

Orange County Public Schools

Lake Gem 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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Lake Gem Elementary

4801 BLOODHOUND ST, Orlando, FL 32818

<https://lakegemmes.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 to lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team, 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
Maxwell, Amanda	Principal	Ms. Maxwell serves as the instructional leader of Lake Gem Elementary School. She monitors instructional delivery of the standards and allocation of resources to ensure students are being provided with a high-quality education. The principal facilitates instructional rounds and provides teachers with actionable feedback to enhance their professional practices. Ms. Maxwell establishes systems of guidance that results in a supportive learning environment with high expectations and increased student outcomes. Equally important, she provides avenues for teachers to collaborate, plan rigorous lessons, and contribute input for the optimal functioning of the school. The principal engages with district and community members to facilitate the use of resources which directly impacts student achievement.
Apollon Simon, Rose	Assistant Principal	Ms. Apollon Simon facilitates instructional rounds and provides teachers with actionable feedback to enhance their professional practices. She partners with the principal to implement systems and structures that yield a strong learning environment. Ms. Apollon Simon analyzes common assessment data to make timely instructional decisions that impact students achievement. The Assistant Principal monitors discipline processes to ensure a safe learning and working environment.
Hodges, Krystal	Instructional Coach	Ms. Hodges provides professional development, analyze data, provide peer coaching support and peer observation feedback, assist with small group instruction, and facilitate common planning.
Strickland, LaTanya	Reading Coach	Ms. Strickland provides professional development, analyze data, provide peer coaching support and peer observation feedback, assist with small group instruction, and facilitate common planning.
Dixon, Shelby	Math Coach	Ms. Dixon provides professional development, analyze data, provide peer coaching support and peer observation feedback, assist with small group instruction, and facilitate common planning.
Dowridgeutomudo, Lois	Dean	Ms. Dowridge Utomudo provides discipline support to students and teachers, support and conduct safety procedures and drills, and oversee facilities.
Saunders, RaNysha	Staffing Specialist	Ms. Saunders provides professional development, analyze data, coordinate ESE/504 services, facilitate ESE/504 compliance and monitoring, and assist with providing support for the instruction of SWD.

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 school leadership team helped review data and develop the school improvement plan. The draft plan is then reviewed with teacher leaders during a team lead meeting. It is also reviewed with parents and the community during a School Advisory Council meeting prior to finalizing. Areas of focus are introduced to all staff during preplanning and action steps and final plans are shared with the staff via a staff newsletter email and faculty meeting.

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 SIP will be monitored through use of scheduled data meetings tied to the areas of focus. This will help us determine progress and make revisions to the plan based on needs shown in data.

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	97%
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) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: D 2018-19: D

	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	10	21	22	27	14	14	0	0	0	108	
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	3	6	10	0	0	0	22	
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	11	20	22	0	0	0	53	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	23	26	0	0	0	57	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	21	13	30	20	0	0	0	0	84	

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	6	5	23	22	0	22	0	0	78

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	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	6	3	5	13	13	10	0	0	0	50	
One or more suspensions	1	3	2	3	9	9	0	0	0	27	
Course failure in ELA	1	1	1	0	5	6	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	5	1	4	0	4	20	0	0	0	34	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	37	33	0	0	0	105	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	30	34	0	0	0	96	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	15	22	26	0	0	0	63	

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	6	4	6	15	22	33	0	0	0	86

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	6	3	5	13	13	10	0	0	0	50	
One or more suspensions	1	3	2	3	9	9	0	0	0	27	
Course failure in ELA	1	1	1	0	5	6	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	5	1	4	0	4	20	0	0	0	34	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	37	33	0	0	0	105	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	30	34	0	0	0	96	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	15	22	26	0	0	0	63	

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	6	4	6	15	22	33	0	0	0	86

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
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*	41			39	57	56	37		
ELA Learning Gains				55	62	61	46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33	50	52	59		
Math Achievement*	49			43	61	60	33		
Math Learning Gains				64	66	64	28		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55	56	55	33		
Science Achievement*	51			39	56	51	39		
Social Studies Achievement*					0	50			
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	57			44			42		

* 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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	241
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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	372
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	25	Yes	4	4
ELL	37	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	45			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

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%
FRL	48			

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	27	Yes	3	3
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	44			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	43			

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	41			49			51					57
SWD	8			21							4	60
ELL	22			43			29				5	57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			47			51				5	58
HSP	34			59			50				5	54
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	39			47			55				5	56

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	39	55	33	43	64	55	39					44
SWD	14	46	31	5	38	54	17					9
ELL	26	54	38	31	56	41	19					44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	55	31	44	65	60	39					50
HSP	38	50		32	57							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	35	55	33	41	63	49	31					38

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	37	46	59	33	28	33	39					42
SWD	17	0		11			20					
ELL	20	55		24	36		38					42
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	46	57	31	28	35	37					41
HSP	47			53								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	50			40								
FRL	34	44	58	30	27	33	36					45

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	39%	54%	-15%	54%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	42%	60%	-18%	58%	-16%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	52%	-11%	50%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	49%	59%	-10%	59%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	47%	62%	-15%	61%	-14%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	55%	-9%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	47%	59%	-12%	51%	-4%

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.

Our data component that had the lowest performance was SWD and ELL in ELA. Students served in general education classrooms show a need for additional support to work towards their goals and grade level proficiency. We have also recognized that we are struggling as a school to effectively identify needs and monitor progress on students foundational gaps for SWD, ELL, and General Education students.

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

Our greatest decline was in our SWD, ELL, and in our students showing need for tiered intervention. We show a need for increased support and consistency of how we are intervening and monitoring progress of our subgroups and tiered students.

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.

Our data component that had the lowest performance was SWD in ELA. We have recognized that we are struggling as a school to effectively identify needs and monitor progress on students foundational gaps and for SWD. We also had several students served in ASD units who were slated to move into access points and alternative assessment but the process was not started. We have implemented this process and all students will be on the appropriate assessment in the new year.

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

The data point with the greatest progress was Science with a 10 point growth. The teacher new to the grade level went to IMPACT training and consistently shared and applied her learning. The team implemented frequent hands on experiences and we embedded Science text in FBS on and above grade level groups in second semester. The coach and program specialist focused on analyzing data and reteach plans based on Big Idea.

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

After reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, one area of concern is attendance.

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year are: Achievement Gaps- SWD and ELL, MTSS Systems, and Attendance.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 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.

Our SWD subgroups showed a decline in proficiency in comparison with peers. This has been a trend over the past 3 school years with the gap widening.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will see an 10% increase in proficiency for SWD this school year. We will see learning gains for SWD of 50%. Learning gains is based on intended growth from 21-22 as we do not have learning gains to base this on from 22-23. This will serve to begin closing the gap observed over the past 3 school years.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will meet with the ESE team monthly to specifically review SWD data and determine progress towards individual goals. Students will also be identified for General Education teachers so they are aware of those specific needs and will be embedded in biweekly data plc conversations. We will also monitor growth towards IEP goals using quarterly progress reports generated by ESE Teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

RaNysha Saunders (ranysha.saunders@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.)

SLD teachers are collaborating with our Staffing Specialist to ensure schedules are created that reflect students minutes and needs in IEPs. They are also collaborating on identifying researched based resources (Reading Mastery and Number Worlds) and using measures to ensure students are placed appropriately in the programs based on individual needs.

Teachers for students in smaller setting classes are receiving training and support on approved tier 2 and 3 resources as well as use to support students as they address foundational reading gaps including Heggerty and SIPPS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on reflection with the team we recognized that the caseload of SWD in general education classes really called for an additional teacher to be able to serve students appropriately. We also recognized that teachers training and access to research based intervention tools was not consistent so this was something we need to provide in order to address these gaps and ensure students were making progress towards the foundational reading and math goals. These resources also include clear progress monitoring pieces that can help guide instructional decisions throughout implementation.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

1. ESE schedule developed and monitored for ESE instructional time of pull-out and push-in support (POPI).

Person Responsible: RaNysha Saunders (ranysha.saunders@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023 and ongoing

2. SWD student data monitored monthly by teachers of SWD with coaches and admin.

Person Responsible: RaNysha Saunders (ranysha.saunders@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023 and ongoing

3. Collaborate with teachers to adjust SWD students' curriculum and supports to reflect need seen in data (IEP quarterly progress monitoring and related data points).

Person Responsible: RaNysha Saunders (ranysha.saunders@ocps.net)

By When: October 2023 and ongoing

4. Provide differentiated professional development for teachers on curriculum and intervention resources (district provided PD, Coaching, planning days).

Person Responsible: RaNysha Saunders (ranysha.saunders@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023 and ongoing

5. Implement monthly ESE Professional Learning Community meetings to collaborate on areas of need and problem solving.

Person Responsible: RaNysha Saunders (ranysha.saunders@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly starting September 2023

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

Our ELL subgroup showed a decline in proficiency in comparison with peers. This has been a trend over the past 3 school years with the gap widening. The need in ELA is larger than math as math is an area of strength for this subgroup.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will see an 10% increase in proficiency for ELL this school year. We will see learning gains for ELL of 50%. Learning gains is based on intended growth from 21-22 as we do not have learning gains to base this on from 22-23. This will serve to begin closing the gap observed over the past 3 school years.

Monitoring:

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

Administration (Assistant Principal Simon) will meet with the ELL team monthly (CCT and Bilingual Paraprofessionals) to specifically review ELL data and determine progress towards individual goals. Students will also be identified for General Education teachers so they are aware of those specific needs and will be embedded in biweekly data PLC conversations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rose Apollon Simon (rose.apollonsimon@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 start by ensuring all students are evaluated and place in appropriate programs including Imagine Learning for newcomers to support language acquisition. A students support schedule will be developed by the AP and CCT for paraprofessionals using student data. As data is monitored the support will change to target those needing additional support to move towards growth goals. Their focus will be on language acquisition, pre teaching academic vocabulary tied to upcoming content, and addressing foundational reading skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our ELL students come in at different levels with the most need being in learning and applying foundational reading skills and acquiring language. Learning and understanding upcoming academic vocabulary is crucial as often times those are not words that are learned passively they acquire English so providing that support will allow them to better engage in gen ed lessons and work towards growth goals.

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 3 - Promising 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.

1. Identify ELL students needing foundational support
2. Provide students with appropriate support to address foundational reading skills
3. Monthly ELL team meeting to review data

Person Responsible: Rose Apollon Simon (rose.apollonsimon@ocps.net)

By When: May 2023

2. Provide students with appropriate support (push-in support, Imagine Learning, etc.) to address foundational reading skills

Person Responsible: Rose Apollon Simon (rose.apollonsimon@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023 to May 2023

3. Monthly ELL team meeting to review data

Person Responsible: Rose Apollon Simon (rose.apollonsimon@ocps.net)

By When: May 2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**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.

We have had a high number of students performing below grade level based on state assessments and district diagnostic data. We have worked over the past year to identify student need, develop and implement tiers of intervention, and ensure progress monitoring. We have seen some improvement in the number of students needing intervention in phonological awareness and phonics in upper grades but we continue to see a need in how we are identifying, addressing, and monitoring needs in vocabulary and reading comprehension in upper grades and in math across all grades.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As a result of increased implementation and monitoring of interventions within the MTSS process, we will show improvement in learning gains for our lowest 25% in both reading and math. We will see 43% of our lowest quartile in reading make a learning gain on state assessments and 65% of our lowest quartile in math. This will be a 10% increase of students in the lowest quartile meeting learning gains based on 21-22 learning gains as we do not have that data available for 22-23.

Monitoring:

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

We have a coach dedicated to facilitating the MTSS process and content area coaches to help support with effective implementation of interventions. They will meet with teacher teams monthly specifically to analyze MTSS progress monitoring data and will collaborate to support in identifying student needs during data PLCs focused on tier one sources of data from unit assessments, state assessments, and district diagnostic assessments.

After mid year assessments all teachers will meet with the Principal (grades 3-5) or AP (Grades K-2) and MTSS coach one on one to do a student by student analysis as another layer of monitoring of this process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

LaTanya Strickland (latanya.strickland@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 are implementing district approved, researched based interventions in both reading and math for tiers 2 and 3 across grade levels. We are setting clear timelines for progress monitoring for both tiers and determining a common progress monitoring tool (some are embedded in the resource). We have implemented use of district created data tools including graphs and comparison tools across grade levels and tiers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Upon reflection, we saw a need to further define intervention resources and progress monitoring to make sure we were consistently implementing researched based resources and collecting data at consistent intervals. This will allow us to continue to see the positive impact on foundational reading gaps and will begin impacting the need we see in vocab or comprehension needs and in math foundational gaps. It will also give us the data needed to adjust supports as we see growth or see students continuing to struggle in a timely manner.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

1. MTSS overview during preplanning

Person Responsible: LaTanya Strickland (latanya.strickland@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023

2. Request support from district MTSS to ensure alignment of approved resources to student need and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: LaTanya Strickland (latanya.strickland@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023

3. Monthly data meetings focused on MTSS facilitated by MTSS Coach.

Person Responsible: LaTanya Strickland (latanya.strickland@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023 and ongoing.

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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.

We have seen an increase for 50 to 108 students being absent more than 10% of the school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will decrease the students identified in this category by 75 students.

Monitoring:

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

We will identify the students that are a part of this group using EWS data. We will identify these students for their classroom teacher, our School Counselor, Dean, Registrar, and Social Worker who will meet monthly to identify progress on attendance for these targeted students, develop a plan for students showing a decline, and identify any new students showing a negative attendance pattern so they can be supported before reaching the 10% mark.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lois Dowridgeutomudo (lois.dowridgeutomudo@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.)

Students in this group will be included in our mentoring program. They will also be identified for our Parent Engagement Liaison so he can contact with families to communicate the importance of attendance and identify any supports the families may need in proactively addressing this area. Students who continue this pattern of behavior will receive support via the child study team in conjunction with their family.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Strong connections can be built through our mentoring program and that is linked to student sense of belonging which can impact attendance.

Parent Engagement in school is also closely tied to attendance and participation so engaging via the PEL and Child Study Team can help address hardships or barriers to attendance being experienced by families.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Identify students in EWI for attendance (10% or more truancy) for the 2022-2023 school year.

Person Responsible: Amanda Maxwell (amanda.maxwell@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

Invite students with EWI for attendance in grades 3-5 to join the mentoring program.

Person Responsible: Lois Dowridgeutomudo (lois.dowridgeutomudo@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

Social Worker and Parent Engagement Liaison work to connect with students with EWI for attendance in grades 1-2 and provide supports.

Person Responsible: Amanda Maxwell (amanda.maxwell@ocps.net)

By When: October 2023

Implement process to identify students at risk for EWI in attendance school wide. Students absent for 2 days receive contact from teacher. At 3 days without parent response, PEL and Registrar are notified so they can attempt to contact via text and phone call. At day 4 without parent contact initiate home visit.

Person Responsible: Amanda Maxwell (amanda.maxwell@ocps.net)

By When: Starting August 2023 and ongoing

Resiliency team bimonthly meeting will include identifying students at risk for truancy. The social worker will initiate child study team meetings by tracking attendance with registrar.

Person Responsible: Amanda Maxwell (amanda.maxwell@ocps.net)

By When: Starting August 2023 and ongoing

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).

We have two subgroups identified as TSI or CSI. We have added additional support positions to support in these areas including additional SLD teacher position and an third Bilingual Paraprofessional position. We have also added sub groups to all data tracking forms to support staff in identifying students, the supports they have in place, and keep track of progress throughout the year.

We will also provide additional after school or Saturday tutoring opportunities for these students starting in January as a part of mid year action planning based on data.

Admin and leadership team supports (Staffing Specialist and ESOL Compliance Specialist) will meet with each department monthly to specifically track progress and make revisions to support to ensure growth for included students.

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

For Grade 2, we will utilize the IES Practice Guide Recommendations which meet ESSA strong level of evidence requirements including the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade. We will focus on teaching students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

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

For Grade 3, we will utilize the IES Practice Guide Recommendations which meet ESSA strong level of evidence requirements including the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade. We will focus on teaching students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

For Grades 4 and 5, we will utilize the IES Practice Guide Recommendation meets ESSA strong level of evidence requirements including Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4-9 with a focus on:

- Build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words.
- Providing purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly.
- Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text. Including:
 - Build students' world and word knowledge so they can make sense of the text
 - Consistently provide students with opportunities to ask and answer questions to better understand the text they read
 - Teach students a routine for determining the gist of a short section of text
 - Teach students to monitor their comprehension as they read

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

For 2nd grade we will increase proficiency by 10% which will put us at 59% proficient.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

For 3-5th grade we will increase proficiency by 10% which will put 3rd grade at 53% proficient, 4th grade at 53% proficient, and 5th grade at 50% proficient.

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.

Weekly reading walkthroughs by administrators

Monthly data meetings by area including the MTSS Problem-Solving Teams and Cadre leadership to review FAST progress monitoring assessments, K-1 DIBELS progress monitoring data, SIPPS progress monitoring data and district-created standard based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Maxwell, Amanda, amanda.maxwell@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?

- Use of the foundational pieces of the daily slides
- Use of the comprehension pieces of the daily slides
- Heggerty within daily slides for K-2
- SIPPS to address foundational gaps during tier 2 intervention.
- Being a Reader Small Group Curriculum and multisensory kits to reinforce foundational reading instruction in grades K-3.
- Exact Path as a resource to support reading skills in grades K-5.

All resources and programs are evidenced based and align with the district reading plan and BEST ELA standards.

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?

All resources and programs are evidenced based and align with the district reading plan and BEST ELA standards.

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 Leadership- Monthly Literacy leadership team meetings, where data are analyzed and action steps implemented and monitored.	Strickland, LaTanya, latanya.strickland@ocps.net
Literacy Coaching Literacy coach attends district coach meetings. Coach uses data to identify personnel and areas of need. Implementation of coaching cycles, modeling, PLC planning support will be adapted to fit areas of need. Literacy coach is an active member of the MTSS problem-solving team.	Strickland, LaTanya, latanya.strickland@ocps.net
Use and analysis of: -FAST -Heggerty Assessments -District created Standards Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs) -District created Foundational Unit Assessments (Grades 2) -Being a Reader Formative Data (K-3) -SIPPS Formative Data (K-5) Use of data to determine interventions and support needs of students.	Maxwell, Amanda, amanda.maxwell@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 is available to all stakeholders at www.ocps.net/lakegem_es. It is also reviewed annually with our School Advisory Council and highlights (areas of focus) are shared via an electronic newsletter to all stakeholders.

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 review our areas of focus with families during our open house presentation. It is also made available to our school website and areas of focus are shared through our electronic newsletter. It is also reviewed annually with our School Advisory Council.

We have a calendar of monthly family engagement events, family nights, and educational/support sessions available to our parents. These are advertised via Talking Points, social media, in our electronic newsletter, and via flyers sent home with students.

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))

We will be providing opportunities for acceleration via our afterschool tutoring program 2 times per week beginning in September. We also provide Saturday tutoring opportunities to targeted students beginning in January.

Daily enrichment and intervention occurs within the school day and is based on individual needs seen in student data. This begins in August and is monitored and adjusted monthly based on data. This also helps inform our differentiation in the small group setting for both reading and math.

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))

N/A

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))

We have a Character Development and Resilience team that meeting biweekly to discuss student needs and implement or monitoring supports for progress. This team is facilitated by our School Counselor in collaboration with our Dean, Social Worker, School Psychologist, District Mental Health Counselor, and an Administrator.

We also have a monthly threat assessment meeting to specifically review progress of any student who have been identified as making a threat to self or others.

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 several initiatives to highlight postsecondary opportunities including weekly college spirit days, national Teach In, and field trips focused on STEAM and college visits for grade 5.

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).

My Dean oversees tier 1 behavior practices school wide with implementation of PBIS and restorative practices to teach desired behaviors. My School Counselor supports teachers with implementing SEL materials and practice to develop communicate and address tier 1 needs tied to social awareness and self regulation.

My Dean collaborates with my behavior specialist for tier 2 and 3 needs.

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))

- Weekly Data focused PLCs
- Vertical Alignment PDs Monthly K-5
- Teachers from each grade being sent to district IMPACT trainings, multisensory trainings, and Becoming a Reader
- District PD focused on ESE needs including TEAACH, Boardmaker, and CPI to support ESE teacher efficacy and retention.

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 implement a jumpstart to kindergarten program in summer. We also have 2 VPK classes on campus so half of our kindergarten students come to us already having the experience with school expectations and foundational skills.