

Orange County Public Schools

Lake George 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	27
Budget to Support Goals	28

Lake George Elementary

4101 GATLIN AVE, Orlando, FL 32812

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

Demographics

Principal: Lauren Watson L

Start Date for this Principal: 6/12/2019

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: B (55%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (58%)
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	28

Lake George Elementary

4101 GATLIN AVE, Orlando, FL 32812

<https://lakewhitneyes.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	94%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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
Watson, Lauren	Principal	The principal facilitates weekly instructional resource team meetings to discuss instructional practices across campus. The principal also meets weekly with the entire resource team and the school's Parent Engagement Liaison to discuss issues that impact the school as a whole and to discuss Family Engagement Activities. Weekly, the Principal collaborates with the instructional resource team as well as grade-level teams and individual teachers to monitor student progress and make recommendations for instructional changes. Classroom walkthroughs are conducted to ensure instructional practices are aligned to the Florida standards.
Dottavio, Carmen	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal collaborates with the instructional resource team to identify and monitor instructional practices across campus. Weekly, she meets with teams during math PLCs to ensure instruction is aligned to the standards and best practices are utilized. The assistant principal conducts classroom walkthroughs and provides actionable feedback to individual teachers to monitor student progress and makes recommendations for instructional changes.
Abalo, Yaniret	Instructional Media	The Media Specialist offers support in the area of Accelerated Reader as she assists teachers in getting students to know their AR range and set goals and work towards them. She coordinates the celebration of students reaching their goal. In addition, she maintains the media center as the hub of the school.
Fitzpatrick, Kristin	Staffing Specialist	The staffing specialist monitors the accommodations provided to ESE students and ensures their IEP plans are up to date and followed.
Velez, Janiene	School Counselor	The guidance counselor collaborates with the behavior specialist, dean, and MTSS coach to work together to support scholars with their behaviors as well as academics. She not only supports the scholars but also works closely with teachers by providing them guidance and support on effective strategies and interventions they can implement to support their scholars. She also monitors our students who are eligible for services through the McKinney Vento Program (MVP) and provides resources or support for families identified as homeless. Some of these services include transportation, gas cards, food, clothing, school supplies, and resources for shelter.
Luyster, Michelle	ELL Compliance Specialist	The ELL Compliance Specialist provides information to the teachers on ELL students, assists teachers in understanding English proficiency levels, and facilitates the acquisition of Imagine Learning licenses for our ELL students who are newcomers to the United States. The ELL Compliance Specialist also plans for future professional development to further their understanding of more effective ELL accommodations and strategies to ensure comprehensible instruction. As the Intervention Specialist, Mrs. Luyster monitors the implementation and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		effectiveness of school-wide tiered interventions. She meets every 2 weeks with PLCs to review the effectiveness of core instruction by analyzing data from formative assessments. During these meetings, teachers identify strategies that have been most effective and make suggestions for instructional changes in the core curriculum. Teachers also identify those students not meeting the standards who will require additional intervention. On a daily basis, the Intervention Specialist also conducts Tier III interventions.
Montijo, Melissa	Dean	The Dean offers support in the area of behavior. She collaborates with the guidance counselor, the behavior specialist, individual teachers as well as grade level teams to implement positive behavior support systems.
Strubbe, Aida	Instructional Coach	As the instructional coach, Mrs. Strubbe works closely with new teachers. She collaborates with the primary grade level teams and individual teachers to monitor student progress and make recommendations for instructional changes. The instructional coach attends weekly PLCs for grades K-2 and assists them with understanding the district's Curriculum Resource Materials (CRMs) and any other resources available to them for their common planning.
Thomas, Nichelle	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Mrs. Thomas monitors and coaches teachers on the use of the core reading program. She collaborates with 3rd-5th grade level teams and individual teachers to monitor student progress and make recommendations for instructional changes. She attends weekly PLCs for grades 3-5 and assists them with understanding the district's Curriculum Resource Materials(CRMs) and any other resources available to them for their common planning. In addition to collaborating with teachers, Mrs. Thomas is also the testing coordinator.
Holmes, Michael	Behavior Specialist	The behavior specialist supports the EBD unit and ensures the academic and social emotional success of the students participating in our unit.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/12/2019, Lauren Watson L

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

379

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.

2

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	24	59	65	70	78	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	395
Attendance below 90 percent	7	20	11	17	16	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	2	0	0	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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

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	18	66	76	65	102	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	396
Attendance below 90 percent	1	11	10	10	15	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
	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	6	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	18	66	76	65	102	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	396
Attendance below 90 percent	1	11	10	10	15	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
	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	6	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				56%	57%	57%	56%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	58%	58%	50%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	52%	53%	49%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				52%	63%	63%	58%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				47%	61%	62%	46%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	48%	51%	44%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				54%	56%	53%	64%	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	56%	57%	-1%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	58%	62%	-4%	62%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	63%	-20%	64%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	57%	-14%	60%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

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.

To monitor the progress of our students from Kindergarten to fifth grade one tool we utilize at Lake George is the iReady program. A diagnostic is given for reading and math, three times a year. The data gathered from each diagnostic drives decisions about instruction, intervention, and tutoring.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8/13%	14/22%	27/40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/8%	6/15%	12/29%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	2/33%
	English Language Learners	2/12%	1/6%	5/29%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14/22%	21/33%	33/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/23%	13/33%	19/46%
	Students With Disabilities	1/17%	2/33%	4/67%
	English Language Learners	5/29%	5/29%	6/17%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	7/11%	13/19%	25/35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/8%	4/10%	10/24%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	1/5%	3/14%	3/14%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3/5%	9/13%	13/18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/3%	4/10%	6/14%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	1/9%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/5%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10/14%	23/32%	30/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/12%	11/24%	14/31%
	Students With Disabilities	3/38%	3/33%	4/44%
	English Language Learners	2/8%	7/27%	9/36%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2/3%	12/16%	36/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/5%	5/11%	17/38%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	3/33%	3/38%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	4/15%	10/40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17/19%	25/27%	29/31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/19%	14/26%	17/31%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	3/9%	7/21%	10/29%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6/7%	16/17%	31/34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/6%	9/17%	16/30%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	1/6%
	English Language Learners	2/6%	5/15%	7/21%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5/80%	14/22%	16/25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/6%	7/18%	9/23%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	2/11%	2/11%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/10%	12/20%	15/23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/3%	4/11%	5/13%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/6%	1/5%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19/33%	22/37%	20/32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/17%	9/29%	9/28%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/14%	1/13%
	English Language Learners	2/11%	3/18%	3/17%

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	31		24	33						
ELL	40	40		49	33		20				
BLK	37	18		45	18		30				
HSP	47	37		51	37		23				
WHT	71			74			70				
FRL	44	37	50	48	30	46	29				
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	27	45	47	23	34	44	10				
ELL	47	64	68	40	58	69	37				
BLK	49	52		48	48		50				
HSP	52	59	61	45	47	57	46				

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	69	69		67	48		75				
FRL	49	53	56	44	44	49	45				
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	29	24	30	31	48	50	25				
ELL	27	43	45	34	57	62	40				
BLK	61	57		55	33						
HSP	49	44	43	53	44	48	58				
WHT	72	65		75	58		88				
FRL	50	48	49	52	43	43	59				

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	387
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
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	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	72
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?

All grade levels achieved growth in both reading and math when comparing the beginning of the year iReady diagnostic to the end of year diagnostic. The subgroup demonstrating the least amount of growth in both reading and math across all grade levels was our Students with Disabilities (SWD). In second grade, the SWD subgroup did not show any growth in the area of reading. In fourth grade, they also did not show any growth in reading but had minimal growth in math. In fifth grade, SWD did not show any growth all year in reading or math. Our science data in fifth grade was stagnant when comparing the winter PMA to the spring PMA.

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

Based on progress monitoring and the 2019 assessments, the greatest need for improvement is math. This is true of learning gains, the performance of our Bottom 25%, and proficiency. When compared to ELA data, math proficiency has either declined or shown minimal growth. Learning gains in math were not as high as they were in ELA, but the Bottom 25% did perform better in math than they did in ELA.

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

The biggest contributing factor to this need for improvement was attendance. Twenty-five percent of our fifth-grade population had an attendance rate below ninety percent. Sixteen percent of our fourth graders and seventeen percent of our third graders also had attendance rates below ninety percent. Students who were learning from home did not attend school as often as students who attended face to face. This was particularly true in fifth grade. Another contributing factor was our Tier I instruction for math and our plan for reteaching. Reteaching did not occur consistently. Our Tier I instruction did not provide enough opportunities for students to interact with the critical content. New actions include creating, implementing, and monitoring a plan for reteaching. Math interventions will also be implemented.

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

Based on progress monitoring and the 2019 state assessments the data component with the most improvement was the math proficiency of economically disadvantaged students. In every grade level except for 3rd and 5th, students belonging to this subgroup performed better in math than they did in ELA.

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

Contributing factors to this improvement include a strategic focus on math instruction outside of the math block. After-school tutoring and acceleration programs focused on math. Students were pulled from lunch to receive extra math instruction. Math was done digitally, during arrival every morning.

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

In order to accelerate learning, we will utilize Instructional Focus Calendars for core instruction, interventions, and small groups in reading and math, to ensure we are strategic and maximize our instructional time. We will continue to hold data meetings frequently with our teachers and our students to involve them in monitoring their progress and use the data to inform instructional changes.

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.

To support teachers and leaders professional development will be provided on small group instruction and centers for math and for reading. In order to ensure our students are prepared for learning and to address all the needs of our students, we will be offering monthly professional development on social and emotional learning.

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

To ensure sustainability we will prioritize our areas of focus. We will continue to develop action plans to address areas of need and monitor the implementation of these action plans. Professional development will be provided on a monthly basis to provide teachers with strategies for continued improvement. We will monitor for the implementation of these strategies and provide teachers with feedback to assist them in adjusting or enriching their instructional practice. Additional staff will be hired to assist with Tier I instruction in reading and math. To sustain improvement we will prioritize, use feedback, and measure our efforts.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: There is a disparity between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers. Historically, students with disabilities have performed poorly in comparison to their non-disabled peers in the areas of math and reading. Our ESSA Federal Index score for SWD for the 2019 school year was 36%. Reducing inequality would increase the achievement levels of SWD and have a positive impact on student achievement overall.

Students with disabilities in grades three through five will show an increase of three percentage points in ELA Achievement from 27% to 30% when comparing 2019 scores to 2022.

Measurable Outcome: Other data points that will be considered is as follows:
iReady math and reading diagnostics
common assessment data
FSA data
PMA (for 5th grade)
classroom walkthrough data

Monitoring: evaluative and non evaluative instructional practice observational data
weekly iReady passing rates of 70% or higher
qualitative data from students

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lauren Watson (lauren.limoncelliwatson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our school will plan and implement a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) for math in grades Kindergarten through fifth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Implementing the MTSS process with fidelity for math will help to accelerate the learning of students with disabilities. With the support and guidance of our Intervention Specialist, our school will select appropriate resources. We will implement effective and sustainable improvement practices with fidelity that will support the needs of our students with disabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

Build up our system of how we analyze data, analyze instructional practices, and make necessary adjustments that improve student outcomes.

After special education teachers develop instructional goals, they evaluate and make ongoing adjustments to students' instructional programs. Once instruction and other supports are designed and implemented, special education teachers have the skills to manage and engage in ongoing data collection using curriculum-based measures, informal classroom assessments, observations of student academic performance and behavior, self-assessment of classroom instruction, and discussions with key stakeholders (i.e., students, families, other professionals). Teachers study their practice to improve student learning, validate reasoned hypotheses about salient instructional features and enhance instructional decision making. Effective teachers retain, reuse, and extend practices that improve student learning and adjust or discard those that do not.

Person Responsible Lauren Watson (lauren.limoncelliwatson@ocps.net)

Develop and implement a system of teaching social behaviors.
Teachers should explicitly teach appropriate interpersonal skills, including communication and

self-management, aligning lessons with classroom and school-wide expectations for student behavior. Prior to teaching, teachers should determine the nature of the social skill challenge. If students do not know how to perform a targeted social skill, direct social skill instruction should be provided until mastery is achieved. If students display performance problems, the appropriate social skill should initially be taught, then emphasis should shift to prompting the student to use the skill and ensuring the “appropriate” behavior accesses the same or a similar outcome (i.e., is reinforcing to the student) as the problem behavior.

Person Responsible Michael Holmes (michael.holmes@ocps.net)

Increase our systematic approach to providing scaffolded supports.

Scaffolded supports provide temporary assistance to students so they can successfully complete tasks that they cannot yet do independently and with a high rate of success. Teachers select powerful visual, verbal and written supports; carefully calibrate them to students’ performance and understanding in relation to learning tasks; use them flexibly; evaluate their effectiveness; and gradually remove them once they are no longer needed. Some supports are planned prior to lessons and some are provided responsively during instruction.

Person Responsible Nichelle Thomas (nichelle.thomas@ocp.net)

Develop and implement the use flexible grouping.

Teachers assign students to homogeneous and heterogeneous groups based on explicit learning goals, monitor peer interactions, and provide positive and corrective feedback to support productive learning. Teachers use small learning groups to accommodate learning differences, promote in-depth academic related interactions and teach students to work collaboratively. They choose tasks that require collaboration, issue directives that promote productive and autonomous group interactions, and embed strategies that maximize learning opportunities and equalize participation. Teachers promote simultaneous interactions, use procedures to hold students accountable for collective and individual learning, and monitor and sustain group performance through proximity and positive feedback.

Person Responsible Aida Strubbe (aida.strubbe@ocps.net)

Provide intensive instruction (Standards and reading instruction).

Teachers match the intensity of instruction to the intensity of the student’s learning and behavioral challenges. Intensive instruction involves working with students with similar needs on a small number of high priority, clearly defined skills or concepts critical to academic success. Teachers group students based on common learning needs; clearly define learning goals; and use systematic, explicit and well-paced instruction. They frequently monitor students’ progress and adjust their instruction accordingly. Within intensive instruction, students have many opportunities to respond and receive immediate, corrective feedback with teachers and peers to practice what they are learning.

Person Responsible Carmen Dottavio (carmen.dottavio@ocps.net)

Area of Focus
Description
and
Rationale:

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:

- Based on Student Panorama Data, social awareness and self-management has areas of concern, specifically the areas listed below:
 - o Understanding and identifying own emotions
 - o Controlling own emotions/reactions during intense situations
- Based on Staff and Teacher Panorama Data, school climate has an area of concern, specifically the area listed below:
 - o Supporting Colleagues

Panorama survey data in the 2021-2022 school year from students in grades three through five will show a five percentage point increase in the overall average score for School Safety when compared to the previous year's overall average score from 63% to 68%.

Measurable Outcome:

Other data points that will be considered is listed below:

- Early Warning Systems indicator data
- Alex Incident/SESIR data
- Panorama survey data
- Student Survey - School Climate, Sense of Belonging
- Teachers and Staff - School Climate, School Leadership, Professional Learning About SEL
- Family Members - Barriers to Engagement, School Climate
- Culture & Climate Continuum data
- DESSA data

Monitoring:

Culture & Climate Continuum data
Classroom Walkthrough trend data
Evaluative instructional and leadership practice observational data
Qualitative data from students, staff, and families

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Watson (lauren.limoncelliwatson@ocps.net)

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. Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of the Culture and Climate continuum, needs assessments, classroom observations, school environment observations, and implementation surveys. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, staff needs, and family needs.

Rationale for Evidence-

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

based Strategy: distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model, our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement a school-wide SEL curriculum
 Ensure a school team receives training on implementation of a school-wide SEL curriculum
 Create a training plan that leverages the trained school team members to train all necessary stakeholders in the implementation of the curriculum
 Implement a school-wide SEL curriculum

Person Responsible Janiene Velez (janiene.velez@ocps.net)

Integrating Aligned Instructional and SEL Strategies
 Identify student social and emotional learning needs to prepare for academic instruction
 Determine cognitive and conative strategies that align with the standard
 Interpret standards and student needs to intentionally integrate aligned instructional strategies

Person Responsible Carmen Dottavio (carmen.dottavio@ocps.net)

Deliberate School SEL Supports for Families
 Identify strategies to support family engagement based on Panorama Family Members Survey - Barriers to Engagement that relates to strengthening communication, building community, and creating connections such as:
 +Strengthening Communication
 -Create and facilitate opportunities to welcome families and introduce key staff (back to school night, Open House, principal breakfast)
 -Develop a school-wide digital communication outreach plan to inform students and families of how they can connect to the school events and resources (Class Dojo)
 +Building Community
 -Create a welcoming environment where family culture and languages are recognized and respected (staff greetings, office appeal)
 -Host events, workshops and opportunities that are relational, connected to family interests and culture, and are linked to learning
 +Creating Connections
 -Create flexible events and opportunities for families (e.g. different times throughout the day, face to face, virtual, pre-recorded sessions, multiple languages)

Person Responsible Raquel Diaz (raquel.diaz@ocps.net)

Monitor, Measure, and Modify
 Evaluate the climate and culture for social and emotional learning to implement necessary responsive practices
 Implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning & leadership that uses cycles of professional learning.
 Evaluate the impact of cycles of professional learning on improvement efforts
 Monitor, measure, and modify the plan for continuous improvement in social and emotional learning & leadership using data-based instructional leadership to positively impact climate and culture

Person Responsible	Lauren Watson (lauren.limoncelliwatson@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 54% of fourth-graders and 58% of fifth-graders scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA). The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase of at least 9 percentage points from 51% to 60% overall.
Measurable Outcome:	For grade level ELA, the 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase for the following grade levels: Fourth Grade - four percentage points from 46% to 50% Fifth Grade - eight percentage points from 42% to 50%
Monitoring:	To monitor for the desired outcome, we will utilize i-Ready diagnostics. Based on this data, we will make adjustments to our intervention groups. i-Ready Growth Monitoring will also be utilized. Classroom Walkthroughs will occur on a daily basis to ensure Tier I instruction is aligned to grade-level standards and students are given time to work towards mastery of the critical content. District Standards-Based Unit Assessments and K-2 Foundational Reading Unit Assessments will be given to monitor for progress. After assessments are given, grade level teams along with the Leadership team will collaborate to disaggregate data and determine next steps.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carmen Dottavio (carmen.dottavio@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	For this area of focus, we will ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This selected instructional practice has a moderate level of evidence, as noted in the IES Guide for Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding. The strategy and resource were selected because the evidence-based program addresses the identified need. Students need instruction to increase reading fluency in order to improve their comprehension and to be successful in reading. Ensuring each student reads connected text every day has a proven record of effectiveness for students who come from diverse backgrounds and are at risk for reading difficulties.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Person Responsible Nichelle Thomas (nichelle.thomas@ocp.net)

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

Person Responsible Lauren Watson (lauren.limoncelliwatson@ocps.net)

Ensure the 90-minute reading block contains statutory requirements.
-6 components of reading (as noted in Florida's Formula for success)
-Daily inclusion of on-level whole group instruction, and differentiated small group instruction

Person Responsible Lauren Watson (lauren.limoncelliwatson@ocps.net)

MTSS Problem Solving Teams meet regularly to ensure:

Students are appropriately identified.

Students are matched to appropriate interventions and intensity.

Data analysis is routinely part of the process, and adjustments are made to interventions based on the MTSS Problem Solving Team's findings.

Person Responsible Michelle Luyster (michelle.luyster@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.

Lake George Elementary is ranked 1337 out of 1395 schools statewide and 105 out of 126 elementary schools in Orange County for incidents that have occurred on campus. Lake George has had a total of 24 violent incidents (with an enrollment of 514 students which converts to approximately 38% of the incident rate in the 2019-2020 school year. As a school with an Emotional and Behavioral Disabled Unit, most of the incidences were repeat occurrences from students receiving services in the unit. Lake George has a ranking of Very High for these 24 incidences. Since physical attacks and threats and intimidation were the two types of violent incidents occurring on campus, our guidance counselor and dean have partnered together to provide teachers and students with Social Emotional Learning (SEL) strategies to be implemented into the daily curriculum. Our guidance counselor, Mrs. Velez, will provide SEL lessons that support the core competencies areas of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making. Mrs. Montijo-Rosado, the dean, will continue to meet with students receiving discipline referrals and implement interventions to correct behaviors.

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 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.

Principal- shapes the culture and communicates the mission and vision of the school to all stakeholders, create norms that build values

School staff- provide an environment that is safe, supportive, encouraging, challenging but inviting for students, engage students in SEL

Parents- encourage and motivate children to do well in school, provide feedback, participate in school activities

Community members- establish a presence within the school and provide resources to students and families

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0301 - Lake George Elementary	General Fund		\$0.00
			Notes: PD Coverage			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3376	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0301 - Lake George Elementary	General Fund		\$3,000.00
			Notes: Guidance Counselor and Dean support teachers by providing SEL strategies through professional development and lessons schoolwide.			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
Total:						\$3,000.00