

Orange County Public Schools

Lakeview Middle



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lakeview Middle

1200 W BAY ST, Winter Garden, FL 34787

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

Demographics

Principal: John Linehan

Start Date for this Principal: 7/6/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI
* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lakeview Middle

1200 W BAY ST, Winter Garden, FL 34787

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	86%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	74%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership

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
Roman, Tony	Principal	Whole school operations
Heidelberg, Arnetta	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule, School Improvement, FTE
Ihnenfeld, Jackie	Assistant Principal	School Facilities, Discipline, School Safety Plan
Chambers, Gail	School Counselor	Guidance and Counseling Grades 8 and 7 (M-Z)
Crosley, Rosemarie	Instructional Coach	Resource for ELA and Social Studies
Drislane, Yolanda	Other	SAFE Coordinator
Ramos, Lauranette	Magnet Coordinator	Coordinator for World Language Academy and Dual Language Magnet
Taylor, Brigitte	Dean	Discipline
Borden, Seante	School Counselor	Guidance and Counseling Grades 6 and 7(A-L)
Caldwell, Chase	Dean	Discipline
Oskin, Hilary	Instructional Media	Media Specialist
Salabarria, Sarah	Staffing Specialist	ESE Compliance
Rondon, Leslie	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Curriculum and Testing

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/6/2020, John Linehan

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

874

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

17

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

19

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	301	270	270	0	0	0	0	841	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	82	80	0	0	0	0	222	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	42	40	0	0	0	0	92	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	7	6	0	0	0	0	27	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	83	70	0	0	0	0	224	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	107	67	0	0	0	268	
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	0	0	0	0	0	70	100	84	0	0	0	0	254	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 7/24/2022

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

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	78	105	0	0	0	0	231	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	275	292	268	0	0	0	0	835
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	79	90	0	0	0	0	231
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	39	34	0	0	0	0	83
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	21	86	0	0	0	0	118
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	28	65	0	0	0	0	115
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	44	46	0	0	0	0	119
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	54	48	0	0	0	0	154
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	78	105	0	0	0	0	231

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	45%	49%	50%				54%	52%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	41%						54%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%						37%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	48%	36%	36%				49%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	53%						48%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						29%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	55%	53%				53%	51%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	61%	58%				59%	67%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	52%	52%	0%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	44%	48%	-4%	52%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
08	2022					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	36%	43%	-7%	55%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	54%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
08	2022					
	2019	16%	36%	-20%	46%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	52%	49%	3%	48%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	57%	66%	-9%	71%	-14%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	92%	63%	29%	61%	31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	80%	53%	27%	57%	23%

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	12	31	26	14	44	43	8	29			
ELL	21	30	27	26	48	52	17	40	73		
ASN	81	53		67	75				73		
BLK	32	29	26	36	45	40	21	66	68		
HSP	41	43	28	43	52	51	35	61	74		
MUL	76	71		67	80						
WHT	56	46	44	60	57	57	52	78	82		
FRL	36	33	29	38	47	44	20	65	79		
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	9	22	21	11	35	39	15	8			
ELL	20	38	38	19	34	40	9	24			

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
ASN	61	57		75	23				70		
BLK	39	40	25	34	32	50	27	47	56		
HSP	46	48	40	45	42	40	43	49	72		
MUL	77	75		57	38						
PAC				50	50						
WHT	63	53	32	64	48	44	63	70	85		
FRL	38	40	36	34	36	41	30	41	54		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	9	24	26	7	14	16	6	14			
ELL	29	43	39	33	37	34	26	33	81		
ASN	72	67		80	71			91	93		
BLK	40	45	29	32	37	31	42	50	77		
HSP	49	52	40	44	43	28	45	50	82		
MUL	60	58		53	53						
WHT	70	63	40	69	59	22	69	75	93		
FRL	45	47	35	40	41	27	44	51	81		

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	506
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
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%	3

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	70
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	48
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	74
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	45
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?

Based on the FSA trend data over the last three years of testing, our students have decreased proficiency in ELA and Math. ELA proficiency decreased by six percent and Math decreased by one percent compared to the previous FSA administration. Our ESE and ELL students continue to struggle to meet proficiency as we have been below the Federal Index of 41% for three consecutive years for these ESSA categories (ESE at 26% and ELL at 39%).

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

The two data components that show the greatest need for improvement are English Language Arts Learning Gains which showed an overall decrease of seven points, and the English Language Arts Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% which dropped by 5 points.

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

Contributing factors include strategies for Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners not utilized daily in the classroom and lack of sufficient monitoring. The new action that needs to be taken to address this need is to provide professional development of best practices for ESE and ELL students. In addition to professional development, leadership team members will attend planning meetings, observe lessons and provide immediate feedback to teachers.

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

Based on the 2022 state assessments and progress monitoring, Math Learning Gains and Civics showed the most improvement. Both Math and Civics increased proficiency by 13 points.

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

Contributing factors to this improvement were effective lesson planning, data-driven instruction, and increased support within the PLCs. One new action that our school took in this area was to provide strategies for small group instruction.

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

The strategies we need to implement in order to accelerate learning are 1) to continue the intense focus on analyzing data, 2) to incorporate best practices for student learning, and 3) to help students make

connections to real-world situations. To assist our ELL students we need to utilize multiple modes to convey information: verbal, written, visuals, teacher and student demonstrations, etc. To assist our ESE students we need to continue to focus on teaching social behaviors as well as providing multiple modes to convey information.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, we will offer professional development on the best instructional strategies for ESE and ELL students, Restorative Practices, Social Emotional Learning, and student grouping.

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

Additional services will include professional development provided by the district, where needed, during a small group setting such as department meetings. Also, before and after school tutoring will be available both Face-to-Face and virtually to accommodate more students.

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.

ELA learning gains on the 2022 FSA showed a seven-point decrease from the previous assessment. The ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% decreased by five points from the previous assessment. Much of the decline was caused by the very low scores of our Students With Disabilities registering proficiency scores at 12%.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

To increase the ELA learning gains by at least 10% from 41% to 51% and increase the ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% by 10% from 30% to 40%. Specifically, increasing SWD scores from 12% to at least 20%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Weekly data meetings, as needed, will be held with leadership team members to discuss areas of improvement and the necessary support for teachers. There will be an intense focus on Students With Disabilities data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tony Roman (tony.roman@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Differentiated instruction through the rotational model will be utilized to minimize learning gaps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Lakeview services a diverse population of students with a variety of needs. Differentiating instruction will allow the classroom teacher to meet the needs of all students.

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.

Students will be scheduled into intensive reading classes for extra support in ELA. Also, the ELA teacher will work with small groups in their classes to ensure the students' success.

Person Responsible

Arnetta Heidelberg (arnetta.heidelberg@ocps.net)

Leadership team members will attend PLCs to support the teachers with data analysis and differentiating lessons based on the data. Teachers will input their data into a template which is divided into ESSA groups. When the teachers meet for their PLCs, the data will be discussed and small groups will be determined using the data. Leadership team members will conduct weekly walk-throughs to monitor teachers' implementation of differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible

Rosemarie Crosley (rosemarie.crosley@ocps.net)

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

Person Responsible

Sarah Salabarria (sarah.salabarria@ocps.net)

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

In analyzing the 2022 ESSA data, ELL students showed a 39% federal index which is below the 41% minimum federal index.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

To increase ELL student proficiency by at least three percent from 39% to achieve a federal index rating of 42% or above.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Weekly data meetings will be held, as needed, with leadership team members to discuss areas of improvement and the necessary support for teachers. An intensive focus will be on English Language Learners.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tony Roman (tony.roman@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teachers will use cooperative learning groups in the classroom while using as many mediums as possible to convey information.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Lakeview services a growing population of English Language Learners. Cooperative learning groups provide language support for ELL students in a small group setting. Students are strategically placed in groups allowing teachers to focus on providing visuals and other print-rich materials to the individual students.

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.

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

Person Responsible

Arnetta Heidelberg (arnetta.heidelberg@ocps.net)

ESOL strategies, including cooperative learning groups, will be shared with the staff during preplanning and throughout the school year.

Person Responsible

Sarah Salabarria (sarah.salabarria@ocps.net)

The leadership team will attend PLCs and support the teachers with data analysis and materials needed.

Person Responsible

Rosemarie Crosley (rosemarie.crosley@ocps.net)

The leadership team will conduct weekly walk-throughs to monitor teachers' use of cooperative learning strategies.

Person Responsible

Jackie Ihnenfeld (jacquelyn.ihnenfeld@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, Lakeview engaged in ongoing, professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, Lakeview used social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. A core team of staff members at Lakeview, which included a mental health designee, attended professional learning throughout the previous school year. The core team is charged, again this year, with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams will collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine the next steps. 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.

It takes a village to educate a child. This involves students, parents, teachers and staff, and community members. It is important for students to take ownership of their learning. They must be willing to get involved in the opportunities provided to them. Parents play a vital role in ensuring that they talk to their students about the importance of school, help them set goals, communicate with the school frequently, and celebrate successes. Teachers provide a safe haven in their classrooms where all students feel welcomed. Teachers also provide valuable instruction ensuring the success of all students. Staff members provide an inviting school environment with safety measures in place. Partners in Education allows community members to get involved with school activities and provide valuable resources in fulfilling students' physical, social and emotional needs. As we continue to analyze our Panorama Surveys, Lakeview is committed to improving in the areas suggested by our stakeholders (parents, students, teachers, and community members).