will increase from 61% to 65% on the 2020 FSA. Learning gains in the lowest quartile will increase from 63% to 65% on the 2020 FSA.
Monitoring:	Through monitoring and walkthrough data we will be able to detect what interventions are being successful with students and what adjustments will be needed in regards to groups and resources in order to make critical academic decisions to meet the needs of our students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Sarasty (melissa.sarasty@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To provide targeted, research-based intervention instruction to ensure learning gains for all students. Students will receive focused instruction during the FBS and Extra-Hour Block. Three days of FBS and extra-Hour time will be used to re-teach needed skills and two days will be used for acceleration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of CWT to monitor instruction during FBS/enrichment and Extra Hour Blocks. Teachers will receive professional development on standards deconstruction and instructional strategies so they can incorporate research-based strategies to teach students at the rigor of the standards. Ability grouped students in grades 3rd through 5th and adjust according to triangulation data Enrichment - Junior Great Books, LAFS Supplement and Battle of Books for Grades 4 and 5

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use of CWT to monitor instruction during FBS/enrichment and Extra Hour Blocks.
2. Teachers will receive professional development and support on research-based intervention instructional strategies.
3. Ability grouped students in grades Kindergarten through 5th grade and adjust according to i-Ready data.
4. Enrichment - Junior Great Books, LAFS Supplement and Battle of Books for Grades 4 and 5

Person Responsible Luz Hale (luz.hale@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of****Focus****Description
and****Rationale:**

On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that over 50%, 65% of our students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA).

**Measurable
Outcome:**

The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase of at least 3% percentage points from 35% to 38%.

Monitoring:

Monitoring of students will be through CWT, MTSS process and i-Ready diagnostic, CRM results, and Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction (SIPPS Mastery Assessments).

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Melissa Sarasty (melissa.sarasty@ocps.net)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Our students are ability grouped in grades K through 5, and it will be adjusted according to triangulation data. Standards-based Tier I instruction, including evidence-based strategies to support all learners within the whole group and small-group instruction. Strategies include incorporating multi-sensory phonics instruction, highly effective questions, explicit instruction, scaffolding strategies, and the building of content knowledge through professional development. Teachers will teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. This instructional practice has a strong level of evidence to improve reading.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

The following strategies were selected because they address the identified needs. Our teachers need support in gaining a better understanding of standards and content, and explicit instruction in order to make better decisions on how to teach the standards. These strategies will also support teachers in developing purposeful questions for upcoming CRM's that probe student thinking, and developing tasks that meet the depth of the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Due to the use of classroom walkthrough and standards-based unit assessment data, we will:

- Continue the structures of common planning to support intentionally incorporating explicit instruction and engagement strategies
- Use of the district created K-2 and 3-5 Common Planning resources to guide the agenda and discussions
- Professional learning, which will include building content knowledge beyond common planning
- Intentionally plan for small group instruction to include scaffolding questions and standards alignment
- Pre-plan questions to check for understanding (CRM in Action)

Person**Responsible**

Gina Warkentien (gina.warkentien@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

The referral rate at Lovell ES is lower than other schools across the state. Last year our discipline calls were substantially lower and we project that this will continue to trend down this year. Based on the discipline data from the 2019-2020 year, the primary area of concern at Lovell is the number of violent incidents. In the area of violent incidents, consisted of 22 incidents that involved either Threats/Intimidation, fighting, sexual harassment, or bullying by repeat offenders. This number should significantly decline with the changes that we are making to the school culture by including Conscious Discipline practices, and an emphasis on social skills instruction (Tier 1 and Tier 2 Instructional Levels). In our monthly behavior team meetings, we will monitor discipline data in order to determine students in need of additional interventions. Students who have displayed violent or threatening behaviors will be referred to the Child Study team so that an action plan can be developed by a multidisciplinary team. Our focus this year will continue to be consistent with this school-wide discipline plan and through our PAWS acronym. We will continue to reward and acknowledge the behavior we want to see. We will also continue with the House system which has really helped unite the school and give our students a better sense of belonging.

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.

Previously, we saw a need to improve the school learning environment by addressing the need for our staff to be equipped with the necessary skills, attitudes, and behaviors to help create a more positive and inclusionary climate and culture for social and emotional learning. This past year we began our first steps with SELL with an explicit goal of promoting educational equity through distributive leadership with social and emotional learning strategies and resources to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise. As we continue to dive deeper into the SEL lessons with the support of our Dean and School Counselor, we are adding Conscious Discipline as a school-wide behavior program to build resilient classrooms. Through SEL and Conscious Discipline, we will promote safety, connections, and problem solving as we create a caring, inclusive learning environment for all.

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

Stakeholders will include our administration, dean, school counselor, PEL, teachers, students and families, other school staff, and community partners.

Their roles will include:

Administration and Dean- Deescalate discipline situations while debriefing with students and teaching alternative ways to react when emotions are high. Work with teachers to support and teach them strategies to de-escalate situations early in the classroom. Communicate with staff on trends and expectations in the classroom. i.e- safe place in every room, greet students at the door in the morning, class meetings.

School Counselor- To be proactive and reactive to staff and students' emotional needs. To lead character lessons and provide teachers with resources for the character trait of the month.

PEL- to communicate the available resources for students and families to our parents and community. To work with outside businesses to provide more resources to our families as needed.

Teachers- To first stabilize their feelings before addressing a student. To support students and de-escalate situations before they become hard to handle. To communicate to parents regularly.

Students- To help keep our school environment safe.

Families- To have open communication with the school on any student or family needs.