

Orange County Public Schools

Lakeview Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	14
III. Planning for Improvement	19
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	28
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Lakeview Middle

1200 W BAY ST, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<https://lakeviewms.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
Linehan, John	Principal	Whole school Operations: Budget Social Media SIP Marquee Website Athletics School Calendar SAFE SEL Magnet Program Media Center Clinic Room Assignments Digital Devices Campus Supervision including extracurricular/ evening activities Duty Roster ESE SAC/PTSO Math CTE PE
Innenfeld, Jackie	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule, School Improvement, FTE: Master Schedule SIP Grades and Grade Recovery Parent Academic Appeals Registration AP Coordinator FTE First Day Procedures Substitutes Calc Project Monitor School Grade components (Spreadsheet formula) Summer School 2024 Meet the Teacher/Open House Curriculum Guide STAT Member Campus Supervision including extracurricular/ evening activities Other duties assigned by principal Science Social Studies World Language
Young, Tara	Assistant Principal	Discipline, Facilities, School Improvement Plan, School Safety Plan: Discipline Facilities

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		SIP Facility Rentals Custodians STAT Member (Lead) ESOL Admin Faculty Handbook Attendance Textbooks Panorama Survey Inventory Safety Drills Summer School 2024 School Safety Plan Campus Supervision including extracurricular/ evening activities Other duties assigned by principal ELA Reading
Taylor, Brigitte	Dean	Discipline Discipline 7th & 8th A-L Code of Cond. Review Title IX Coord. SIP HERO Incentives Wednesday Detention Field trips Grade level assemblies Threat to others Discipline Reentry Meetings Vice-Chair STAT Campus Supervision including extracurricular/ evening activities Other duties assigned by principal
Borden, Seante	School Counselor	School Counselor - 7th & 8th A-L
Chambers, Gail	School Counselor	School Counselor - 6th & 8th M-Z 6th & 8th M-Z 504s Parent Conference 6th Grade Orientation Student of the Month EOY Ceremony Guidance Lessons Vision Screening Hearing Screening Scoliosis Screening SSD Contact SOAR Award STAT Member

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Campus Supervision Other duties assigned by principal
Salabarría, Sarah	Staffing Specialist	ESE Compliance ESE Compliance IEP Meeting EP Meetings ESOL Compliance ESE and ESOL Para Coord ESOL Award STAT Member Campus Supervision Other duties assigned by principal
Crosley, Rosemarie	Instructional Coach	Resource for ELA & SS Attend PLCs Tutoring Program Literacy Week College Volunteer Coord. Lead Mentor New Teacher Induction Interns Data Updates for ELA, Read, SS Campus Supervision Other duties assigned by principal
Oskin, Hilary	Instructional Media	Media Specialist Textbook Inventory Reading Incentive Program AR Coordinator PIE Coordinator Teach In Coordinator Promote Sunshine State Books Digital Device Fines Instructional Tech Support Media Center class schedule Media Center book ordering Maintain Media Collection Book Fair Electronic Newsletter
Ramos, Laurantette	Magnet Coordinator	Coordinator for World Language Academy and Dual Language Magnet
Waddell, Jennifer	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Curriculum Resource and Testing PD Calendar

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Inservice Pts Sky Captain CAS Lead All Testing Attend PLCs Data Updates for Science and Math Campus Supervision Other duties assigned by principal
Dhanraj, Omelia	Other	Safe Coordinator SEL Lead Quarterly SEL Lessons Quarterly RP Lesson Red Ribbon Week Mentoring Program Clubs Coordinator Food/clothing pantry Migrant Education Program Contact SEDNET Contact Threat to Suicide and Harm to Self Protocols and follow up re-entry meetings to create Student Mental Health Safety Plans Thanksgiving baskets Additions Coord. Campus Supervision Other duties assigned by principal
Belmarez, Michael	Dean	Discipline Discipline 6th & 8th M-Z Title IX Backup Discipline MTSS HERO Incentives Wednesday Detention SIP Transportation Facilities/Work Orders Grade level assemblies Threat to others Discipline Reentry Meetings STAT Member Campus Supervision including extracurricular/ evening activities Other duties assigned by principal

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 Advisory Council meets once a month. John Linehan, Principal will conduct the meetings with the committee. The School Advisory Council is composed of the principal and a balanced number of elected teachers, education support employees, students and parents, along with appointed business and community people, who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. The School Advisory Council (SAC) primary purpose is to assist the principal in developing a school improvement plan in order to help students achieve success. The efforts of SAC are always focused on improving student achievement. The SAC offers suggestions and ideas for changes to the proposed strategies and barriers listed in the SIP.

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))

SIP Monitoring—The SIP Plan will be monitored regularly for effectiveness and increasing student achievement by creating a data driven environment where by we will use school data to monitor the school improvement plan. Monitoring of the School improvement plan will include but is not limited to the following:

- FAST Progress Monitoring
- Classroom Walkthroughs
- Common Planning
- Common Planning Notes
- Standard Based Unit Assessments
- MTSS Process

Data will be shared and discussed with the leadership team on a monthly basis. The leadership team will look at proficiency, trends, strengths, and weaknesses of the data and make adjustments in classroom instruction and the school improvement plan to ensure 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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	74%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	86%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)

	Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	62	83	211
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	57	56	138
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	1	3	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	107	88	269
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	85	82	260
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	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level 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	0	0	0	0	0	77	96	97	270

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	2	0	4	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	82	80	222
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	42	40	92
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	7	6	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	1	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	83	70	224
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	107	268
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	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	100	84	254

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	82	80	222
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	42	40	92
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	7	6	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	1	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	83	70	224
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	107	201
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	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	100	84	254

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	48	48	49	45	49	50	51		
ELA Learning Gains				41			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30			35		
Math Achievement*	48	57	56	48	36	36	49		
Math Learning Gains				53			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			44		
Science Achievement*	57	53	49	37	55	53	46		
Social Studies Achievement*	68	64	68	70	61	58	57		
Middle School Acceleration	82	77	73	76	52	49	76		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	29	43	40	55	79	76	58		

* 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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	332
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	506
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	23	Yes	4	4
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	52			
HSP	53			
MUL	68			
PAC				

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%
WHT	68			
FRL	49			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	3	3
ELL	39	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	48			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	45			

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	48			48			57	68	82			29
SWD	13			13			25	41			4	
ELL	28			37			37	43	89		6	29
AMI												
ASN	79			75			82		83		4	
BLK	37			37			48	53	86		5	
HSP	44			47			52	64	80		6	29

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
MUL	70			65							2	
PAC												
WHT	58			52			63	83	83		5	
FRL	39			37			49	59	79		6	33

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	45	41	30	48	53	51	37	70	76			55
SWD	12	31	26	14	44	43	8	29				
ELL	21	30	27	26	48	52	17	40	73			55
AMI												
ASN	81	53		67	75				73			
BLK	32	29	26	36	45	40	21	66	68			
HSP	41	43	28	43	52	51	35	61	74			55
MUL	76	71		67	80							
PAC												
WHT	56	46	44	60	57	57	52	78	82			
FRL	36	33	29	38	47	44	20	65	79			58

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	48	35	49	40	44	46	57	76			58
SWD	9	22	21	11	35	39	15	8				
ELL	20	38	38	19	34	40	9	24				58
AMI												
ASN	61	57		75	23				70			
BLK	39	40	25	34	32	50	27	47	56			
HSP	46	48	40	45	42	40	43	49	72			57
MUL	77	75		57	38							
PAC				50	50							
WHT	63	53	32	64	48	44	63	70	85			

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
FRL	38	40	36	34	36	41	30	41	54			77

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
07	2023 - Spring	43%	45%	-2%	47%	-4%
08	2023 - Spring	53%	46%	7%	47%	6%
06	2023 - Spring	36%	44%	-8%	47%	-11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	45%	53%	-8%	54%	-9%
07	2023 - Spring	19%	38%	-19%	48%	-29%
08	2023 - Spring	49%	58%	-9%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	52%	50%	2%	44%	8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	47%	39%	50%	36%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	45%	46%	48%	43%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	61%	3%	66%	-2%

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.

The component with the lowest performance is the English Language Arts proficiency scores. English Language Arts improved proficiency by 1%. The previous year English Language Arts proficiency was 45%. The proficiency goal for the 22-23 school year was 48%. The proficiency of the school for English Language Arts was 46%. Contributing factors include strategies for Students with Disabilities and the English Language Learners not utilized daily in the classroom.

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

Civics declined by 3%. Contributing factors were the English Language Learners and Students With Disabilities students were on a decline the first semester. During the second semester we changed our instructional strategies to provide additional support to our English Language Learners students through our English Speakers of Other Languages Paraprofessional. The Students With Disabilities were receiving support through learning strategies class.

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.

English Language Arts had the greatest gap compared to the state average. Lakeview is 11% below the state average for ELA grades 6-8. Our Exceptional Student Education and English Language Learners students continue to struggle to meet proficiency.

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

Science and Mathematics are the two components that showed measurable improvement. Math had interventionists focused on small group tier 1 support. Interventionists also pushed in classrooms and did teacher-led small groups, and parallel teaching. Science teachers utilized Study Island in class and for review of instructional material.

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

1. Absenteeism
2. Level 1 students on statewide assessments

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

1. Decrease percent of Level 1 students in English Language Arts & Math
2. Decrease percent of Level 1 English Language Learners
3. Decrease percent of Level 1 Students With Disabilities

Area of Focus

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

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

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

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

At Lakeview Middle School, scheduling is arranged so that teachers of similar subjects and grade levels have common planning time for PLC, PLC Data Meetings and Department meetings. Positive relationships are modeled by the administrative team. Each week, a teacher passes "Lightning Bolt" to a colleague who has exemplified solid character and strength in supporting students and staff. New teachers and special recognition of teachers are featured in the school's newsletter. Professional development will be based on data of classroom observations by administrators and instructional coaches. New teachers are supported by a team, a department, and the CRT and/or instructional coach. Teachers are engaged in professional development through a professional learning community (PLC). Teachers with non education majors on temporary certification receive training through the district's Professional Development Certification Program (PDCP), and all teachers new to our school are paired with a veteran teacher for guidance and support. New strategies include the use of data to drive instruction with a focus on results. This will ensure instructional decisions are purposeful and deliberate. School based leadership team and instructional coaches are observing classes to monitor teaching to the level of rigor of the standard. Common planning time has been scheduled to allow time for collaboration on lessons. One content area expert will be assigned to each core academic PLC.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Assign Mentors to first and second year teachers at Lakeview Middle School that will assist as needed for ongoing, individual support and direction.

Increase the number of teachers who feel that our school is a positive environment by 25% using quarterly surveys (Panorama Survey, Thought Exchange and Google Form).

Monitoring:

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

Quarterly surveys to collect data on climate and culture.

PLC Meetings twice a week where teachers will discuss best practices and instructional strategies

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Linehan (john.linehan@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.)

Provide additional support for struggling teachers (classroom management, instructional strategies, best practices)

quarterly data for job satisfaction, retention, climate, and culture.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that when teachers have the necessary support and resources there are better retention rates. Teachers with the same subject and/or grade levels can collaborate and discuss their ideas and instructional practices during the monthly new teacher meeting. Research also shows that schools that have set a shared vision and goals have a more positive climate and culture. These visions and goals allow the whole school community to take ownership of the school's vision and 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 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.

Mentoring and Induction program to improve teacher effectiveness and retention. Pairing a new teacher with a more experienced teacher to be oriented to the school and provide them with ongoing guidance and support.

Person Responsible: Rosemarie Crosley (rosemarie.crosley@ocps.net)

By When: Bi-weekly check-ins with new teachers and mentors throughout the year.

Establish and maintain a Vision and focus on a core set of goals.

Person Responsible: John Linehan (john.linehan@ocps.net)

By When: The vision and goals will be addressed at monthly staff meetings

Questionnaires that will be used for gathering teacher feedback on the climate and culture of the school.

Person Responsible: Tara Young (tara.young@ocps.net)

By When: Questionnaires will be conducted monthly to collect evidence of the schools climate and culture.

The administrators and resource teachers will attend PLCs to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in each department.

Person Responsible: John Linehan (john.linehan@ocps.net)

By When: Leadership will attend weekly PLC meetings to collaborate with each department.

#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.

In analyzing the 2023 ESSA data, ELL students showed a 39% federal index which is below the 41% minimum federal index.

Measurable Outcome:

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

To increase ELL student proficiency by at least three percent from 39% to achieve a federal index rating of 42% or above.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly data meetings will be held, as needed, with the leadership team members to discuss areas of improvement and the necessary support for teachers. An intensive focus will be on English Language Learners.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Linehan (john.linehan@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.)

Teachers will use cooperative learning groups in the classroom while using as many mediums as possible to convey information.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lakeview services a growing population of English Language Learners. Cooperative learning groups provide language support for ELL students in small group setting. Students are strategically placed in groups allowing teachers to focus on providing visuals and other print-rich materials to the individual students.

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.

Students will be scheduled with core content teachers and the ESOL Paraprofessional who can support the native language during instruction.

Person Responsible: Jackie Ihnenfeld (jacquelyn.ihnenfeld@ocps.net)

By When: Scheduling will be done at the beginning of the year and revised as needed.

ESOL strategies, including cooperative learning groups, will be shared with the staff during preplanning and throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Sarah Salabarria (sarah.salabarria@ocps.net)

By When: During preplanning and PLCs throughout the year

The leadership team will attend PLCs and support the teachers with data analysis and materials needed.

Person Responsible: Rosemarie Crosley (rosemarie.crosley@ocps.net)

By When: Information will be shared with the staff during preplanning, and PLC meetings throughout the year.

The leadership team will conduct weekly walk-throughs to monitor teachers' use of cooperative learning strategies.

Person Responsible: Tara Young (tara.young@ocps.net)

By When: Walk-throughs will be conducted weekly throughout the year

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

ELA learning gains showed a decrease. The ELA learning gains if the lowest 25% decreased by five points from the previous assessment. Much of the decline was caused by the very low scores of our Students with Disabilities registering proficiency at 12%

Measurable Outcome:

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

To increase ELA learning gains by at least 10% from 41% to 51% and increase the ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% by 10% from 30% to 40%. Specifically, increasing SWD scores from 12% to 20%

Monitoring:

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

Weekly data meetings, as needed, will be held with leadership team members to discuss areas of improvement and the necessary support for teachers. There will be an intense focus on Students with Disabilities data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Linehan (john.linehan@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.)

Differentiated instruction through the rotational model will be utilized to minimize learning gaps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lakeview services a diverse population of students with a variety of needs. Differentiating instruction will allow the classroom teacher to meet the needs of all students.

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.

Students will be scheduled into the appropriate classes (learning strategies) for extra support. Also, the ELA teacher will work with small groups in their classes to ensure the students' success.

Person Responsible: Jackie Ihnenfeld (jacquelyn.ihnenfeld@ocps.net)

By When: Scheduling will be done at the beginning of the year and revised as needed.

Leadership team members will attend PLCs to support the teachers with data analysis and differentiating lessons based on the data. Teachers will input their data into a template which is divided into ESSA groups. When the teachers meet for their PLCs, the data will be discussed and small groups will be

determined using the data. Leadership team members will conduct weekly walk-throughs to monitor teachers' implementation of differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Rosemarie Crosley (rosemarie.crosley@ocps.net)

By When: Information will be shared with the staff during preplanning, and PLC meetings throughout the year. Walk-throughs will be conducted weekly throughout the year

Best practices for inclusive education will be shared with staff during preplanning and continued throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Sarah Salabarria (sarah.salabarria@ocps.net)

By When: Information will be shared with the staff during preplanning, and PLC meetings throughout the year.

#4. 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.

In analyzing the ESSA data, Black/African American students showed a 40% federal index which is below the 41% minimum federal index.

Measurable Outcome:

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

To increase the Black/African American student proficiency by at least four percent from 40% to achieve a federal index rating of 44% or above.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly data meetings will be held, as needed, with leadership team members to discuss areas of improvement and the necessary support for teachers. An intensive focus will be on Black/African American students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Linehan (john.linehan@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.)

Teachers will use cooperative learning groups, differentiated instruction through rotational models in the classroom while using as many mediums as possible to convey information and minimize learning gaps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lakeview has implemented PLC lesson planning meetings to ensure that there is a focus on the planning, and instruction of the standards.

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.

The leadership team will routinely monitor student data for evidence of effectiveness in rigorous standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible: John Linehan (john.linehan@ocps.net)

By When: Information will be shared with the staff during PLC meetings throughout the year. Walk-throughs will be conducted weekly throughout the year to monitor instruction.

Professional development to increase understanding of how to track and analyze student data.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Waddell (jennifer.waddell@ocps.net)

By When: Professional Development on Student data will be administered after progress monitoring testing and will continue to be addressed in PLCs throughout the year with formative and summative assessments as well.

Communicate with parents, students, and staff through connect orange, email, talking points, social media, and posting to the school website.

Person Responsible: Jackie Ihnenfeld (jacquelyn.ihnenfeld@ocps.net)

By When: Information will be shared with the parents, students, and staff during PLC meetings, staff meeting and various media channels throughout the year.

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).

Based on data from the 2022-2023 school year, our English Language Learners and Exceptional Student Education students continue to perform below 41%. During the budget allocation process, funds were allocated to hire personnel specializing in ESE interventions. Additionally, funds were allocated for an additional English Language Learner para to help support English Language Learner students. While no school improvement funding was allocated, adjustments were made to campus personnel and hiring to ensure these areas of need were adequately funded to support students.