

Orange County Public Schools

Lake Gem Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lake Gem Elementary

4801 BLOODHOUND ST, Orlando, FL 32818

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

Demographics

Principal: Danielle Brancato

Start Date for this Principal: 6/28/2022

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 Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (47%) 2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: C (42%)
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 was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lake Gem Elementary

4801 BLOODHOUND ST, Orlando, FL 32818

<https://lakegemmes.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	97%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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 to 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
Apollon Simon, Rose	Assistant Principal	Ms. Apollon Simon facilitates instructional rounds and provides teachers with actionable feedback to enhance their professional practices. She partners with the principal to implement systems and structures that yield a strong learning environment. Ms. Apollon Simon analyzes common assessment data to make timely instructional decisions that impact student achievement. The Assistant Principal monitors discipline processes to ensure a safe learning and working environment.
Hodges, Krystal	Instructional Coach	Provide professional development, analyze data, provide peer coaching support and peer observation feedback, assist with small group instruction, and facilitate Math/Science common planning.
	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Provide professional development, analyze data, coordinate instructional resource alignment, facilitate school-wide testing, and assist with small group instruction.
Dixon, Shelby	Math Coach	Provide professional development, analyze data, provide peer coaching support and peer observation feedback, assist with small group instruction, and facilitate common planning.
Brown, Steven	ELL Compliance Specialist	Provide professional development, analyze data, coordinate MTSS, facilitate ESL compliance and monitoring, and assist with small group instruction.
Dowridgeutomudo, Lois	Dean	Provide discipline support to students and teachers, support and conduct safety procedures and drills, and oversee facilities.
Cook, Richard	School Counselor	School counselor, Threat Assessments, Child Safety Matters, SEL implementation, counseling
Saunders, RaNysha	Staffing Specialist	Provide professional development, analyze data, coordinate ESE/504 services, facilitate ESE/504 compliance and monitoring, and assist with providing support for the instruction of SWD.
Strickland, LaTanya	Reading Coach	Provide professional development, analyze data, provide peer coaching support and peer observation feedback, assist with small group instruction, and facilitate common planning.
Maxwell, Amanda	Principal	Ms. Maxwell serves as the instructional leader of Lake Gem Elementary School. She monitors instructional delivery of the standards and allocation of resources to ensure students are being provided with a high-quality education. The principal facilitates instructional rounds and provides

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		teachers with actionable feedback to enhance their professional practices. Ms. Maxwell establishes systems of guidance that result in a supportive learning environment with high expectations and increased student outcomes. Equally important, she provides avenues for teachers to collaborate, plan rigorous lessons, and contribute input for the optimal functioning of the school. The principal engages with district and community members to facilitate the use of resources which directly impacts student achievement

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/28/2022, Danielle Brancato

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

567

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

9

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

8

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	69	74	86	78	103	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501
Attendance below 90 percent	6	3	5	13	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	1	3	2	3	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	1	1	1	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	5	1	4	0	4	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	37	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	32	30	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	15	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	6	4	6	15	22	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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

Tuesday 6/28/2022

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	28	77	93	87	104	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	475
Attendance below 90 percent	6	24	35	23	22	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	8	10	7	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	1	5	4	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	28	77	93	87	104	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	475
Attendance below 90 percent	6	24	35	23	22	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	8	10	7	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	1	5	4	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
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	39%	57%	56%				50%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	62%	61%				46%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	50%	52%				35%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	43%	61%	60%				54%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	64%	66%	64%				40%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	56%	55%				19%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	56%	51%				36%	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	50%	55%	-5%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	55%	57%	-2%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

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	65%	62%	3%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	63%	-12%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2022					
	2019	40%	57%	-17%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	53%	-18%
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	14	46	31	5	38	54	17				
ELL	26	54	38	31	56	41	19				
BLK	38	55	31	44	65	60	39				
HSP	38	50		32	57						
FRL	35	55	33	41	63	49	31				

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	17			11			20				
ELL	20	55		24	36		38				
BLK	35	46	57	31	28	35	37				
HSP	47			53							
WHT	50			40							
FRL	34	44	58	30	27	33	36				
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	20	18	18	20	24	9	6				
ELL	47	47	36	54	42	24	54				
BLK	49	47	35	52	37	20	37				
HSP	44	38		65	48						
FRL	47	47	39	54	42	19	39				

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	47
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	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	372
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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

English Language Learners	
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	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	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?

Math learning gains were an area of strength. ELA learning gains is an area of opportunity. Overall proficiency increased in math and ELA. Science maintained proficiency and is an area of opportunity. Students with disabilities continue to be an area of opportunity.

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

Based on iReady progress monitoring data and FSA data, ELA and science proficiency are showing the greatest need for improvement.

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

Students need additional support in acquiring grade level phonics and fluency skills and then making the transition to applying those skills to connected, grade level text. Science content is an area that lost focus during distance learning so the need now is to increase frequency of science instruction and reinforcing standards from previous grades that are tested in 5th grade.

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

Math overall showed the most growth with 10% increase in proficiency, 36% increase in learning gains, and 22% increase in L25.

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

Use of math interventionists to target students needs, target tutoring focused on math with strategically assigned teachers and resources, and a change in math coach help make a positive impact in math instruction and data.

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

A clear understanding and implementation of the MTSS process, ESE services, and incorporation of enrichment opportunities for students performing on or above grade level.

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

We will begin the year with a deep dive into the MTSS process, ESE supports and services, and expectations for data collection and use of interventions. We will also work with teachers to build capacity around enrichment opportunities that will be embedded throughout the day and during FBS for students performing at or above grade level.

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

We will focus on building capacity in teacher leaders across campus as well as documenting the systems built so it is sustainable even with change in staff.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

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

Lake Gem Elementary will focus on differentiating instruction in order to increase proficiency across content areas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase ELA proficiency by 11%, math by 7%, and Science by 11%.

Monitoring:

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

Instructional practices relating to differentiation will be monitored through classroom walks, the coaching cycle, and the MTSS process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Lake Gem Elementary will use data-based decision-making to drive differentiated instruction by consistently monitoring academic growth, and provide relevant interventions in ELA, Math, and Science.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

We selected this strategy to support both the planning process for and delivery of standards-based scaffolding to reach mastery.

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. MTSS Overview during preplanning
2. Increase enrichment opportunities for students at or above grade level
3. Monthly data meetings focused on MTSS.

Person Responsible

Lois Dowridgeutomudo (lois.dowridgeutomudo@ocps.net)

1. Analyze classroom walk-through data to monitor instructional focus areas with specific actionable feedback.

Person Responsible

Amanda Maxwell (amanda.maxwell@ocps.net)

1. Develop an intensive plan to help promote student success by collecting, analyzing, and reviewing data.
2. Monitor the fidelity of implementation used to support students through intervention.

Person Responsible

Amanda Maxwell (amanda.maxwell@ocps.net)

1. Facilitate weekly collaboration amongst leadership team members to determine specific look-fors for differentiation for walkthroughs.

Person Responsible

Amanda Maxwell (amanda.maxwell@ocps.net)

1. Support common planning with Interventionists to reinforce differentiation strategies in small group structures.

Person Responsible

Krystal Hodges (krystal.hodges@ocps.net)

1. Develop, implement and monitor science experiments for all students in grades K-5.
2. Identify teachers in need of professional development for hands-on science labs.
3. Develop and implement a 5th-grade spiral review of 3rd and 4th grade standards.

Person Responsible

Shelby Dixon (shelby.dixon@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that 39% of students scored level 3 or higher in English Language Arts (ELA).

Measurable Outcome:

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

The 2023 state ELA assessment will show an increase of at least 11% percentage points from 37% to 50% proficient.

Monitoring:

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

ELA growth for KG - 5th will be measured with the following ongoing progress monitoring tools: SIPPS Mastery Assessments, Classroom Walkthroughs, District Standards-Based Unit Assessments, District K-2 Foundational Unit Assessments and Literably Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Maxwell (amanda.maxwell@ocps.net)

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

We will implement a clearly defined instructional framework that includes daily time for students to engage in grade level texts, close reading, TQs, and differentiated instruction with the teacher focused on bridging the gap from phonics and fluency to comprehension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students received consistent instruction on phonics and fluency and comprehension but there was a disconnect with them being able to apply the skills independently to grade level text. The goal of this strategy is to fill gaps while ensuring students learn to apply them as required for grade level standards.

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.

Use the district-created K-5 Common Planning Resources to guide the agenda and discussions, including the foundational planning in K-2. Ensure classroom walkthroughs are conducted regularly and ELA feedback is provided; when needed adjustments are made in common planning/PLCs.

Person Responsible

LaTanya Strickland (latanya.strickland@ocps.net)

Weekly data meetings focused on district common assessments to drive focus on trailing skills. Reteaching will also be monitored by reassessment after instruction has occurred.

Person Responsible

Amanda Maxwell (amanda.maxwell@ocps.net)

Clearly define and present the reading block framework to teachers during preplanning including WG focus, SG focus, and centers. This will be embedded in common planning moving forward.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Petit-Fere (jennifer.petit-fere@ocps.net)

#3. 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.

Lake Gem Elementary will increase learning gains for Students with Disabilities (SWD) in ELA (ESSA).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students with Disabilities will increase by 10 percentage points.

Monitoring:

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

Lake Gem Elementary will increase learning gains for Students with Disabilities (SWD) by developing a system to analyze data by subgroup and scaffold instructional practices. We will monitor instructional practices through classroom walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Petit-Frere (jennifer.petit-frere@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Build a system to analyze data, services, accommodations, instructional practices, and make data-driven adjustments that improve student outcomes directly related to our SWDs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

We selected this strategy because our students with disabilities and similar groups such as those designated as 504 continue to struggle with learning gains in all areas. After teachers of students with disabilities implement instruction with accommodations, they will monitor student progress and make data-driven adjustments.

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. ESE schedule monitored for ESE instructional time of pull-out and push-in support (POPI).
2. ESE student data monitored weekly by teachers of SWD as with coaches and admin.
3. ESE students' curriculum adjusted to reflect data collected for IEP goals.
4. Professional development will be provided to teachers of Students with Disabilities to support instruction with accommodations to improve student outcomes.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Petit-Frere (jennifer.petit-frere@ocps.net)

1. Common planning structures will include coaching and resources to ensure scaffolding and appropriate strategy use, and implementation of accommodations.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Petit-Frere (jennifer.petit-frere@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

Based on 21-22 End of the Year progress monitoring, the area of focus needed for Kindergarten is High Frequency words. The need for high frequency words affect student's fluency, which delays and prevents reading comprehension.

Based on 21-22 End of the Year progress monitoring, the area of focus needed for 1st grade is Comprehension of informational texts. As students read informational text their vocabulary and higher order thinking is strengthened.

Based on 21-22 End of the Year progress monitoring, the area of focus needed for 2nd grade is Phonics. A deficiency in phonics will impede decoding which affects fluency and comprehension.

The percentage of students K-3 who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on statewide, standardized ELA assessment based on End of Year progress monitoring data:

Kindergarten: 13%

1st Grade: 54%

2nd Grade: 52%

3rd Grade: 50%

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

Based on 21-22 End of the Year progress monitoring, the areas of focus needed for 3rd is phonics and vocabulary. The gap in these skills are impacting their ability to engage in grade level text.

Based on 21-22 End of the Year progress monitoring, the areas of focus needed for 4th and 5th grade is vocabulary and comprehension of informational text. There is also a small group of students who are still struggling with phonics and fluency which impacts their ability to engage in grade level text.

The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment:

3rd Grade: 66%

4th Grade: 59%

5th Grade: 67%

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)

Kindergarten: 100% of students will be on track to be on or above grade level on end of year assessments.

1st Grade: 75% of students will be on track to be on or above grade level based on end of year assessments.

2nd Grade: 75% of students will be on track to be on or above grade level based on end of year assessments.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

3rd Grade: 60% of students will be on track to be on or above grade level based on end of year assessments.

4th Grade: 50% of students will be on track to be on or above grade level based on end of year assessments.

5th Grade: 50% of students will be on track to be on or above grade level based on end of year assessments.

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.

ELA growth for KG - 5th will be measured with the following ongoing progress monitoring tools. SIPPS Mastery Assessments, Classroom Walkthroughs, District Standards-Based Unit Assessments, District K-2 Foundational Unit Assessments, and Literably Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Maxwell, Amanda, amanda.maxwell@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. Â§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 evidence based practices/ programs being implemented to achieve measurable outcomes include district created curriculum resource materials, SIPPS, Heggerty, and Literably.

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?

The programs were chosen because they place a focus on the foundational skills needed for success. The use of these evidence-based programs have shown to be effective in increasing foundational skills in reading.

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
<p>1. Strengthen foundational skills.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Literacy Leadership will promote foundational skills by planning activities throughout the school year. -Literacy coaching will support teachers to effectively implement the instruction of foundational skills. -Assessments will be used to monitor the effectiveness of the instruction of foundational skills. -Professional learning will be incorporated to support the needs of the instructional staff. 	<p>Strickland, LaTanya, latanya.strickland@ocps.net</p>
<p>2. Strengthen reading comprehension.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Literacy Leadership will promote reading comprehension by planning activities throughout the school year. -Literacy coaching will support teachers to effectively implement the instruction of reading comprehension. -Assessments will be used to monitor the effectiveness of instruction in reading comprehension. -Professional learning will be incorporated to support the needs of the instructional staff. 	

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 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.

The school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders. The PTA's goal is to foster a nurturing and caring environment that strives for continued parent involvement in helping build a better educational environment for our children. The PTA, along with SAC, seeks to promote a school community where teachers and administrators can do their best work with the resources we can provide and help make school fun.

For the PTA to be effective and truly representative of the school, it is essential to have parental involvement from as many parents as possible. Many activities will be held during the evening hours to ensure increased participation of parents in school-sponsored activities. When parents volunteer they get

the opportunity to enjoy interacting with their students.

In addition, a Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL) is purchased with Title I funds to serve as a liaison to bridge the gap between school and home. The PEL advocates for the parents and encourages their involvement in all school activities. We will also develop and implement discipline policies that balance accountability with an understanding of trauma.

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

Stakeholders include faculty, staff, parents, students, and community members.
Parents and teachers participate in PTA and SAC Meetings.