Lakeville Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lakeville Elementary

2015 LAKEVILLE RD, Apopka, FL 32703

https://lakevillees.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Charles Jackson

Start Date for this Principal: 1/4/2021

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (53%)
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

Lakeville Elementary

2015 LAKEVILLE RD, Apopka, FL 32703

https://lakevillees.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	83%

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 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
Chunoo, Karena	Principal	Oversee school-wide student safety and student achievement. Create a common school vision for excellence, and engage teachers, students, and community stakeholders towards the achievement of that vision.
Mrozek, Cristina	Assistant Principal	Support the principal in the oversight of school-wide student safety and student achievement. With the principal, create a common school vision for excellence, and engage teachers, students, and community stakeholders towards the achievement of that vision.
Bien-Aime, Sonny	Behavior Specialist	Team leader for ASD units at Lakeville Elementary. Supports the staff teaching these units by providing academic resources to support the curriculum as well as behavior support. Behavior support includes crisis intervention, student observation, data collection on targeted behaviors, creation of behavior plans, and analyzing data to create behavior plans. Monitors behavior data of students in ESE at Lakeville along with needs in the general student population. Meets as a member of the Leadership Team for collaboration.
Bustamante, Denise	Instructional Media	Provides support with the K-12 Reading Plan, facilitates school-wide reading initiatives and monitors and reports Accelerated Reader (AR), provides resources for staff members on high yield strategies and best practices in the area of reading, manages textbook and fixed asset inventories, serves as a grade level liaison, and meets as a member of the Leadership Team for collaboration.
Lemieux, Jacqueline	Instructional Coach	Provide professional development, analyze data, provide peer coaching support and peer observation feedback, assist with small group instruction, and facilitate common planning.
Jesso, Tanner	Math Coach	Provide professional development, analyze data, provide peer coaching support and peer observation feedback, assist with small group instruction, and facilitate common planning.
Panas, Stephanie	School Counselor	Provides support for healthy emotional and social development strategies and programs, provides training for instructional staff on the specific social and emotional needs of subgroups in the student body, facilitates the school mentoring program, Positive Behavior Support and monitors behavior data and school-wide recognition efforts, participates in MTSS meetings where needed and provides follow-up to ensure student success, monitors attendance data and follows up with the required attendance warning letters and processes for compliance serves as a grade level liaison, meets as a member of the Leadership Team for collaboration.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 1/4/2021, Charles Jackson

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

4

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

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Total number of students enrolled at the school

650

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

3

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

10

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	27	113	120	99	112	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	569
Attendance below 90 percent	6	23	29	32	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	0	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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

Wednesday 7/28/2021

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	27	113	120	99	112	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	569
Attendance below 90 percent	9	24	20	17	25	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	3	5	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	96	96	105	114	96	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	616
Attendance below 90 percent	9	24	20	17	25	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	3	5	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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				47%	57%	57%	46%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	58%	58%	48%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	52%	53%	40%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				55%	63%	63%	55%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				62%	61%	62%	54%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	48%	51%	35%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				51%	56%	53%	50%	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	51%	55%	-4%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	57%	-5%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	34%	54%	-20%	56%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	50%	62%	-12%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	53%	63%	-10%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	57%	-5%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	53%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The prominent indicator of progress used this year was iReady. Progress was determined with baseline scores from the Fall Beginning of the Year assessment, monitored during the Winter Middle of the Year assessment, and measured with the Spring End of Year assessment.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16	20	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	18	26
	Students With Disabilities	11	0	0
	English Language Learners	6	11	17
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17	20	24
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	16	19
	Students With Disabilities	11	10	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	11

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13	23	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	16	5
	Students With Disabilities	0	5	17
	English Language Learners	4	4	32
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5	17	19
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	17	21
	Students With Disabilities	0	15	10
	English Language Learners	4	8	13

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19	21	19
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	13	10
	Students With Disabilities	10	5	13
	English Language Learners	21	14	28
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4	5	14
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	2	11
	Students With Disabilities	5	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	8	13

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13	13	10
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	6	0
	Students With Disabilities	10	0	0
	English Language Learners	4	3	16
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2	7	21
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	6	14
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	7	7

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11	11	20
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	8	22
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	8
	English Language Learners	5	0	5
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2	19	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	14	24
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	9	5
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60	51	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	55	41	56
	Students With Disabilities	23	8	8
	English Language Learners	45	24	43

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	10	31		5	58						
ELL	20	26		18	35		21				
BLK	35	35		34	43	33	45				
HSP	30	47		27	41		37				
WHT	53	69		64	80		72				
FRL	30	44	31	30	46	47	41				

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				

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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	336
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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	30
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	38
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	42
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	
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	68
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	43
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?

Across both ELA and Mathematics, students with disabilities are scoring below their non-disabled peers.

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

The greatest areas for improvement are overall proficiency in mathematics across grade levels and learning gains for 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 of the contributing factors include but are not limited to: hybrid learning model, lack of small-group instruction school-wide, and lack of targeted intervention for underperforming students. We have built into the schedule extra time for math intervention utilizing small groups with standard-aligned tasks, professional development for small-group instruction, targeted data walks for teacher accountability and growth, and after school acceleration programs for enrichment and grade-level standards-based instruction.

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

Grade 2 overall learning gains for all subgroups except Economically Disadvantaged and Grade 4 and 5 mathematics showed the most improvement

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

One of the contributing factors to this improvement was the use of strategic support to close learning gaps without missing core instruction. Resource teachers and certified tutors were utilized for push in support to ensure Tier 3 students received personalized and differentiated instruction in both ELA and Math.

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

We are implementing an after-school acceleration program, emphasizing small-group instruction, and utilizing data chats with teachers.

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.

We will offer PD opportunities in small-group instruction, data analysis, targeted interventions, and acceleration.

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

Additional services include behavior monitoring, teacher data analysis, student data tracking, caring school community, SELL, and the Ron Clark Academy House System (positive behavior management program) to promote a school culture of belonging and success.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The data revealed that there was a critical gap in students who receive ESE services. Establishing intentional structures for differentiation will help to ensure that students are intentionally grouped for support, given measurable tasks and monitored for outcomes.
Measurable Outcome:	The overall outcome that we wish to achieve is to ensure that more than 41% of our Students with Disabilities are proficiently performing in both ELA and Math on the FSA.
Monitoring:	Students will be ultimately montired with their iReady diagnostic results. There will be more frequent monitoring through the tools used during their Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karena Chunoo (karena.chunoo@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Lakeville will use data-based decision making to drive instruction, consistently monitoring academic growth and providing relevant interventions in ELA, Math, and Science, monitored through the MTSS process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Since there is a high correlation between the iReady prediction and FSA results, these data will help to offer a better indicator of progress and outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement	
Our instructional coaches will provide professional development opportunities in the areas of teacher led small group instruction, data analysis, targeted interventions and acceleration.	
Person Responsible	Jacqueline Lemieux (jacqueline.lemieux@ocps.net)
Students receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction will be monitored for academic growth with the use of selected intervention curriculum and the iReady diagnostic assessments.	
Person Responsible	Paige Rohter (paige.rohter@ocps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The data from our Panorama student surveys showed that there was room for improvement based on the CASEL competencies. By strengthening our schools culture for social emotional learning, we will address the academic gap of our students with disabilities along with increasing the skills for our parents to better support their student academically, socially and emotionally.
Measurable Outcome:	The overall outcome that we wish to achieve is to ensure that zero students demonstrate any Early Warning Indicators and a 5% increase in student Panorama responses overall in this area.
Monitoring:	Student will be ultimately monitored by the annual Panorama Survey Results. There will be more frequent monitoring through ongoing surveys that will reflect the use of new social emotional skills. We will also utilize classroom walkthrough data to monitor students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Panas (stephanie.alden@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school will be utilizing a common social emotional curriculum to increase the social emotional skills of our students. The Caring School Community curriculum will be used to intentionally integrate the introduction and practice of social emotional skills with aligned instructional strategies, and include deliberate school supports for families. 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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building, including its families. To strengthen a culture of social and emotional learning with families, staff, 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 integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective organizational improvement and change.

Action Steps to Implement

Classroom teachers will implement the Caring School Community curriculum.

Person Responsible	Karena Chunoo (karena.chunoo@ocps.net)

The school behavior team will utilize Second Chance curriculum to support students who need Tier 2 and Tier 3 small group support.

Person Responsible	Sonny Bien-Aime (sonny.bien-aime@ocps.net)

The school based SELL team will continue to develop teacher expertise on Social and Emotional strategies that will be used in conjunction to teaching and learning strategies.

Person Responsible	Cristina Mrozek (cristina.mrozek@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 (50% or more) 55% of students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA).
Measurable Outcome:	The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase of at least 24 percentage points from 30% to 54%.
Monitoring:	Students will be ultimately montired with their iReady diagnostic results. There will be more frequent monitoring through the tools used during their Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction (SIPPS Mastery Assessments). We will also use classroom walkthrough data and district standards based unit assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jacqueline Lemieux (jacqueline.lemieux@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. This instructional practice has a strong level of evidence.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This selected instructional practice has a strong level of evidence, as noted in this link for the IES Guide for Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding. The following strategies/resources were selected because the evidence-based program/ practices address the identified need and shows a proven record of effectiveness for the target population.

Action Steps to Implement

Strengthen the common planning process. Use the district created K-2 and 3-5 Common Planning Resources to guide the agenda and discussions. Include foundational planning in K-2.

Person Responsible	Jacqueline Lemieux (jacqueline.lemieux@ocps.net)

Classroom walkthroughs are conducted regularly and ELA feedback is provided; when needed adjustments are made in common planning/PLCs.

Person Responsible	Karena Chunoo (karena.chunoo@ocps.net)

Standards Based Unit Assessment (SBUA) Data and Foundational Assessment Data is used to plan small group.

Person Responsible	Jacqueline Lemieux (jacqueline.lemieux@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.

Lakeville Elementary's primary area of concern is physical attack. The secondary are of concern is threats and intimidation. Discipline data suggests that many of these incidents are occuring in in our unit of students with emotional or behavior disorders and we will continue to follow Behavior Intervention Plans and monitor their implementation to support these students to decrease aggressive or threatening behaviors. The school culture and environment will be monitored each month using our discipline data. We will use discipline referrals as well as BIPs and BASPs as data to monitor. In comparison with the state, Lakeville Elementary is below the average number of incidents.

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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, Lakeville Elementary will engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. Lakeville Elementary will use the Caring School Curriculum. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. Lakeville's school leadership team will collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.

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

Dr. Karena Chunoo - Principal: build strong relationships, create a shared vision, be a role model, praise students for good choices

Cristina Mrozek - Assistant Principal: build strong relationships, create a shared vision, be a role model, clarify classroom & school rules/expectations, set appropriate consequences, praise students for good choices

Stephanie Panas - Guidance Counselor: be a role model, build strong relationships, teach essential social skills, teach all students problem solving, praise students for good choices.

Valeria Grosso - Staffing Specialist: be a role model, build strong relationships, teach essential social skills, teach all students problem solving, praise students for good choices.

Sonny Bien-Aime - Behavior Specialist: be a role model, build strong relationships, teach essential social skills, teach all students problem solving, praise students for good choices.

Darreyl Williams - Program Assistant focused on MTSS Behavior: be a role model, build strong relationships, teach essential social skills, teach all students problem solving, praise students for good choices.

Mandy Austin-PTA President: support the school staff in the areas listed above

Jennifer Magnussen - SAC Chair: support the school staff in the areas listed above