

Orange County Public Schools

Lakeville Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

Lakeville Elementary

2015 LAKEVILLE RD, Apopka, FL 32703

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jackson, Charles	Principal	<p>The principal is responsible for setting the school's vision, mission, and expectations. 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 accelerate academic momentum and close student performance gaps. 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 all students' academic and behavioral need. 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.</p>
Mrozek, Cristina	Assistant Principal	<p>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.</p>
Jacovino, Barbara	Curriculum Resource Teacher	<p>Ms. Jacovino provides various resources to the staff and parents. She analyzes data with teachers and researches scientifically-based curriculum and intervention programs. She collaborates with the instructional coaches to assess students early and ensure that interventions are in place. Ms. Jacovino works with new teachers to place them with mentors and provide professional development opportunities. She ensures that teachers have the necessary data to make informed decisions about students. Additionally, she facilitates common planning for 3rd-5th grade ELA.</p>
Loggans, Darla	Reading Coach	<p>Ms. Loggans provides research-based suggestions for intervention and instruction in reading. She provides guidance on all reading curriculum and intervention programs. Ms. Loggans supports data collection, assists in data analysis, and provides professional development opportunities for all staff members. she works with the CRT and teachers to implement Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions. Additionally, she oversees and participates in common planning and helps create formative assessments.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Chandler, Alma	Math Coach	Ms. Chandler provides research-based suggestions for intervention and instruction in math. She provides guidance on all reading curriculum and intervention programs. Ms. Chandler supports data collection, assists in data analysis, and provides professional development opportunities for all staff members. Ms. Chandler works with the CRT and teachers to implement Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions. Additionally, she oversees and participates in common planning and helps monitor formative assessments.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The Lakeville Elementary School Advisory Council is the primary means for all stakeholders to provide input into the school improvement process. SAC has representation from families, businesses, community leaders, and other entities with a vested interest in Lakeville Elementary. Typical SAC business includes discussing the results of the annual stakeholder survey, determining school improvement action items, and developing a plan to implement action items. SAC also provides input on budget matters and the identification, implementation, and monitoring of school improvement metrics.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The school improvement plan is monitored through a variety of structures. First, classroom teachers and school-based coaches monitor student performance on standards-based unit assessments. This data informs us on student progress towards mastering state standards. With this information, we can determine if classroom interventions are warranted and make a plan for implementing them. Secondly, regular data meetings are conducted with classroom teachers to discuss progress demonstrated on progress monitoring measures that predict proficiency. Through this medium, additional interventions are discussed and monitored for effectiveness. The school administration conducts regular classroom observations. In conjunction with classroom observations conducted by school-based coaches, this will inform if a teacher requires support in implementing academic structures that promote student achievement.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	85%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	7	27	20	22	18	16	0	0	0	110	
One or more suspensions	0	6	8	5	3	10	0	0	0	32	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	39	44	0	0	0	88	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	35	51	0	0	0	91	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	20	29	34	39	0	0	0	0	122	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	14	12	13	41	38	0	0	0	118

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	12	29	34	31	30	13	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	43	39	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	47	42	0	0	0	89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	36	36	0	0	0	75

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	12	29	34	31	30	13	0	0	0	149	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	43	39	0	0	0	84	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	47	42	0	0	0	89	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	36	36	0	0	0	75

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	40	57	53	38	56	56	36		
ELA Learning Gains				53			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			27		
Math Achievement*	37	60	59	48	46	50	36		
Math Learning Gains				67			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			35		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	51	63	54	39	61	59	47		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	57	59	59	51			62		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	229
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	17	Yes	4	4
ELL	31	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	43			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	3	3
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	49			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	49			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	40			37			51					57
SWD	14			14			18				4	
ELL	23			28			31				5	57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			33			48				5	53
HSP	37			36			33				5	65
MUL	62			54							2	
PAC												
WHT	52			39			80				4	
FRL	35			31			40				5	55

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	38	53	49	48	67	54	39					51
SWD	9	37	25	15	48	42	7					
ELL	14	52	45	34	61	67	12					51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	52	50	43	66	46	35					38
HSP	33	55	43	39	65	55	41					57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	56	58		76	68		41					
FRL	32	52	55	41	64	59	33					53

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	36	45	27	36	48	35	47					62
SWD	10	31		5	58		0					
ELL	20	26		18	35		21					62

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	35		34	43	33	45					43
HSP	30	47		27	41		37					72
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	53	69		64	80		72					
FRL	30	44	31	30	46	47	41					78

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	41%	54%	-13%	54%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	60%	-21%	58%	-19%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	52%	-11%	50%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	41%	59%	-18%	59%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	37%	62%	-25%	61%	-24%
05	2023 - Spring	34%	55%	-21%	55%	-21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	48%	59%	-11%	51%	-3%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

According to the third 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. administration, our lowest performance area was math proficiency. This measure indicated that 40% of our students were proficient. Factors that influenced this can be attributed to the resignation of key staff members after the start of the school year. This factor impacted student performance in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades. Furthermore, Lakeville did not have the benefit of a school-based math coach. This made it challenging to provide teachers with needed support and coaching in the area of mathematics.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Mathematics proficiency was the area that showed the most significant decline. We realized an 8% decline in proficiency rates when compared to the 21-22 school year. This decline can be attributed to the resignation of key staff members after the start of the school year. This factor impacted student performance in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades. Furthermore, Lakeville did not have the benefit of a school-based math coach. This made it challenging to provide teachers with needed support and coaching in the area of mathematics.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Math. Our scores in grades 3-5 were an average of 14 points below the state average (3rd grade = -9, 4th grade = -12, 5th grade = -19). A major contributing factor in this deficit is that two teachers (one in 3rd grade and one in 5th grade) resigned very early in the school year and we were not able to secure a permanent teacher in either classroom. The students in 5th grade were all taught by this one teacher (departmentalized) and the rest of the 5th grade teachers split the math instruction for the remainder of the year. The students in 3rd grade split into the remaining 5 teachers' classrooms for the remainder of the year causing larger class sizes (over 18).

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our science scores showed the most improvement this year. Our school implemented a departmentalized model in 5th grade with one teacher teaching all 5th grade students science. We utilized the Study Island program consistently and our students participated in the North Learning Community Science Bowl to help prepare for the assessment.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Reflecting on the EWS data, absenteeism is our number one concern. Twenty five percent of our students are showing as being absent 10 or more days. Our second priority would be students in 4th & 5th grade scoring a level 1 on the state assessments in both ELA & Math.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1) Positive culture and environment; 2) Math proficiency scores; 3) Absences/Tardies/Early Releases; 4) SWD ESSA data

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Lakeville has had a tremendous amount of staff turnover in recent years. Of the 61 instructional staff members that make up Lakeville's faculty, 40 were hired within the last two years. Furthermore, of the 30 members of our support staff, 14 were hired within the last two years. School improvement is not sustainable without continuity within the faculty and staff. For this reason, we must focus on building an environment and establishing a culture that will promote the retention of all staff members.

Measurable Outcome:

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

According to the 2022-2023 Panorama Survey, 55% of our faculty and staff rated Lakeville positively in the area of school climate. For the 2023-2024 school year, we expect to increase this to at least 60%.

Monitoring:

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

This focus will be monitored by administering quarterly school climate surveys to monitor the social and learning climate at our school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Charles Jackson (charles.jackson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will implement various activities designed to promote a positive work environment while providing opportunities for staff members to have interactions designed to build cohesion and camaraderie.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We believe that a positive school culture will reduce teacher burnout and contribute to increasing teacher retention. Furthermore, we believe that when teachers feel an attachment, they will be more inclined to buy into the vision of the school, which will increase student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Interventions will include hosting an off-campus team-building activity before the start of school; celebrating staff members in the weekly newsletter sent by the principal; sporadic lunches, treats, and tokens of appreciation; holiday celebrations; and teacher and staff appreciation week activities.

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

By When: April 2024

Planning and coaching support will be provided by a present and visible administrative team. The teachers will be able to experience in the moment, side by side, and full cycle coaching. An administrator and academic coach will be present in the planning meetings to collaborate on instructional practices.

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

By When: Weekly beginning September, 2024

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In examining statewide assessment data from the 2022-2023 school year, there was an eight percentage drop in proficiency in math from 48% to 40%.

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 math from 40% to 45% on the final F.A.S.T.

Monitoring:

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

Progress toward identified outcomes will be monitored through standards-based unit assessments and the first two administrations of the F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cristina Mrozek (cristina.mrozek@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

We will implement data monitoring systems that will include individual teacher data meetings and group data meetings within the PLC meeting structures.

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

By When: April 2024

Students will track their data through data notebooks.

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

By When: April 2024

We will host parent conference nights and monthly parenting engagement meetings to ensure parents stay informed on their student's progress.

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

By When: April 2024

#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 crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Of the 316 students with disabilities at Lakeville, 33% (105) students did not score in the proficient range (levels 3, 4, or 5) on the third 2022-2023 progress monitoring assessment (FAST/STAR).

Measurable Outcome:

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

We aim to increase the number of students scoring in the proficient range (levels 3-5) on the third 2023-2024 STAR/FAST assessment by 8% from 33% to 41%.

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 Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will focus on implementing positive action attendance strategies that promote whole-school reform emphasizing climate and social-emotional skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By addressing social emotional factors, we anticipate positively influencing student achievement for students with disabilities.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Implement Zones of Regulation and Kelso's Choice programs with the intent of helping students develop social skills that will help make the school environment more positive and inclusive.

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

By When: The programs will be up and running by September 2023.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Lakeville Elementary meets the needs of the students with disabilities (SWD) in several ways. There is a self-contained EBD unit on campus with a full-time behavior specialist, program assistant, two full-time classroom teachers and one paraprofessional. There is also one varying exceptionalities teacher who supports the general education SWD using a pull-out model. The SWD are monitored by the general education teachers, the special education teachers as well as the staffing specialist and administration. This team ensures that the IEPs and 504s are being followed with fidelity through the use of tracking charts, regular data meetings, and compliance meetings for the IEP and 504 documents. At these meetings, the data is analyzed and instruction is adjusted as needed for each individual student.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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 2022-2023 state assessments, 64% of our students in grades 1-2 scored below level 3 (proficiency target) on the FAST PM 3 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 related to Reading/ELA

Based on the 2022-2023 state assessments, 60% of our students in grades 3-5 scored below level 3 on the third ELA FAST Progress Monitoring 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.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

We will increase the percentage of students who score at a level 3 and above on the third administration of the 2023-2024 FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment from 36% to 41%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

We will increase the percentage of students who score at a level 3 and above on the third administration of the 2023-2024 FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment from 40% to 45%.

Monitoring**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 impact student achievement outcomes.

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**Description:**

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

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:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based 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 content coach will facilitate to ensure that tenets of The Science of Reading are implemented following a prescribed structure.	Jackson, Charles, charles.jackson@ocps.net
Professional Learning: The literacy coaches will conduct professional development to support all tiers of instruction for students. The implementation of programs, the instructional framework, and follow up on teacher attended district provided professional development will be lead by the literacy coaches.	Jacovino, Barbara, barbara.jacovino@ocps.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be placed on the school's website as well as in references during SAC, Title I Parent Meetings and during the welcome speech to families prior to the Open House event.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We will continue to build the positive relationships with our parents, families and other community stakeholders through our SAC meetings, PTA meetings, parent/family nights (both academic and non-academic), communication using Talking Points, school messenger, newsletters, and PEL specific activities.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

In order to provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum, we will continue to offer after school tutoring and clubs. We will strengthen the academic program and increase the amount of quality learning time by focusing on maximizing time given in each instructional block to include small group/center rotations with teacher led groups and quick and efficient transitions.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Our tutoring program is funded through Title 1 funds.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Our school has a school-based guidance counselor and a district-based mental health counselor who both see students on a schedule in both individual and group settings. Our guidance counselor also teaches group lessons on Child Safety Matters. Our behavior specialist teaches social skills lessons to students. We have started a mentoring program for students identified in both academic and/or behavior areas of need.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

We participate in our district's Teach-In event each year. We bring in parents and community members who present to the students different careers and occupations.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We have a behavior team at our school consisting of a Dean, Behavior Specialist, an MTSS Coach, Staffing Specialist, administration (principal & assistant principal), a guidance counselor, and a staffing specialist (if necessary). We use a PBIS model for behavior school-wide.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

We have weekly PLCs for all instructional personnel in the subject areas of ELA, Math & Science. We give bi-weekly professional development to the staff. Our staff also attends off-campus professional development both with the district and outside the district for an array of topics.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

We currently have two full-time VPK classes at our school. This allows those 40 students to learn the school, our expectations and procedures all prior to Kindergarten. The students who come into Kindergarten are screened immediately in both ELA and Math so that the teachers are able to form small groups and begin differentiated instruction specific to each learners needs right at the start of the school year.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment				\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$16,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0141 - Lakeville Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$7,500.00
			Notes: Supplemental math instructional resource.			
			0141 - Lakeville Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$9,000.00
			Notes: After-school tutoring.			

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$16,500.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No