

Orange County Public Schools

Lakeview Middle



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lakeview Middle

1200 W BAY ST, Winter Garden, FL 34787

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

Demographics

Principal: John Linehan

Start Date for this Principal: 7/6/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: 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	

* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lakeview Middle

1200 W BAY ST, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<https://lakeviewms.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)
Middle School 6-8	No	77%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

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
Roman, Tony	Principal	Whole school operations
Heidelberg, Arnetta	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule, School Improvement Plan, FTE
Ihnenfeld, Jackie	Assistant Principal	School Facilities, Discipline, School Safety Plan
Bergdahl, Kathryn	School Counselor	Students with last names that begin with A - L
Chambers, Gail	School Counselor	Students with last names that begin with M - Z
Harris, Tracy	Staffing Specialist	ESE Compliance
Shavers, La'Shosha	Dean	Discipline
Sparks, Alicia	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Testing
Wise, Saralee	Math Coach	Resource for the math department
Crosley, Rosemarie	Instructional Coach	Resource for ELA and Social Studies
Lopez, Naomi	ELL Compliance Specialist	ELL compliance
Drislane, Yolanda	Other	SAFE Coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/6/2020, John Linehan

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.*

0

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

835

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

11

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

9

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	275	292	268	0	0	0	0	835	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	79	90	0	0	0	0	231	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	39	34	0	0	0	0	83	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	21	86	0	0	0	0	118	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	28	65	0	0	0	0	115	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	44	46	0	0	0	0	119	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	54	48	0	0	0	0	154	
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	0	0	0	0	48	78	105	0	0	0	0	231

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/16/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	328	277	280	0	0	0	0	885
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	51	70	0	0	0	0	171
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	29	31	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	108	104	0	0	0	0	233
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	80	75	0	0	0	0	191
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	52	50	0	0	0	0	156
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	53	71	0	0	0	0	184
	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	0	0	0	63	103	112	0	0	0	0	278

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	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	9

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	328	277	280	0	0	0	0	885
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	51	70	0	0	0	0	171
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	29	31	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	108	104	0	0	0	0	233
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	80	75	0	0	0	0	191
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	52	50	0	0	0	0	156
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	53	71	0	0	0	0	184
	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	0	0	0	63	103	112	0	0	0	0	278

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	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	9

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				54%	52%	54%	50%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	52%	54%	48%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	45%	47%	35%	42%	47%
Math Achievement				49%	55%	58%	51%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains				48%	55%	57%	54%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				29%	50%	51%	44%	44%	51%
Science Achievement				53%	51%	51%	44%	51%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				59%	67%	72%	66%	68%	72%

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
06	2021					
	2019	52%	52%	0%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	44%	48%	-4%	52%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
08	2021					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	36%	43%	-7%	55%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	54%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
08	2021					
	2019	16%	36%	-20%	46%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	52%	49%	3%	48%	4%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	57%	66%	-9%	71%	-14%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	92%	63%	29%	61%	31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	80%	53%	27%	57%	23%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool used to monitor ELA students by grade level is IReady Reading. The progress monitoring tool used to monitor math students by grade level is IReady Math. The progress monitoring tool used to monitor Algebra, Geometry, Civics, and Science students by grade level is PMAs.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56/23	74/27	77/28
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/17	27/20	33/24
	Students With Disabilities	1/3	2/5	0/0
	English Language Learners	4/8	5/9	8/14
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32/13	47/19	53/20
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/9	15/12	18/13
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	3/7	5/10	6/11

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35/18	40/17	50/20
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/5	8/7	15/12
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	3/13
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/2
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	Math[2/1]	Math[3/2] Alg[49/98]	Math[4/2] Alg[46/100]
	Economically Disadvantaged	Math[0/0]	Math[1/1] Alg[12/100]	Math[0/0] Alg[12/100]
	Students With Disabilities	Math[0/0]	Math[0/0]	Math[1/5]
	English Language Learners	Math[0/0]	Math[0/0] Alg[[2/100]	Math[0/0] Alg[2/100]
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	135/56	147/66	165/66
	Economically Disadvantaged	48/44	54/55	63/55
	Students With Disabilities	3/14	5/26	7/27
	English Language Learners	13/34	17/44	18/38

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56/24	52/23	51/22
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/16	18/16	18/16
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/5	2/8
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/3	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	Math[0/0]	Math[0/0] Alg[47/89] Geo[33/89]	Math[9/5] Alg[40/95] Geo[34/87]
	Economically Disadvantaged	Math[0/0]	Math[0/0] Alg[13/87] Geo[4/80]	Math[5/5] Alg[10/100] Geo[6/86]
	Students With Disabilities	Math[0/0]	Math[0/0] Alg[1/100] Geo[0/0]	Math[0/0] Geo[1/100]
	English Language Learners	Math[0/0]	Math[0/0] Alg[1/100]	Math[0/0] Alg[1/100]
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	75/40	94/43	99/43
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/23	28/29	35/32
	Students With Disabilities	2/13	1/6	4/17
	English Language Learners	1/6	3/13	1/3

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	9	22	21	11	35	39	15	8			
ELL	20	38	38	19	34	40	9	24			
ASN	61	57		75	23				70		
BLK	39	40	25	34	32	50	27	47	56		
HSP	46	48	40	45	42	40	43	49	72		
MUL	77	75		57	38						
PAC				50	50						
WHT	63	53	32	64	48	44	63	70	85		
FRL	38	40	36	34	36	41	30	41	54		

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	24	26	7	14	16	6	14			
ELL	29	43	39	33	37	34	26	33	81		
ASN	72	67		80	71			91	93		
BLK	40	45	29	32	37	31	42	50	77		
HSP	49	52	40	44	43	28	45	50	82		
MUL	60	58		53	53						
WHT	70	63	40	69	59	22	69	75	93		
FRL	45	47	35	40	41	27	44	51	81		
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	1	28	32	9	28	33	4	14			
ELL	18	25	18	32	36	31	27	37	71		
ASN	79	69		89	69		77		93		
BLK	40	42	37	36	43	36	36	58	67		
HSP	41	42	29	42	47	39	31	57	73		
MUL	57	65		57	70		58		80		
WHT	63	55	42	67	66	63	56	81	91		
FRL	42	45	33	44	49	42	38	59	74		

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	50
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	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	504
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
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	57
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
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	48
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	62
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	50
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
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?

Based on the i-Ready Data for Reading: Sixth-grade increased proficiency by 5% from the Beginning of the Year (BOY) to the End of the Year (EOY). Seventh-grade increased proficiency by 2%. Eighth-grade decreased proficiency by 2%. The Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students in sixth and seventh-grade increased proficiency by 7% from the BOY to EOY, while the eighth-grade students showed zero increase. Students with Disabilities (SWD) in sixth grade decreased proficiency by 3%, while seventh and eighth-grade increased proficiency by 13% and 8%, respectively. English Language Learners (ELL) increased proficiency in sixth and seventh-grade by 6% and 2%, respectively, while the 8th grade ELL students showed zero increase.

Based on i-Ready Data for Math: Sixth-grade increased proficiency by 7% from the BOY to the EOY. Seventh-grade increased proficiency by 1%. Eighth-grade increased proficiency by 5%. The Economically Disadvantaged students in sixth-grade increased proficiency by 4% from the BOY to the EOY. Seventh-grade showed no growth, while eighth-grade showed an increase of 5% proficiency. Students with Disabilities in sixth and eighth-grade showed zero growth, while seventh-grade showed an increase of 5%. English Language Learners in sixth-grade showed a 4% increase, while seventh and eighth-grade students showed zero increase in proficiency. Based on the PMA Data: Students in all core subjects showed an increase in proficiency.

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

Based on the 2019 state assessments and IReady progress monitoring, Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners show the greatest need for improvement in all core subject areas, in all grade levels.

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

Strategies for Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners were not utilized daily. The new actions that need to be taken to address this need is professional developments on how ESE and ELL strategies may be used in the classroom. In addition to professional development, leadership team members will observe and provide immediate feedback to ensure additional support is provided to teachers.

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

Based on the 2019 state assessments and progress monitoring, Algebra and Science showed the most improvement.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement were the retention of experienced teachers and the appropriate placement of students in accelerated courses. The new actions taken in this area included morning enrichment activities, the use of district resources, and student incentives for motivation.

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

The strategies we need to implement to accelerate learning are to build up our system of how we analyze data, analyze instructional practices, make necessary adjustments that improve student outcomes, and connect unfinished learning into the context of new learning. For our ESE students we need to develop and implement a system of teaching social behaviors. For our ELL students we need to use as many mediums as possible to convey information: oral, written, videos, teacher demonstration, student demonstration, etc.

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.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, we will offer professional development to all teachers on Restorative Practices; Social Emotional Learning; analyzing data (look-fors); and, strategies such as flexible grouping, learning styles and other best practices to accommodate ESE and ELL students. New teachers will receive professional development on classroom management and teaching social behaviors in addition to what all teachers receive.

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

Teacher schedules will provide common planning time to collaborate on lessons and assessment data. Before and after school tutoring will be available and professional development provided by the district office will be utilized where needed.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: While the ELA lowest 25th percentile on the 2019 FSA showed an increase of two points, it remained seven points below the district's performance. The math lowest 25th percentile on the 2019 FSA declined 17 points below that of the district. Overall student performance on i-Ready Reading assessments from the beginning of the year to the end of the year remained at 39 percent proficiency, showing zero increase. Although the overall student performance on the i-Ready Math assessments from the beginning of the year to the end of the year showed a nine point increase, students were only at a 28 percent proficiency at the end of the year. Many of the students performing at these levels are Students With Disabilities. It will take an organized effort to monitor, support, and facilitate improvement.

Measurable Outcome: To increase the lowest 25th percentile in ELA by 10% from 37% to 47% and in math by 17% from 29% to 39%.

Monitoring: Weekly data meetings will be held with leadership team members to discuss areas of improvement and necessary supports for teachers. An intense focus will be on Students With Disabilities data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tony Roman (tony.roman@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiated Instruction will be utilized to minimize learning gaps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Lakeview Middle School services a very diverse population of students with a variety of needs. Differentiating instruction will allow the classroom teacher to meet the individual needs of all students. The teacher will work with small groups of students in both ELA and math.

Action Steps to Implement

Students will be scheduled into intensive math and reading classes for extra support in ELA and Math.

Person Responsible: Arnetta Heidelberg (arnetta.heidelberg@ocps.net)

The administrators and resource teachers will attend the PLCs and support the teachers with data analysis and differentiating lessons based on the data.

Person Responsible: Rosemarie Crosley (rosemarie.crosley@ocps.net)

Best practices for inclusive education will be shared with the staff during preplanning and continue throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Tracy Harris (tracy.harris@ocps.net)

The administrators and resource teachers will conduct weekly walk-throughs to monitor teacher's implementation of differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Jackie Ihnenfeld (jacquelyn.ihnenfeld@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

In analyzing the 2019 ESSA data, ELL students showed a 39% federal index which is below the 41% minimum federal index.

Measurable Outcome: To increase student proficiency by at least two percent from 39% to achieve a federal index rating of 41% or above.

Monitoring: Weekly data meetings will be held with leadership team members to discuss areas of improvement and necessary supports for teachers. An intense focus will be on English Language Learners.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tony Roman (tony.roman@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use cooperative learning groups in the classroom while using as many mediums as possible to convey information.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Lakeview Middle School services a very diverse population of students with a variety of needs. Cooperative learning groups provide language support for the ELL students in a small group setting. Students are strategically placed in the groups allowing teachers to focus on providing visuals and other print-rich materials to the individual students.

Action Steps to Implement

Students will be scheduled with core content teachers and the ESOL Paraprofessional who can support the native language during instruction.

Person Responsible Arnetta Heidelberg (arnetta.heidelberg@ocps.net)

ESOL strategies, to include cooperative learning strategies, will be shared with the staff through professional development training during preplanning and throughout the school year.

Person Responsible Naomi Lopez (naomi.lopez@ocps.net)

The administrators and resource teachers will attend PLCs and support the teachers with data analysis and materials needed.

Person Responsible Rosemarie Crosley (rosemarie.crosley@ocps.net)

The administrators and resource teachers will conduct weekly walk-throughs to monitor teacher's use of cooperative learning strategies.

Person Responsible Jackie Ihnenfeld (jacquelyn.ihnenfeld@ocps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially and emotionally. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By strengthening our school's culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:
Measurable Outcome:	Based on the school climate survey, 387 out of 451 students scored the school below 3.5 in the area of Sense of Belonging, with 41 students scoring the school below 2.0. The school will ensure that every student has at least one person they feel they can go to if they need help, increasing our score to above 3.5.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through the use of classroom walkthrough trend data and culture and climate continuum data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tony Roman (tony.roman@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence-based Strategy: Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning focused on implementing a school-wide SEL curriculum, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies, and deliberate school supports for families.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Rationale for Strategy Selection: 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. Resources/Criteria: Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement a school-wide SEL curriculum ensuring a school team receives training on implementation of a school-wide SEL curriculum.

Person Responsible Tony Roman (tony.roman@ocps.net)

Create a training plan that leverages the trained school team members to train all necessary stakeholders in implementation of the curriculum.

Person Responsible Yolanda Drislane (yolanda.drislane@ocps.net)

Monitor, measure, and modify the plan for continuous improvement in social and emotional learning and leadership using data-based instructional leadership to positively impact climate and culture.

Person Responsible Jackie Ihnenfeld (jacquelyn.ihnenfeld@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.

During the 2019-2020 school year, Lakeview Middle School ranked number 487 out of 553 middle/junior high schools statewide for school safety incidents. This places Lakeview into the "very high" category. The primary area of concern we will monitor during the upcoming school year is the number of out-of-school suspensions and the use of restorative practices.

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, all schools 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. 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. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine the next steps. The 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.

It takes a village to educate a child. This involves students, parents, teachers and staff members, and community members. It is important for students to take ownership of their learning. They must be willing to get involved in the opportunities provided to them. Parents play a vital role in ensuring that they talk to their student about the importance of school, help them set goals, communicate with the school frequently, and

celebrate successes. Teachers provide a safe-haven in their classroom where all students feel welcomed. Teachers also provide valuable instruction ensuring the success of all students. Staff member provide an inviting school environment with safety measures in place. Partners in Education allows community members to get involved with school activities and provide valuable resources in fulfilling students' physical, social and emotional needs.