Lake George Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (56%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (52%)
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	ATSI
* 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

Lake George Elementary

4101 GATLIN AVE, Orlando, FL 32812

https://lakewhitneyes.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 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	82%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Watson, Lauren	Principal	The Principal leads the teachers and staff. She ensures the mission and vision of the school are communicated to all, sets the expectations for parents, students, and staff, and works to achieve high student learning outcomes through collaboration. Resource Team meetings are facilitated by the Principal to discuss issues impacting the school. The Principal meets with the Parent Engagement Liaison to discuss monthly Family Engagement Activities. Weekly, the Principal collaborates with instructional coaches and grade level teams to monitor student progress and to plan for data-driven, standards-aligned, instruction. Walkthroughs are conducted to monitor for implementation and feedback is promptly provided. The Principal engages stakeholders through frequent communication. Community members and parents are encouraged to volunteer and participate in everyday school functions. Stakeholders are canvassed before decisions. They are aware that their feedback is encouraged and valued.
Dottavio, Carmen	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal collaborates with the instructional resource team to identify and monitor instructional practices across campus. Weekly, she collaborates with teams during PLCs to ensure instruction is aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards and is data-driven. Classroom walkthroughs are conducted and actionable feedback is provided to individual teachers. The Assistant Principal monitors student progress and makes recommendations for instructional changes. The Assistant Principal serves as the tutoring coordinator.
Abalo, Yaniret	Instructional Media	The Media Specialist maintains the media center as the hub of the school. She offers teachers support with AR. She assists teachers with understanding and navigating the program and helps to establish goals for students to work towards within the program. She coordinates the celebration of students reaching their goals. She sponsors the morning news crew and coordinates events such as the Spelling Bee, Teach-In, the Book Fair, Literacy Week, Battle of the Books, and several other events. In addition to teaching lessons to Kindergarten and First-grade classes, she also pulls groups for Fundamental Basic Skills.
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.
Holmes, Michael	Behavior Specialist	The Behavior Specialist focuses on Tier III behavior supports for students in our Emotionally and Behaviorally Disabled Unit. He collaborates with the Dean to provide behavioral support to general education teachers as well.
Strubbe, Aida	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach 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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		instructional coach attends weekly PLCs for grades K-2 and assists them with understanding and implementing the B.E.S.T. Standards. She is in charge of Title I Compliance, our bookroom, the Read to Success Program, Kindergarten Round-Up, and the Sight Word Challenge initiative. The Instructional Coach also pulls groups for Fundamental Basic Skills.
Thomas, Nichelle	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The CRT 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 and implementing the B.E.S.T standards. The CRT also serves as the testing coordinator, the field trip coordinator, and as a support to the science lab instructor. She manages textbook inventory and is in charge of the 3rd-5th Math Facts Challenge.
Perdomo, Yenisei	ELL Compliance Specialist	The ECS is also the Intervention Specialist. She assists in maintaining an efficient system of staffing and monitoring for all ESOL students and provides leadership for improving instruction for English Language Learners through the implementation of ELL accommodations and strategies. As the Intervention Specialist, Ms. Perdomo monitors the implementation and effectiveness of school-wide tiered interventions. She meets biweekly with PLCs to review the effectiveness of core instruction by analyzing data from formative assessments. The Intervention Specialist conducts Tier III interventions.
Tarantola, Stacy	Staffing Specialist	The Staffing Specialist monitors the accommodations provided to ESE students and ensures IEPs and 504 plans are up to date and followed.
Velez, Janiene	School Counselor	The guidance counselor collaborates with the Behavior Specialist, Dean, and Intervention Specialist, support scholars with behaviors as well as academics. She 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 students who are eligible for services through the McKinney Vento Program (MVP) and provides resources or support to families identified as homeless. The Guidance Counselor conducts groups, provides SEL lessons and resources, mentors students, and is in charge of Character Education activities.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/12/2019, Lauren Watson L

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

400

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

12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	42	77	56	67	70	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	390
Attendance below 90 percent	9	29	21	19	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	9	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	2	4	13	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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

Thursday 8/18/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	53%	56%	56%				56%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	49%						61%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						61%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	65%	46%	50%				52%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	66%						47%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	72%						51%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	61%	59%				54%	56%	53%

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**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	51%	55%	-4%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	56%	57%	-1%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	58%	62%	-4%	62%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	63%	-20%	64%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2022					
	2019	43%	57%	-14%	60%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	53%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	11	35	45	24	54	85	5				
ELL	46	55	44	63	66	72	40				
BLK	34	37	30	49	56		31				
HSP	56	53	50	65	63	73	44				
WHT	51	46		76	77		46				
FRL	44	48	50	56	60	69	30				

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				
WHT	69	69		67	48		75				
FRL	49	53	56	44	44	49	45				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
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	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	460
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

In the area of reading, every grade level had an increase in proficiency from the beginning of the year (BOY) to the end of the year (EOY) on the iReady Diagnostic. Overall, the school went from 31% proficient on the BOY to 61% at the end of the year. The school has increased proficiency compared to last year's FSA ELA data, scoring 53% compared to 51% the previous year for proficiency. Students with Disabilities (SWD) remained stagnant in ELA proficiency scoring 11% proficient both this year and last. Black students continue to decline in ELA proficiency for the third year in a row, scoring 49% in 2019, 37% in 2021, and 34% in 2022.
In the area of math, all grade levels showed an increase in proficiency from the BOY to the EOY. Overall the school went from 19% proficient on the BOY to 61% proficient on the EOY. The school has also increased in proficiency and learning gains compared to last year's FSA math data. SWD again, remained stagnant scoring 24% proficient both this year and last. There are no consistent trends for other subgroups.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on progress monitoring and state assessment data, the data components with the greatest need for improvement are proficiency in fifth-grade ELA and in math. Only 45% of fifth graders scored a three or above on the ELA FSA and only 48% of fifth graders scored a three or above on the Math FSA. These scores are significantly lower than the third and fourth-grade scores. When looking at progress monitoring data in ELA for the 21-22 school year, fifth-grade students only scored 60% or higher on 3 out of 11 standards-based unit assessments (SBUA). In math, fifth-grade students scored 60% or higher on 2 out of 11 SBUAs. According to school-wide iReady data for reading, fifth grade showed the least amount of growth from BOY to EOY with an increase of only 11% (32% to 43%). In math, they also demonstrated the least amount of growth for the year with an increase of only 21% (24% to 45%).

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

Historically, this cohort of students has been low-performing since third grade. This group of students was promoted to fourth grade during a pandemic. Attendance issues also played a role. In order to

address this need for improvement, an intense focus will be placed on Tier I Reading and math instruction and reteaching. Coaches will work closely with teachers to plan, implement, and monitor standards-based instruction. Reteaching will be closely monitored. Tutoring will target the specific needs of specific students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the 2022 state assessments, math showed the most improvement. Our overall proficiency increased from 56% to 67% (+11%). Our learning gains increased from 38% to 68% (+30%). Learning gains from the Bottom 25% increased from 42% to 70% (+28%).

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

There were several contributing factors to the increase in math scores. This year, the school implemented math interventions for grades K-5. After-school tutoring strategically addressed math instruction for bubble students in addition to low-performing students in grades 2-5. Four days a week targeted students in grades 3-5 were pulled for reteaching, during their lunchtime. The Assistant Principal collaborated with teachers who were in charge of math planning and assisted with ensuring resources were standards-aligned and appropriately scaffolded.

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

In order to accelerate learning in math. we will continue to focus on targeted groups of students strategically. In addition to re-teaching, we will incorporate acceleration for our low-performing students and provide enrichment to our high-performing students.

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 how to effectively implement and monitor reteaching. Professional development will also be provided on implementing B.E.S.T. standards resources in whole group and small group.

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 intentionally plan for our areas of focus and strategically target specific subgroups. We will collaborate with teachers to develop action plans to address areas of need and will monitor for the fidelity of implementation and the effectiveness of the plan. Teachers will be provided with actionable feedback to assist them in enriching their instructional practice. We will continue to utilize Tier I Interventionists to provide additional and more targeted support in reading and math.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	The gap between students with disabilities (SWD) and their non-disabled peers continues to widen. In the areas of reading, math, and science, students with disabilities continue to decline in proficiency. On the 2022 ELA FSA, only 11% of SWD scored proficient. Twenty-four percent scored proficient in math, and only five percent scored proficient on the Science SSA.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	SWD in grades three through five will demonstrate an increase of 10 percentage points from FAST PM 1 to FAST PM 3 in reading and math. Common assessments will also be considered.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	- Classroom walkthrough data - evaluative and nonevaluative instructional practice observational data - qualitative data from students
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Yenisei Perdomo (yenisei.perdomo@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Intentionally planning, implementing, and monitoring, a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) for reading and math in grades Kindergarten through fifth.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Implementing the MTSS process with fidelity for both reading and math will help to address to lessen the gaps in learning for SWD. With the guidance and support of our Intervention Specialist, staff will be able to select appropriate and effective resources to implement. The staff will be able to monitor for improvement and consistently use data to inform their decision-making.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The B.E.S.T. standards are being taught for the first time, in every grade level, K-5. As these standards are new to everyone, it is imperative that school leaders and staff members participate in professional development to learn about strategies for implementation and discuss the standards during weekly PLCs. School leaders will communicate to the instructional staff the need to implement the B.E.S.T. Standards at the beginning of the year during pre-planning. We will recommend the usage of county-adopted textbooks and resources provided and collaborate with teams to ensure instruction is aligned to the standards.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Sixty percent of students in grades three through five will score proficient on Progress Monitoring 3 for ELA and Math. Common assessments will also be considered.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The school will use data to drive instructional decisions. Data will be monitored and discussed during weekly data meetings with the grade level teachers and leadership team. Differentiated instruction will occur to meet the needs of our gifted, exceptional education, and English Language Learners. Any scholar whose data is showing a deficiency will be placed in our Multi-Tier System of Support (MTSS) process.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carmen Dottavio (carmen.dottavio@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Classroom teachers will implement data-driven decision-making to assess the strengths, needs, and performance of students. Teacher leaders will assess the strengths, needs, and performance of students and staff. Teachers and school leaders will collaborate to develop and revise instruction, targets, and goals based on data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.	Using data to drive instruction will track progress towards the school's goals. We will utilize PLC time to disaggregate data in order to continue to inform our instruction. This will ensure students are successful and demonstrate growth.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Teams will meet weekly to review data with the administration and the instructional coach.
2. Data will be disaggregated and students will be grouped.
3. Teachers will plan for reteaching.
4. Teachers will implement reteach.
5. Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted to monitor for the implementation of the reteach plan based on data.
6. Teachers will receive actionable feedback regarding implementation.

Last Modified: 7/30/2018 Page 10 https://www.floridacims.org

6. Guided walkthroughs by district personnel will be implemented - led by the DPLC team.
7. Common end of unit assessments, iReady Reading/Math data will be reviewed to monitor the effectiveness of this strategy.

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

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Historically, students who are one or more grade levels behind on progress monitoring assessments and on the End-of-Year iReady diagnostic, continue to struggle in intermediate grades. In the primary grades, students learn to read while in the intermediate grades, they read to learn. Without the foundational skills, students cannot become fluent readers. Based on the EOY iReady ELA Diagnostic, 19% of Kindergarten students were performing below grade level. Forty-seven percent of first graders were one grade level behind, and ten percent of the second graders scored 2 or more grade levels below. Thirty-seven percent of our second graders scored one grade level below. Our lowest performing readers were in second grade, with 47% scoring at least one grade level below on the EOY iReady Reading Diagnostic. An area of instructional practice we will implement will be developing an awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters. We will also continue to support our readers by teaching them to decode words and analyze word parts.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on the 2021-2022 FSA ELA, only fifty-three percent of students in grades 3-5 scored proficient or higher. In fifth grade, only 45% scored a Level 3 or higher on the FSA, while in 3rd grade, 58% scored proficient or higher and in fourth grade, 56% scored proficient or higher. Learning gains in fifth grade were the lowest among the tested grades, with only 48% of students demonstrating learning gains. Based on the EOY iReady Reading Diagnostic, 58% of faith grades were at least one or more grade levels below. Our biggest area of focus in the intermediate grades is Tier one instruction for ELA, especially in fifth grade. We will support our readers by building upon their decoding skills in order to read complex multisyllabic words.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Sixty percent of students in grades K-2 will score proficient on Progress Monitoring 3 for ELA. Additional assessments will also be considered.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Sixty percent of students in grades three through five will score proficient on Progress Monitoring 3 for ELA. Common assessments will also be considered.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Areas of focus will be monitored in a variety of ways. Weekly walkthroughs with feedback will be conducted by the administration. Common Assessment day will be monitored after each unit. Tier two data and reteach data will be monitored bi-weekly. Tier three data will be monitored on a weekly basis. Monthly data

meetings by area including the MTSS Problem-Solving Teams and learning community leadership to review FAST progress monitoring assessments and district-created standard-based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Watson, Lauren, lauren.limoncelliwatson@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The following IES Practice Guide Recommendations meet ESSA strong level of evidence requirements for grades K-3: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade: Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. The following IES Practice Guide Recommendations meet ESSA strong level of evidence requirements for grades 4th and 5th: Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Consider that the below use of the above Practice guide strategies meet ESSA strong level of evidence:
-use of the foundational pieces of the optional daily slides (Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.)
-Heggerty (Recommendation 2: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters)
-SIPPS (Recommendation 3: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. And Recommendation 1: Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.)

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Monthly Literacy leadership team meetings, where data are analyzed and action steps implemented and monitored.	Thomas, Nichelle, nichelle.thomas@ocp.net
The literacy coach attends district coach meetings. Coach uses data to identify personnel and areas of need. Implementation of coaching cycles, modeling, PLC planning support, etc… to fit area(s) of need. The literacy coach is an active member of the MTSS problem-solving team.	Thomas, Nichelle, nichelle.thomas@ocp.net
Use and analysis of various Assessments: -FAST -iReady diagnostic -Heggerty Assessments -District created Standards Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs) -District created Foundational Unit Assessments (Grades K-2) Use of data to determine interventions and support needs of students	Dottavio, Carmen, carmen.dottavio@ocps.net
Professional Development Lake George will develop professional learning plans based on the needs of the school. These plans include specific supports for teachers based on progress monitoring data. District PD options available include literacy coach meetings, Coach B.E.S.T. Book study, K-5 ELA Impact Series.	Watson, Lauren, lauren.limoncelliwatson@ocps.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 a 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 of authentic family engagement in school staff.

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

Principal- shapes the culture and communicates the mission and vision of the school to all stakeholders, and create norms that build values
School staff- provide an environment that is safe, supportive, encouraging, challenging but inviting for students, and engage students in daily SEL lessons
Parents- encourage and motivate children to do well in school, provide feedback, and participate in school activities
Community members- establish a presence within the school and provide resources to students and families