Lake George Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lake George Elementary

4101 GATLIN AVE, Orlando, FL 32812

https://lakewhitneyes.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
Watson, Lauren	Principal	The Principal leads the teachers and staff. She ensures the mission and vision of the school are communicated to all, sets the expectations for parents, students, and staff, and works to achieve high student learning outcomes through collaboration. Leadership Team meetings are facilitated by the Principal to discuss issues impacting the school. The Principal collaborates with instructional coaches and grade-level teams to monitor student progress and to plan for data-driven, standards-aligned, instruction. Walkthroughs are conducted to monitor for implementation and feedback is promptly provided. The Principal engages stakeholders through frequent communication. Community members and parents are encouraged to volunteer and participate in everyday school functions. Stakeholders are canvassed before decisions. They are aware that their feedback is encouraged and valued.
Dottavio, Carmen	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal collaborates with the instructional coach and resource team to identify and monitor instructional practices across campus. Weekly, she collaborates with teams during PLCs to ensure instruction is aligned with the B.E.S.T. standards and is data-driven. Classroom walkthroughs are conducted and actionable feedback is provided to individual teachers. The Assistant Principal monitors student progress and makes recommendations for instructional changes. The Assistant Principal works with small groups targeting students performing in the Bottom 30% for math and serves as the tutoring coordinator.
Abalo, Yaniret	Instructional Media	The Media Specialist maintains the media center as the hub of the school. She offers teachers support with AR. She assists teachers with understanding and navigating the program and helps to establish goals for students to work towards within the program. She coordinates the celebration of students reaching their goals. The Media Specialist sponsors the morning news crew and coordinates events such as the Spelling Bee, Teach-In, the Book Fair, Literacy Week, Battle of the Books, and several other events. In addition to teaching lessons to Kindergarten and First-grade classes, she also pulls groups for Fundamental Basic Skills. The Media Specialist also maintains the school website.
Ipina, Jennifer	ELL Compliance Specialist	The ECS is in charge of maintaining an efficient system of staffing and monitoring for all ESOL students and provides guidance for improving instruction for English Language Learners through the implementation of ELL accommodations and strategies.
Tarantola, Stacy	Staffing Specialist	As the Staffing Specialist/504 Designee, Ms. Tarantola coordinates ESE and 504 meetings and communicates with teachers, evaluators, parents, and staff. The Staffing Specialist runs and documents ESE and 504 meetings, organizes and checks ESE packets, and files in the student cumulative folders. She helps to ensure policy and procedures are followed, providing teachers with information on documenting services, and accommodations. She provides parents with information regarding FAPE and enters and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		updates IEP/504 information on Skyward. The Staffing Specialist provides information to the district regarding student services, and evaluations and works with district ESE staff to request ESE support. She helps to gather information to ensure ESE students are receiving appropriate ESE services, makes transportation requests, and communicates with the transportation department. The Staffing Specialist organizes the ESY roster and communicates with teachers and parents as well as organizes ESE transition services.
Perdomo, Yenisei	Other	As the Intervention Specialist, Ms. Perdomo monitors the implementation and effectiveness of school-wide tiered interventions. She meets biweekly with PLCs to review the effectiveness of core instruction by analyzing data from formative assessments. The Intervention Specialist conducts Tier III interventions. As the MTSS Coach, she guides the classroom teachers to gather all data needed and track and monitor the data. She is also responsible for presenting Tier 2 and Tier 3 data as part of the staffing or non-qualifying process for ESE.
Montijo, Melissa	Dean	The Dean offers support in the area of behavior. She collaborates with the guidance counselor, the behavior specialist, and individual teachers as well as grade-level teams to implement positive behavior support systems.
Thomas, Nichelle	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT) collaborates with 3rd-5th grade level teams and individual teachers to monitor student progress and make recommendations for instructional changes. She attends weekly PLCs for grades 3-5 and assists them with understanding and implementing the B.E.S.T standards. The CRT also serves as the testing coordinator and as a support to the science lab instructor. She manages textbook inventory and provides Tier II and Tier III services to third through fifth-grade students.
Strubbe, Aida	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach works closely with new teachers. She collaborates with the primary grade level teams and individual teachers to monitor student progress and make recommendations for instructional changes. The instructional coach attends weekly PLCs for grades K-2 and assists them with understanding and implementing the B.E.S.T. Standards. She is in charge of our bookroom, the Read to Success Program, and Kindergarten Round-Up. The Instructional Coach also pulls groups for Fundamental Basic Skills.
Holmes, Michael	Behavior Specialist	The Behavior Specialist focuses on Tier III behavior supports for students in our Emotionally and Behaviorally Disabled Unit (EBD). He collaborates with the Dean to provide behavioral support to general education teachers as well. The Behavior Specialist also assists in transitioning students from the EBD Unit into their general education classroom. He creates and implements behavior plans, tracking and graphing behavioral data.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Velez, Janiene	School Counselor	The guidance counselor collaborates with the Behavior Specialist, Dean, and Intervention Specialist, to support scholars with behaviors as well as academics. She works closely with teachers by providing them guidance and support on effective strategies and interventions they can implement to support their scholars. She also monitors students who are eligible for services through the McKinney Vento Program (MVP) and provides resources or support to families identified as homeless. The Guidance Counselor conducts groups, provides SEL lessons and resources, mentors students, and is in charge of Character Education activities.

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 reviews the School improvement Plan components. Schoolwide data is reviewed in addition to our areas of focus. At the beginning of the year staff meeting, the areas of focus are shared with teachers. Teachers are always given the opportunity to provide input regarding strategies for improvement when it comes to school culture and climate as the Principal and Assistant Principal maintain an "Open Door" policy. Professional Learning Communities (PLC) meet weekly and discuss strategies for growth and improvement for our Students with Disabilities (SWD) as they often fall into the category of PLC question number three (What will we do when they do not get it?). Parents and families are given the opportunity to provide feedback when the plan is presented at SAC and PTA meetings.

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 leadership team will engage in a cycle of continuous improvement as we meet once a month to discuss the goals in our SIP and the progress made. The progress of our Students with Disabilities (SWD) will be reviewed during once-a-month data meetings and again during Intervention meetings. Teachers will engage in data chats with our SWD prior to each progress monitoring administration and after reading and math common assessments. The Support Facilitation teacher will collaborate with the classroom teachers as well as the SWDs to reflect on progress and come up with the next steps for continuous improvement.

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	82%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	4	22	14	13	18	15	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	5	3	2	0	0	0	11
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	0	24	28	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	30	0	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	22	19	24	0	0	0	0	72

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	4	5	8	27	24	0	0	0	68

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	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	9	29	21	19	13	24	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	4	10	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	18	25	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	9	22	0	0	0	34
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	1	2	4	13	20	0	0	0	40

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	9	29	21	19	13	24	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	4	10	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	18	25	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	9	22	0	0	0	34
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	1	2	4	13	20	0	0	0	40

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*	52	57	53	53	56	56	51		
ELA Learning Gains				49			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			57		
Math Achievement*	57	60	59	65	46	50	56		
Math Learning Gains				66			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				72			43		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	55	63	54	43	61	59	38		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	73	59	59	70			63		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	286
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	460
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97
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	28	Yes	4	1
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	2	
HSP	57			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	50			

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	40	Yes	3	
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	59			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	53			

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	52			57			55					73
SWD	17			25			40				5	50
ELL	52			52			50				5	73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			51			40				4	
HSP	57			54			51				5	70
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	54			67			73				4	
FRL	43			50			44				5	72

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	53	49	42	65	66	72	43					70
SWD	11	35	45	24	54	85	5					57
ELL	46	55	44	63	66	72	40					70
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	37	30	49	56		31					
HSP	56	53	50	65	63	73	44					70
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	51	46		76	77		46					
FRL	44	48	50	56	60	69	30					63

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	51	43	57	56	36	43	38					63
SWD	11	31		24	33							33
ELL	40	40		49	33		20					63

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	37	18		45	18		30					
HSP	47	37		51	37		23					62
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	71			74			70					
FRL	44	37	50	48	30	46	29					62

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	52%	54%	-2%	54%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	60%	-12%	58%	-10%
03	2023 - Spring	42%	52%	-10%	50%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	65%	59%	6%	59%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	62%	-18%	61%	-17%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	55%	-9%	55%	-9%

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.

When comparing reading and math, the data component with the lowest performance was reading. While our reading scores showed a slight improvement (2%) compared to last year, only 55% of scholars were able to score proficient or higher, while 58% of scholars scored proficient or higher in math. This correlates to common assessment data in grades three through five. The overall average for ELA common assessments for the year was less than 56% in each fifth-grade class. In fourth grade, the overall average was less than 45%, while in 3rd grade, the overall average was less than 60%. This could be attributed to brand new teachers being hired later in the year in fourth and fifth grade and inconsistencies in Tier 1 instruction. Another contributing factor could have been the low attendance rates for after-school tutoring.

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

The data component with the greatest decline was math. Overall, math had a 9-point decrease. With the exception of third-grade, math common assessment data showed that fourth and fifth-grade scholars struggled to demonstrate proficiency, with average common assessment scores failing to surpass 50%. Again, hiring two brand new teachers later in the year could be attributed to this. Also, the lunch support group that was offered five days a week for third-fifth graders had to be reduced to two times a week because of scheduling conflicts.

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.

When compared to the state average, the data component with the greatest gap compared to the state average was science with an 11% gap, followed by reading with a 7% gap (unscrubbed data). This correlates with low reading scores for fifth grade.

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

Science showed the greatest improvement, with an 11% increase in proficiency (scrubbed data). This can be attributed to the implementation of a Science Lab for our scholars in third through fifth grade. Every week, each class went to the science lab where they engaged in hands-on inquiry specifically related to the topics and units they were working on in class.

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

One area of concern is the amount of students we have with two or more indicators in fourth and fifth grade. Another area of concern is the amount of students who were absent 10% or more days. This is almost a quarter of our population.

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

1. ELA Tier 1 instruction in grades K-2 (ensuring foundational skills are mastered).
2. Math Tier one instruction in 4th and 5th grade.

3. Math Tier one instruction in 1st and 2nd grade.
4. Increasing student achievement in our SWD.
5. Continuing to improve our school culture and community.

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 Attendance

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.

Lake George prides itself on cultivating a positive school culture and climate. The need for the school to have a positive culture and environment is a priority which reflects a high degree of collective teacher efficacy, and the belief that all students can be successful and learn. Establishing relationships and promoting positive peer relationships will give teachers the opportunity to connect on a personal level and build collective teacher efficacy. This culture will be reinforced with evidence of high expectations demonstrated in every classroom. Both student and teacher attendance data reflect areas that need improvement. By addressing this area of focus, teacher attendance will improve, thereby increasing student achievement.

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

As a result of focusing on maintaining a positive school culture, we will show a six percent increase in the area of school climate on the Panorama Ed Survey. Currently, our percentage favorable in regards to the perception of the overall social and learning climate of the school is at 84%, which is a 28% increase from the previous year.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through teacher attendance, stakeholder surveys, and teacher participation in after-school events. Classroom walkthroughs will also be utilized as a form of monitoring, with a focus on evidence of positive school culture and high expectations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Watson (lauren.limoncelliwatson@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.)

Through the implementation of resources from the Panorama Ed playbook, the administration will be able to improve teacher attendance and the perception of our school culture and climate.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By implementing this strategy we will be able to meet the goal of creating a learning environment where high expectations are set and reflected in every classroom, and a positive school-wide culture is built.

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.

Professional development will be provided to teachers focusing on cultivating a safe and positive classroom environment where students can thrive. Teachers will be provided resources to create Safe SPOTS in their classrooms and allotted time each morning, to hold family meetings. To cultivate a positive culture and environment among staff, events will be planned throughout the year to take the time to celebrate the staff.

Person Responsible: Janiene Velez (janiene.velez@ocps.net)

By When: 08/03/23

#2. 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.

The gap between Students with Disabilities (SWD) and their non-disabled peers continues to widen. Based on FAST data, Students with Disabilities performed below the 41% Federal Index threshold with a level of 40%. This subgroup has performed below the threshold the the past three years. In comparison, in the previous school year, only 11% of Students with Disabilities scored proficient in ELA. In math, 54% of Students with Disabilities scored proficient with 85% of the subgroup making a learning gain. ELA continues to be an area of focus as growth for this subject has been minimal compared to math.

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

Students with Disabilities in grades three through five will demonstrate an increase of 20 percentage points from FAST PM 1 to FAST PM 3 in reading and math.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through weekly classroom walkthrough data. Evaluative and non-evaluative instructional practice observational data will also be used. Quantitative data from students such as Progress Monitoring Data and Standards-Based Unit Assessment Data along with data chats with students will also be used to monitor for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carmen Dottavio (carmen.dottavio@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.)

The Evidence-based intervention we will be using is Exact Path. In order to increase proficiency for our students with disabilities, the resource team will collaborate with classroom teachers to Intentionally plan, implement, and monitor, Tier I instruction for reading in grades three through five. We will teach non-readers in grades three through five to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. We will utilize the item analysis report to determine the greatest deficits based on benchmarks, have data-driven discussions within PLCs, and analyze instructional practices by providing coaching cycles for identified teachers with consistent monitoring and feedback across grade levels. Teachers will be provided opportunities during PLCs to adjust their instruction to improve student learning, plan for misconceptions, and enhance instructional decision-making. The instructional coach will work with teachers to incorporate benchmark-aligned small group instruction, including comprehension and foundational skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

There is strong evidence to support teaching students to decode, analyze word parts, and practice fluency builds strong foundations and supports them in becoming fluent readers. Teachers will engage in a continuous cycle of improvement. When teachers intentionally plan and analyze instructional practices, student proficiency will increase. Data will be used from common assessments to drive small-group instruction.

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.

-Planning: Common planning, have data meetings after each ELA SBUA is given to analyze data and explain best practices for instruction (whole/small group).
-Provide teacher feedback: Meaningful and actionable feedback on a continuous basis.
- Provide teachers with additional resources to support our SWD.

Person Responsible: Carmen Dottavio (carmen.dottavio@ocps.net)

By When: This will occur after each common assessment is given in ELA for grades K-5 throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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.

Out of 46 students in the Black/African American subgroup in grades three through five, 11 students are in the bottom 25% for reading and math. Historically, this subgroup does not fall below the 41% threshold for the Federal Index, but this year, they fell short by one percent. Out of the 138 students who scored a Level 3, 4, or 5 on the PM3 for ELA only 9 students were in the Black/African American subgroup and only 12 scored a Level 3, 4, or 5, on the PM3 for math. When compared to the ELL and Hispanic subgroups, the Black/African American subgroup is underperforming.

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

The gap between the learning gains of our students in the Black/African American subgroup and their white peers will be reduced by 3%. The number of Level 2 and 3 discipline referrals generated by our 3rd-5th grade students in this subgroup, will reduce by 5% when compared to last year's data.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through weekly classroom walkthrough data. Evaluative and non-evaluative instructional practice observational data will also be used. Quantitative data from students such as Progress Monitoring Data and Standards-Based Unit Assessment Data along with data chats with students will also be used to monitor for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carmen Dottavio (carmen.dottavio@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.)

The Evidence-based intervention we will be using is Exact Path. In addition, we will provide professional development on how to embed culturally responsive instruction into daily lessons. Training teachers on school-wide behavior expectations and building relationships will help teachers become more effective.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

There is strong evidence to support teaching students to decode, analyze word parts, and practice fluency builds strong foundations and supports them in becoming fluent readers. Teachers will engage in a continuous cycle of improvement. When teachers intentionally plan and analyze instructional practices, student proficiency will increase. Data will be used from common assessments to drive small-group instruction. Furthermore, while our school population is very diverse, the staff is not as diverse. Embedding culturally responsive instruction into lessons will help teachers and students build empathy, understand differences, and further build positive relationships. This will increase cognitive engagement, decrease behaviors, and ultimately, improve 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.

Monthly professional development will provided on classroom management strategies that boost engagement with a focus on the importance of building relationships with students. Professional development will be provided by the dean and guidance counselor. Our instructional coach will provide professional development on embedding Exact Path and culturally responsive instruction into subject areas, during common planning meetings.

Person Responsible: Melissa Montijo (melissa.montijo@ocps.net)

By When: This will occur on a monthly basis beginning August 9th.

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).

The Principal and Assistant Principal review the budget items pertaining to school improvement needs. Some of these items include teaching positions and resources purchased for intervention and tutoring.

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

Literacy Instruction is our Area of Focus for grades two through four. More than 50% of students in second-grade levels scored below the 40th percentile on the STAR Reading. To improve achievement, coaches and teachers will collaborate to plan and implement lessons that address decoding words, analyzing word parts, and writing and recognizing words in second grade and third grade.

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

More than 50% of students in third and fourth-grade levels scored below a Level 3 on the FAST ELA. For third and fourth graders, lessons will address building students' decoding skills so they can read complex, multisyllabic words. Teachers will provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read with ease. Comprehension-building practices will be implemented to help students make sense of the text. This will be done by building students' word and world knowledge so they can make sense of the text by consistently providing students opportunities to ask and answer questions to better understand the text they read. Students will be taught a routine for determining the gist of a short section of text.

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

After implementing evidence-based instructional practices, the number of students in second grade scoring below the 40th percentile on the STAR Reading Assessment will decrease from 52% to 40%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

After implementing evidence-based instructional practices, the number of students scoring a Level 3 or higher in third grade will increase from 46% to 56%. The number of fourth graders scoring a Level 3 or higher will increase from 50% to 60%.

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.

The area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome through weekly reading walkthroughs done by administrators and the instructional coach. Monthly data meetings will occur to review progress monitoring data, SIPPS progress monitoring data, DIBELS progress monitoring data, and common assessment data.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Strubbe, Aida, aida.strubbe@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?

For second and third grade, students will be taught to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. They will make connections between the segments of sound in speech and how they link to letters. For fourth-grade students, lessons will address building students' decoding skills so they can read complex, multisyllabic words. Teachers will provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read with ease. Comprehension-building practices will be implemented to help students make sense of the text. This will be done by building students' word and world knowledge so they can make sense of the text by consistently providing students opportunities to ask and answer questions to better understand the text they read. Students will be taught a routine for determining the gist of a short section of text. Teachers will utilize, Heggerty, SIPPS, OCPS Multisensory Kits, Being a Reader Small Group Curriculum, and Exact Path.

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?

Teaching students to recognize letter patterns and word parts will help them to read increasingly complex words along with decoding. This will increase fluency, accuracy, and comprehension. These resources also help to build students' decoding skills so they can read complex multisyllabic words and provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly. Moreover, the use of these programs routinely uses a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text and develop an awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters.

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 The team will meet monthly to analyze data and action steps implemented and monitored.	Watson, Lauren, lauren.limoncelliwatson@ocps.net
Literacy Coaching The Instructional Coach will attend district coach meetings. The coach will use data to identify personnel and areas of need. The administration will monitor the implementation of coaching cycles, modeling, PLC planning, and support areas of need. The MTSS team will include the Instructional Coach.	Strubbe, Aida, aida.strubbe@ocps.net
Assessment Use and analysis of the following data to determine interventions and support needs of students: FAST, Heggerty Assessments, SBUAs, district-created Foundational Unit Assessments for 2nd grade, DIBELS (K-1), Being a Reader Formative Data (K-3), SIPPS Formative Data (K-5).	Dottavio, Carmen, carmen.dottavio@ocps.net
Professional Learning Lake George will develop a professional learning plan based on the needs of our students. This plan will include specific support for teachers based on progress monitoring data. The district provides PD options that include the Instructional Literacy Institute, coaches' meetings, K-5 ELA Impact Series, Being a Reader PD, SIPPS PD, and Making Sense of Multisensory Instruction PD.	Thomas, Nichelle, nichelle.thomas@ocps.net

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 Attendance**	$0.00
2	III.B.	**Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**	$0.00
3	III.B.	**Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**

Budget Approval

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

No