

Orange County Public Schools

Vista Lakes Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Vista Lakes Elementary

6050 LAKE CHAMPLAIN DR, Orlando, FL 32829

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

Demographics

Principal: Kristy Key

Start Date for this Principal: 7/26/2022

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	60%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (61%) 2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: B (55%)
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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Vista Lakes Elementary

6050 LAKE CHAMPLAIN DR, Orlando, FL 32829

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>60%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>83%</p>

School Grades History

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

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
Key, Kristy	Principal	The principal, Mrs. Key, facilitates weekly instructional resource team meetings to discuss instructional practices across campus. The principal also meets weekly with the entire resource team and the school's Parent Engagement Liaison to discuss issues that impact the school as a whole and to discuss Family Engagement Activities. Weekly, the Principal collaborates with the instructional resource team as well as grade level teams and individual teachers to monitor student progress and make recommendations for instructional changes. Classroom walkthroughs are conducted to ensure instructional practices are aligned to the Florida standards.
Malek, Denise	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal, Mrs. Malek, collaborates with the instructional resource team to identify and monitor instructional practices across campus. She meets weekly with teams during PLCs to ensure instruction is aligned to the standards and best practices are utilized. The assistant principal conducts classroom walkthroughs and provides actionable feedback to individual teachers to monitor student progress and make recommendations for instructional changes.
Wood, Jamie	Behavior Specialist	The behavior specialist, Mrs. Wood, supports the ASD unit and ensures the academic and social emotional success of the students participating in our unit. She also provides guidance and support to the instructional staff with resources and strategies to promote positive behavioral interventions.
Sanchez, Nicole	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach, Mrs. Sanchez, works closely with new teachers. She collaborates with grade level teams and individual teachers to monitor student progress and make recommendations for instructional changes. The instructional coach collects the weekly data from each teacher on their common assessments. She assists them with understanding the district's Curriculum Resource Materials (CRMs) and any other resources available to them for their common planning.
Rosario, Vanessa	Curriculum Resource Teacher	As the Curriculum Resource Teacher, Mrs. Rosario monitors and coaches teachers on the use of the core reading program. She collaborates with grade level teams and individual teachers to monitor student progress and make recommendations for instructional changes. She assists them with understanding the district's Curriculum Resource Materials (CRMs) and any other resources available to them for their common planning.
Griffith, Jennifer	Instructional Media	The Media Specialist, Mrs. Griffith, offers support in the area of Accelerated Reader as she assists teachers in getting students to know their AR range and set goals and work towards them. She coordinates the celebration of students reaching their goal. In addition, she maintains the media center as the hub of the school. She is also our lead teacher for our digital learning at Vista Lakes Elementary. She provides resources and professional learning opportunities

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		for our staff on the technological resources available to them for instruction and student learning.
Roberts, Tiffany	School Counselor	The guidance counselor, Ms. Roberts, collaborates with the behavior specialist, and MTSS coach to work together to support scholars with their behaviors as well as academics in most instances. They not only support the scholars but also work closely with teachers by providing them guidance and support on effective strategies and interventions they can implement to support their scholars. She also monitors our students who are eligible for services through the McKinney-Vento Program (MVP) and provides resources or support for these families identified as homeless. Some of these services include transportation, gas cards, food, clothing, school supplies and resources for shelter.
Hurst, Kathleen	Staffing Specialist	The staffing specialist, Mrs. Hurst, oversees all compliance for ESE, as well as scholars with a 504 plan. The school staffing specialist also monitors the accommodations provided to the ESE students and ensures their IEP plans are up to date and followed.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/26/2022, Kristy Key

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.*

2

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

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

568

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

7

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

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	2	19	24	17	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	18	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	1	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/27/2022

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	14	91	103	118	87	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	513
Attendance below 90 percent	6	9	9	10	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	7	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	

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	2	7	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	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	14	91	103	118	87	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	513
Attendance below 90 percent	6	9	9	10	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	7	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	

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	2	7	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	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	65%	56%	56%				69%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%						64%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						55%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	68%	46%	50%				75%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	74%						70%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						44%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	66%	61%	59%				74%	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	68%	55%	13%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	68%	57%	11%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2022					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

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	79%	62%	17%	62%	17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	72%	63%	9%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2022					
	2019	67%	57%	10%	60%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	53%	14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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	26	21	24	35	27	17				
ELL	42	41	22	49	67	56	40				
ASN	81	69		88	92						
BLK	50	65		60	59						
HSP	59	58	40	60	70	53	56				
WHT	83	80		80	85		89				
FRL	58	63	47	58	70	50	53				
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	15	31		31	31		31				
ELL	42	39	20	48	13		35				
ASN	75	70		79	50		64				
BLK	67	55		49	52		64				
HSP	51	34	22	49	38	35	47				
WHT	76	61		78	72		74				
FRL	54	44	24	49	46	29	48				
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	17	33	21	19	34	27	25				
ELL	60	64	57	72	69	48	68				
ASN	84	82		84	77						
BLK	63	55		63	65		77				
HSP	67	61	48	72	68	46	69				
WHT	76	71		81	74		85				
FRL	59	58	50	66	65	43	67				

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	59

ESSA Federal Index	
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	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	473
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

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	46
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	83
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	59
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	56
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	83
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	57
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?

Across grade levels, the SWD (students with disabilities) are showing the lowest percentage of proficiency in all content areas, including ELA, Math and Science. In ELA, 14% of the 49 students who make up our SWD subgroup performed in the proficient range. In Math, 24% of the 49 students who make up our SWD subgroup performed in the proficient range. In Science, 17% of the 12 students who make up our SWD subgroup in 5th grade performed in the proficient range.

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

The greatest need for improvement is indicated in ELA for our scholars identified in the lowest 25%. For this component 40% of the 43 scholars made a learning gain on the 2022 ELA FSA. This was our lowest percentage for all school grade components. Of the total 43 scholars identified in the lowest 25%, 14 are also identified in the ESSA SWD subgroup.

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

Despite our intense focus on standards based instruction in the core content over small group differentiated instruction and intervention, a contributing factor to the need for improvement is consistent low performance by our Students With Disabilities. To address this need for improvement we will focus on providing small group and differentiated instruction and intervention to decrease learning gaps and support students with specific skill deficits.

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

Although we showed improvement in all data components, the component showing the most growth was our learning gains for Math. FSA results from 2021 indicated 49% of scholars made a learning gain in Math. In 2022, 74% of Vista Lakes Elementary scholars made a learning gain in Math. This exhibits a 25% improvement in the math learning gain component.

Improvement for the ELA learning gains and ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% were also identified.

In 2021, 46% of scholars showed a learning gain in ELA. In 2022, there is an 18% increase with 64% of scholars showing a learning gain in ELA.

For ELA Learning Gains of the lowest 25%, 21% of the scholars made a learning gain in 2021. In 2022, 40% of the scholars identified in the lowest 25% made a learning gain in ELA. This indicates improvement of 19% for ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% from 2021 to 2022.

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

In the area of ELA we worked closely with our instructional staff to monitor our MTSS processes at Vista Lakes Elementary. Scholars were identified based on multiple data sources for tiered intervention or enrichment. Intervention blocks were monitored closely for appropriate resources and fidelity of use.

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

In order to accelerate learning we will continue to focus on standards aligned differentiated instruction based on individual student needs. Strategies will include activities that support various learning modalities for presentation and student responses. Strategies to formatively assess students using multiple sources to drive instructional decisions and lesson planning.

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.

B.E.S.T. Math and ELA
Small Group and Differentiated Instruction
Instructional Framework - strategies and desired effects
Researched Based Intervention and Supports

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

Ongoing professional learning and coaching will be provided to all staff, along with consistent monitoring of student data to ensure academic growth in response to services provided.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. The subgroup data from the ESSA Federal Index indicates Students With Disabilities(SWD) performing below 41% for the previous years to include 2018 through 2022.

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

For the 2022-2023 school year it is expected that the Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup will show an increase of at least 5% in their proficiency percentage in the area of ELA(from 14% in 2022 to 19% in 2023), Math(from 26% in 2022 to 31% in 2023), and Science(from 17% in 2022 to 22% in 2023). Due to The State testing changes from the Florida Standards Assessment(FSA) to the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) learning gains will not be measured for the 2022-2023 school year.

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

The students in the SWD subgroup will be monitored closely through the use of F.A.S.T. PM1 and PM2. Common assessment data for all students will be tracked for each unit. Prescribed reteaches of standards not met will be implemented for students identified as having not met the 70% proficiency target.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Kristy Key (kristy.key@ocps.net)

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

Vista Lakes will utilize research based intervention strategies and resources to support our lowest performing students with their specific skill deficit. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), differentiated professional development, and specific research-based curriculum and instructional strategies will be implemented.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:
Explain the
rationale for
selecting this
specific strategy.
Describe the
resources/criteria
used for selecting
this strategy.**

By utilizing researched based intervention strategies and resources, we will be able to close achievement gaps which will increase proficiency in reading and math for our Students with Disabilities.

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.

FAST PM and Common Assessment Data Tracking

Person Responsible Nicole Sanchez (nicole.sanchez@ocps.net)

Weekly grade level PLCs will incorporate a focus on regular monitoring of students identified as receiving Multi Tiered Systems of Support in tier II and III.

Person Responsible Kristy Key (kristy.key@ocps.net)

Consistent review of student intervention data to monitor their progress toward specific goals.

Person Responsible Denise Malek (sharonda.malek@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

In review of our current data and potential gaps with the transition to the B.E.S.T. standards in ELA for 3rd-5th and in Math for grades K-5th, Instructional Practice specifically related to these standards will be at the forefront of our professional learning this year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the 2022-2023 school year, at least 70% of all students assessed and measured by the F.A.S.T. will be proficient in the content areas of English Language Arts (ELA) and at least 75% will be proficient in Math.

Monitoring:

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

PM1, PM2, as well as, the common assessments will be analyzed and discussed in data meetings. Classroom walkthrough and observations will also be used to monitor adjustments made to instruction based on the assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristy Key (kristy.key@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Vista Lakes will utilize distributive leadership in PLCs, along with differentiated professional learning incorporating the Instructional Framework elements to support standards based instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

As stronger implementation of standards based instruction will increase our overall proficiency and decrease the amount of students in need of targeted and intensive interventions.

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.

Weekly PLCs and collaborative planning for alignment of the standard, instruction and student tasks.

Person Responsible

Kristy Key (kristy.key@ocps.net)

Closely monitor formative and summative assessments.

Person Responsible

Nicole Sanchez (nicole.sanchez@ocps.net)

Classroom Walkthroughs focused on evidence to support monitoring for understanding and student processing.

Person Responsible

Kristy Key (kristy.key@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 build a positive culture, we promote an atmosphere that motivates and encourages both students and teachers. We focus on our goals while celebrating our successes along the way. We utilize a variety of motivational strategies with students that build their intrinsic motivation and develop strong relationships between home and school that carries our positive culture throughout the local community. In addition, we have a CHEER committee that serves to promote positivity for the educators on our campus as they set the foundation for the positive culture that nurtures our scholars' academic growth.

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

Administration - Positivity starts at the top so we must lay the foundation in which our school culture is built upon. By maintaining open communication and involving teachers in academic planning, administrations empowers them to be more confident and effective. Similarly, administrators who actively engage parents and seek community input establish invaluable partnerships in their mission to build a strong culture.

Teachers/Staff - They must maintain the positive culture as students feed off of the teachers and staff around them. They should celebrate student success and continually motivate them within their classroom so that the positivity eventually expands past their own classroom walls. Teachers should tap into each other's strengths and engage in reflective dialogue to drive professional learning and create a positive change.

Students/Family - With positive home/school relationships, students and families feel a connection with their school and develop a sense of teamwork and camaraderie that builds and supports a positive culture and climate.