

Orange County Public Schools

Lakeville Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lakeville Elementary

2015 LAKEVILLE RD, Apopka, FL 32703

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

Demographics

Principal: Charles Jackson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2022

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (47%)
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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lakeville Elementary

2015 LAKEVILLE RD, Apopka, FL 32703

<https://lakevillees.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	85%

School Grades History

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

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 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
Jackson, Charles	Principal	The principal is responsible for setting the vision, mission, and expectations for the school. He serves as the curriculum and instructional leader and is responsible for hiring and supervising all faculty and staff members. The principal is responsible for establishing and monitoring academic structures to ensure that academic momentum is accelerated and student performance gaps are closed. He provides leadership in examining data and making decisions supporting student learning. The principal also ensures that the MTSS process is implemented with fidelity so that support measures are implemented to meet the academic and behavioral needs of all students. He is also responsible for building strong relationships, creating a shared vision, being a role model, and praising students for positive choices. Finally, the principal manages the school's fiscal resources so that appropriate expenditures are made to meet the various needs of the school.
Mrozek, Cristina	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Mrozek provides various resources to the staff and parents. She analyzes data with teachers and guides them in providing data-based instruction. She collaborates with the instructional coaches to assess students early and ensure that interventions are in place. She participates in common planning to ensure that lessons coincide with state standards. She helps create the master schedule that complies with district and state mandates. She assists the principal in hiring, supervising, and evaluating faculty and staff members. The assistant principal also builds strong relationships, create a shared vision, serve as a role model, and praise students for positive choices.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/12/2022, Charles Jackson

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.*

3

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

Total number of students enrolled at the school

686

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

27

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

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	43	91	109	109	126	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	567
Attendance below 90 percent	12	29	34	31	30	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	43	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	47	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
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	3	36	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/19/2022

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	27	113	120	99	112	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	569
Attendance below 90 percent	6	23	29	32	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	27	113	120	99	112	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	569
Attendance below 90 percent	6	23	29	32	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	38%	56%	56%				47%	57%	57%

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	53%						48%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						37%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	48%	46%	50%				55%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	67%						62%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						54%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	61%	59%				51%	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	52%	57%	-5%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	54%	-20%	56%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

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	50%	62%	-12%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	63%	-10%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	52%	57%	-5%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

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	9	37	25	15	48	42	7				
ELL	14	52	45	34	61	67	12				
BLK	35	52	50	43	66	46	35				
HSP	33	55	43	39	65	55	41				
WHT	56	58		76	68		41				
FRL	32	52	55	41	64	59	33				
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	10	31		5	58						
ELL	20	26		18	35		21				
BLK	35	35		34	43	33	45				
HSP	30	47		27	41		37				
WHT	53	69		64	80		72				
FRL	30	44	31	30	46	47	41				
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	12	24	25	14	47	48	15				
ELL	25	33	25	44	63	55	35				
BLK	40	49	46	48	61	65	42				
HSP	46	42	32	51	67	48	52				
WHT	58	47		69	58		73				
FRL	39	46	36	48	59	51	38				

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
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	42
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	46
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	49
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	60
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	49
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 comparing FSA scores from the 20-21 school year to the 21-22 school year, there was positive growth in many areas. Lakeville experienced growth in all components included in the school grade calculation, except for science. Science scores dropped from 47% proficiency in 20-21 to 39% in 21-22. In examining the reading FSA scores, there was modest growth in proficiency from 36% to 38%, while learning gains showed an 8% increase up to 53% in 2022.

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

The two areas that are demonstrating the greatest need for improvement are reading and science. Reading is a priority area due to the very modest growth in learning gains and proficiency compared to math scores. Science is a priority as proficiency scores dropped by eight percentage 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?

One of the largest contributing factors to this need for improvement was the loss of 1/3 of our classroom teachers (5/15) in third, fourth, and fifth grade in December 2021. Students in those classrooms had substitute teachers for the remainder of the school year. We are currently hiring for all of our instructional vacancies as quickly and efficiently as possible. Our goal is to focus on retention and coaching support for all teachers.

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

According to 21-22 state assessments, math scores showed the greatest improvement. Proficiency scores rose thirteen percentage points from 35% to 49%. Learning gains rose from 48% to 67%. There was tremendous growth in the low twenty-five population as learning gains rose from 35% to 54%.

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

We will focus on implementing instructional frameworks for both reading and math content areas that promote differentiation through small-group instruction and center rotations. There will also be a concerted effort to monitor student data and modify instructional means in response to needs demonstrated by the student data.

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

There will be a concerted effort to ensure that instructional frameworks that support differentiation through small-group instruction are implemented for both the reading and math content areas. These instructional blocks will be supplemented by timeframes allotted for intervention activities that are intended to close achievement gaps and provide enrichment appropriate enrichment opportunities. Multiple data measures will also be monitored to provide insight into areas of need, and instructional methods will be adjusted to meet student needs identified through these measures. Lastly, after-school tutoring will be offered using an acceleration model to expose students to scheduled concepts, thereby giving them an increased opportunity of understanding these concepts.

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.

Professional development will be provided on monitoring student data and making instructional adjustments to meet student needs identified by the data measures.

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

We will work to establish a school culture that promotes grit and perseverance for students and teachers. Our goal is to offer support for all entities that will make Lakeville a positive place to learn and work. We will continue promoting tenets of social and emotional learning and self-care for teachers and 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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

With solid support from the district level to assist schools with Tier I instruction, we feel that addressing differentiation efforts through small-group instruction provides a continuum of support that will support student growth in crucial subject areas. In the 2021-22 school year, our students with disabilities (SWD) scored 9% in ELA proficiency. Differentiation through small-group instruction will allow teachers to meet the needs of all their students, especially those identified as a SWD.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

We will increase school-wide proficiency rates in ELA from 38% to 50% on the state-wide end-of-year assessment. On state-wide end-of-year assessments, math proficiency rates will increase from 48% to 53%.

Monitoring:

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

Progress towards identified outcomes will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, formal and informal observations, F.A.S.T. results, and mentoring and coaching activities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Charles Jackson (charles.jackson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Using data to drive instructional decisions will be the evidence-based strategy that will be implemented to promote growth in the area of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

This strategy was selected to help drive differentiation efforts that are intended to supplement core instruction and help increase the percentage of students who are proficient in reading and math.

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.

Professional development opportunities will be provided in the areas of teacher-led small group instruction, data analysis, targeted interventions, and acceleration.

Person Responsible Cristina Mrozek (cristina.mrozek@ocps.net)

Data meetings will be conducted to track student progress towards reaching targets that predict proficiency. Student data will drive decisions for intervention and small group instruction.

Person Responsible Charles Jackson (charles.jackson@ocps.net)

Coaching and mentoring will be provided by school-based administrators and district coaches through weekly PLC meetings.

Person Responsible Cristina Mrozek (cristina.mrozek@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

In examining Statewide Science Assessment data from the 21-22 school year, there was an eight percent drop in proficiency from 47% to 39%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase school-wide proficiency rates in science from 39% to 50% on the state-wide end-of-year assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Progress towards identified outcomes will be monitored through district Progress Monitoring Assessments, classroom walkthroughs, formal and informal observations, and mentoring and coaching activities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Charles Jackson (charles.jackson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Using data to drive instructional decisions will be the evidence-based strategy that will be implemented to promote growth in the area of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

This strategy was selected to increase the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency on designated state standards as measured by state end-of-year assessments.

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.

Data meetings will be conducted to track student progress towards reaching targets that predict proficiency. Student data will drive decisions for intervention and small group instruction.

Person Responsible Charles Jackson (charles.jackson@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 the 2021-2022 state assessments, 62% of our students in grades 1-2 scored below grade-level on the iReady Assessment. The instructional practice that we will focus on is providing differentiated instruction through small-group activities. Additionally, we will address Tier I instruction through planning activities facilitated by an instructional coach.

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

Based on the 2021-2022 state assessments, 62% of our students in grades 3-5 scored below level 3 on the ELA FSA. The instructional practice that we will focus on is providing differentiated instruction through small-group activities. Additionally, we will address Tier I instruction through planning activities facilitated by an instructional coach.

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)

We will increase school-wide proficiency rates in ELA from 38% to 50% on the state-wide end-of-year assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

We will increase school-wide proficiency rates in ELA from 38% to 50% on the state-wide end-of-year assessment.

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.

Progress towards identified outcomes will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, formal and informal observations, and mentoring and coaching activities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Jackson, Charles, charles.jackson@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?

Through planning, we will address tier I instructional practices to ensure that the six components of the Science of Reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, and oral language) are integrated into the reading instruction continuum. This will be supplemented through small-group instruction to provide differentiated instruction to meet individual student needs.

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?

This strategy was selected to help drive core instruction and differentiation efforts that are intended to help increase the percentage of students who are proficient 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
Literacy Coaching: Teachers will participate in planning meetings that a coach facilitates to ensure that The Science of Reading components are implemented.	Jackson, Charles, charles.jackson@ocps.net
Literacy Assessment: Standards-based common assessments will be utilized and analyzed to monitor student progress towards standards mastery.	Mrozek, Cristina, cristina.mrozek@ocps.net
Monitoring: Administration will conduct regular, ongoing classroom walkthroughs to monitor for implementation of evidence-based practices and provide actionable feedback to staff in an effort to positively adjust instructional practice.	Jackson, Charles, charles.jackson@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, Lakeville Elementary will 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. Lakeville Elementary will use the Caring School Curriculum. 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. Lakeville's school leadership team will collaborate with students, staff, and

families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council to reflect on implementation and determine the next steps. The development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.

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

Charles Jackson - Principal: build strong relationships, create a shared vision, be a role model, praise students for good choices

Cristina Mrozek - Assistant Principal: build strong relationships, create a shared vision, be a role model, clarify classroom & school rules/expectations, set appropriate consequences, praise students for good choices

Antonette Erhabor - Guidance Counselor: be a role model, build strong relationships, teach essential social skills, teach all students problem solving, praise students for good choices.

Rhonda Lociatto - Staffing Specialist: be a role model, build strong relationships, teach essential social skills,

teach all students problem solving, praise students for good choices.

Shani Porter - Behavior Specialist: be a role model, build strong relationships, teach essential social skills, teach all students problem solving, praise students for good choices.

Peter Taylor - Dean: be a role model, build strong relationships, teach essential social skills, teach all students problem solving, praise students for good choices.

Mandy Austin-PTA President: support the school staff in the areas listed above

Jennifer Magnussen - SAC Chair: support the school staff in the areas listed above