

Orange County Public Schools

Lakemont Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Lakemont Elementary

901 N LAKEMONT AVE, Winter Park, FL 32792

<https://lakemontes.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
Fox, Karl	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, collaborative lesson planning and effective instructional practices and intervention -Manage school resources, including but not limited to facilities, budget, personnel, materials and supplies that are designed to support the areas of focus for school improvement -Oversee high-quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and student achievement to include the implementation of year three of Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership; with emphasis on the use of distributive leadership with social and emotional learning strategies and resources to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise -Provide teachers with the resources, professional development, and support needed to provide students with grade-level work in order to accelerate learning that is aligned with the Florida B.E.S.T. standards -Maintain communication with all stakeholder groups -Assist in data analysis to identify trends and challenges and to adjust instruction based on findings -Monitor the fidelity of Fundamental Basic Skills; ie. differentiated interventions -Support the growth of teacher leaders by providing leadership opportunities
Thompson, Emily	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provide professional development to teachers and staff regarding data management and its use to drive instruction -Collaborate with staff to ensure student needs are met and SIP areas of focus are addressed -Provide professional development on Florida B.E.S.T. Standards for ELA -Provides guidance with K-12 ELA Plan -Monitor common assessment data and make recommendations for modifying instruction through Professional Learning Communities -Provide professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regard to data-based instructional planning; Facilitate the Coaching Cycle as determined by teacher needs -Support the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP, as well as monitor the MTSS process to ensure students are receiving the appropriate interventions and support -Member of the Literacy Leadership Team
Stewart, Amanda	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Input Master Schedule into Skyward and update class and student rosters as needed -Provide professional development to teachers and staff regarding data management and use to drive instruction

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provide curriculum support through Professional Learning Communities in which leadership will work collaboratively with instructional coaches to facilitate common planning, disaggregate common assessment data to identify opportunities for support during small group instructions and interventions/enrichment -Ensure that the school-based team is implementing MTSS and addressing areas of focus in the SIP -Ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation -Ensure adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation -Communicate with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities -Monitor discipline and provide alternate strategies for behavioral interventions -Assist in data analysis to identify trends and challenges and to adjust instruction based on findings -Monitor the fidelity of Fundamental Basic Skills; ie. differentiated interventions -Support the growth of teacher leaders through leadership opportunities
Hennessey, Lauren	Curriculum Resource Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation -Monitor common assessment data assisting with data analysis and make recommendations for modifying instruction through Professional Learning Communities -Provide professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regard to data-based instructional planning -Implementation of state and district standardized assessments and standards-based unit assessments -Support the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address areas of focus identified in the SIP -Collaborate with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP -Provide professional development on the implementation of the Envision Math curriculum -Provide guidance with K-12 Math Plan -Facilitate Math Enrichment Program -Facilitate after-school tutoring and STEM program
Erhardt, Luke	Staffing Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Facilitate and support data collection activities -Monitor students with disabilities data as part of ESSA -Support the implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans that address goals identified in the SIP -Document interventions and provide follow-up to ensure student success -Collaborate with staff to ensure student needs are met based on areas of focus identified in the SIP

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Ensure practices are in place for the best practices in inclusive education -Provide professional development to support ESE compliance -Facilitate IEP and 504 meetings

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.

Each year, OCPs provides the opportunity for parents, teachers, staff, and students to provide feedback through the Panorama Survey. The information obtained through this process allows the school leadership team to then make decisions regarding school climate, school safety, professional development, and resources, as well as address barriers to engagement.

At the beginning of the school year, Panorama results are then shared with school teachers and staff to analyze trends. This year, a school-wide behavior plan is being implemented as a result of previous feedback. Members of school staff were identified and met to devise expectations for common areas, classrooms, arrival, and dismissal areas. A school-wide point system was developed to allow for consistency in recognizing students for positive behaviors.

During preplanning, the Behavior Team provided an overview to the school staff of the SPOTS program, which stands for show respect, positive attitude, organization, responsibility, and safe choices. Posters were made for each of the areas to what acceptable behaviors may look like in that area. Teachers were shown how to use the ClassDojo platform to track positive behaviors through a point system. They then created an incentive program for their classes. The Parent Teacher Organization provided funds for incentives to be provided as part of the program.

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))

Every nine weeks, grade-level data chats will occur in order to monitor progress in meeting the outcomes of the areas of focus. In addition, individual teachers will meet with the school leadership team in regard to individual student data to ensure appropriate interventions are in place if needed. As part of the MTSS process, these chats will allow members to determine if the specific targeted intervention is working, and if not then an intervention change may need to be made to ensure achievement gaps are being addressed. Through this explicit and systematic approach, individual student needs will be identified and addressed through a multi-tier approach.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	63%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	75%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) 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: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	2	27	28	24	29	16	0	0	0	126	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	5	
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	2	23	19	0	0	0	44	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	14	15	0	0	0	30	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	12	10	10	23	0	0	0	0	55	

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	9	6	8	24	14	0	0	0	61

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	3	26	18	26	16	19	0	0	0	108	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	3	1	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	18	15	0	0	0	43	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	10	25	0	0	0	43	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	8	10	17	0	0	0	35

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	1	0	0	0	1

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	3	26	18	26	16	19	0	0	0	108	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	3	1	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	18	15	0	0	0	43	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	10	25	0	0	0	43	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	8	10	17	0	0	0	35

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	1	0	0	0	1

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*	63	57	53	61	56	56	62		
ELA Learning Gains				69			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62			32		
Math Achievement*	64	60	59	62	46	50	59		
Math Learning Gains				55			56		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39			43		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	70	63	54	59	61	59	59		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	70	59	59	62			68		

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	334
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	469
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	4	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	57			
HSP	59			
MUL	81			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	60			

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	31	Yes	3	3
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	58			
MUL	84			
PAC				
WHT	62			
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	63			64			70					70
SWD	29			31			42				4	
ELL	26			33							3	70
AMI												
ASN	83			83							2	
BLK	58			60							3	
HSP	51			55			62				5	68
MUL	81			81							2	
PAC												
WHT	72			71			73				4	
FRL	54			54			59				5	71

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	61	69	62	62	55	39	59					62
SWD	24	50	36	26	40	23	15					
ELL	29	70	64	34	59	64	47					62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46	50		46	50		47					
HSP	54	68	63	55	57	43	58					62
MUL	78			89								
PAC												
WHT	70	75	71	70	55	27	66					
FRL	53	65	52	47	51	37	58					60

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	62	56	32	59	56	43	59					68
SWD	21	33	30	29	58	50	9					
ELL	32			36								68

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	86			86								
BLK	39	46		39	46		38					
HSP	56	59		50	52		52					67
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	70	56		71	62	33	69					
FRL	51	47	7	47	50	43	49					63

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	64%	54%	10%	54%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	60%	4%	58%	6%
03	2023 - Spring	59%	52%	7%	50%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	72%	59%	13%	59%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	62%	9%	61%	10%
05	2023 - Spring	54%	55%	-1%	55%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	66%	59%	7%	51%	15%

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.

Based on the 2022-2023 FAST ELA assessment, the ELL subgroup demonstrated the lowest performance. The unscrubbed data indicates that 6 out of 30 (20%) scored level 3 or above on the assessment. The scrubbed data shows that 4 out of 13 (31%) scored level 3 or above on the FAST ELA assessment. The contributing factors to the low performance are the number of ELL students demonstrating limited language acquisition as well as being limited English speakers. In reviewing the 2021-2022 FSA ELA unscrubbed data, 5 out of 27 (19%) scored level 3 or above on the assessment.

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

Based on the 2021-2022 FSA ELA, FSA math, and NGSSS science data to include overall proficiency, learning gains, and learning gains in the lowest 25%, Lakemont scored a total of 58 points (a grade of B). Based on the overall proficiency for FAST ELA, FAST math, and NGSSS science, as well as 3rd-grade ELA proficiency, Lakemont is projected to score a total of 68 points. All subgroups demonstrated gains.

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.

In reviewing the state gap comparison for Students with Disabilities and Students without Disabilities, the gap is 36 points. The gap comparison at Lakemont for Students with Disabilities and Students without Disabilities is 32 points. One of the factors that contribute to the gap between Students with Disabilities and Students w/o Disabilities is that Lakemont has four ASD units. Another factor is the lack of foundational skills that our Students with Disabilities have in ELA. This has been a trend at Lakemont as we were previously identified as a TSI school with ESSA for our Students with Disabilities subgroup. This gap has continued to close due to the support of the SLD teacher, the MTSS process, school-wide interventions, and specific targeted support within the classroom.

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

The 2022-2023 data component that demonstrated the most improvement from the 2021-2022 assessment was the black subgroup. The black subgroup made equal improvement (30%) in both ELA and Math, which was an increase from 32% to 62% in ELA and from 37% to 67% in Math. Lakemont implemented school-wide walk-in interventions for both ELA and Math last year during a designated block in the master schedule. In addition, two Tier I intervention teachers were provided as support through ESSER funding. Each of these intervention teachers had a content-specific focus during the designated intervention block, which allowed them to target the acquisition of foundational skills. In addition, Lakemont has continued to implement the Multi-Tiered System of Supports, which has allowed for specific data to be tracked and interventions to be adjusted based on individual student needs.

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

Based on the EWS data, Lakemont has two potential areas of concern. The first area of concern is the absenteeism of students with 10 or more days. In order to address this concern, parents first need to understand the correlation between student attendance and student achievement, which would also

address the second area of concern; the number of students with substantial reading deficiency. According to Florida Statute 1003.26, "the Florida Legislature has identified that poor academic performance is associated with nonattendance and that school districts must take an active role in promoting and enforcing attendance as a means of improving student performance." By working with the school social worker, school registrar, and classroom teacher, Lakemont will improve its Attendance Child Study Team protocols to identify trends for chronically absent students to ensure appropriate and achievable interventions are implemented, monitored, and adjusted if needed.

In order to address the number of students with substantial reading deficiency, Lakemont will continue to monitor students through the MTSS process. By monitoring the MTSS process, students will receive specific and targeted interventions based on the area of deficiency. Knowing that the MTSS process is a tiered approach to intervention, the first step will be to identify the gaps in Tier I instruction. Based on this data, interventions can be identified and addressed through the FBS block, which at Lakemont is implemented through a school-wide walk-to-intervention approach known as Leopard Learning Time. During this time, all classroom teachers and support staff utilize the SIPP's program, which is systematic instruction in phonological awareness, phonics, and sight words. This program utilizes five stages of intervention. The first is the beginning level, which addresses the simple alphabetic approach. The extension level addresses the spelling-pattern phase. The challenge level addresses the most complex, polysyllabic/morphemic phase. The SIPP's Plus addresses the simple alphabetic and spelling-pattern phases of foundational skills instruction and is uniquely designed for intervention instruction for students in grades 4–12. The Challenge Level addresses the most complex, polysyllabic stage of decoding.

This year, Lakemont will also implement Being a Reader. Research states that "When SIPP's is used as intervention alongside Being a Reader for Tier 1, the scopes and sequences and teaching routines of the respective programs align, providing a smooth transition for students moving between tiers." The MTSS coach will hold meetings with the teacher every six weeks to discuss student progress with the designated intervention. If an instructional/intervention change is needed, it will be data-based and a team decision.

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

As we enter the 2023-2024 school year, our focus will be directly connected to student achievement. The highest priorities for school improvement at Lakemont Elementary will include:

1. Focus on small group instruction to include centers and the teacher-led table
2. Student data tracking tools for students to set goals and monitor progress towards these goals
3. Professional Learning Communities and common planning to analyze, discuss, and plan standards-based instruction and individual student needs
4. Creating a positive learning environment through the implementation of a Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS) system, which will include the school-wide behavior plan
5. School-wide interventions for ELA and Math in conjunction with the MTSS process

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 Other**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.

Creating a positive culture and environment is one area of focus at Lakemont for the 2023-2024 school year. Based on the Panorama results from 2021-2022 and 2022-2023, school climate was an area of concern for both the student survey and faculty/staff survey. In 2021-2022, 53% of students shared a favorable rating of school climate, and in 2022-2023, 57% of students shared a favorable rating of school climate. This demonstrates a 4% increase. In 2021-2022, 55% of teachers and staff shared a favorable rating of school climate, and in 2022-2023, 76% of teachers and staff shared a favorable rating of school climate. This demonstrates a 21% increase.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on the implementation of a Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support program school-wide, Lakemont will see an increase of 10% in the favorable rating of the school climate on the 2023-2024 Panorama Survey. In addition, Lakemont will see an increase in the number of students who receive positive recognition through the ClassDojo app school-wide.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring of the Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support program school-wide will be accomplished through the data collection on the ClassDojo app. Students are awarded points based on specific targeted behaviors in the hallways, cafeteria, classrooms, arrival/dismissal areas, and special areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karl Fox (karl.fox@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.)

Lakemont will implement a Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports program called SPOTS. This program stands for Show Respect, Positive Attitude, Organized, Takes Responsibility, and Safe Choices. With a tiered PBIS system, we are able to create a climate with a shared vision for a positive school culture. Through the tiered approach, we are able to focus on universal (Tier I), targeted (Tier II), and intensive and individualized (Tier III) behavioral and academic growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lakemont is in need of a specific school-wide behavioral approach to raise awareness for students of the appropriate social, behavioral, and academic impact of one's actions on the school climate. By having a school-wide tier I system, all stakeholders are aware of and create consistency of school-wide expectations. This in turn should impact one's perception of the school climate and therefore decrease the number of discipline cases and referrals.

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.

Analyze positive behavioral data with the School Behavior Team

Person Responsible: Amanda Stewart (amanda.stewart@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing for the 2023-2024 school year

Implement school-wide incentives to recognize student milestones with the SPOTS program

Person Responsible: Amanda Stewart (amanda.stewart@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing for the 2023-2024 school year

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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 area of focus is to accelerate student performance by increasing teacher efficacy in the delivery of standards-based instruction. In reviewing the current data from the 2022-2023 FAST assessments, Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Hispanic subgroups are performing at 34% proficiency, 31% proficiency, and 55% proficiency in ELA and 32% proficiency, 23% proficiency, and 60% proficiency in math respectively.

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 standards-based instruction in both ELA and Math, Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Hispanic students will demonstrate a 10% increase in proficiency on the FAST ELA and math assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Knowledge and efficacy of Florida's BEST standards will be monitored through weekly Professional Learning Communities to ensure planning the whole group and small group are aligned to the K-12 Reading plan. In addition, small group instruction will be monitored through both informal and formal observations, as well as walkthrough trend data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karl Fox (karl.fox@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.)

Lakemont will implement school-wide interventions in both ELA and Math utilizing the SIPPS, which is a researched, evidence-based intervention program for ELA, and Number Worlds and SAAVAS for math.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These programs have been adopted by OCPS to support school-based intervention programs. Lakemont demonstrated a 10% increase from 58% to 68% on statewide assessments from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023.

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.

Provide common planning time for teams to collaborate and review resources available to them from various platforms to collectively plan standards-based lessons.

Person Responsible: Karl Fox (karl.fox@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing for the 2023-2024 school year

Conduct classroom walkthroughs, informal and formal observations with one area of focus being the implementation of standards-based instruction aligned to the Florida BEST standards.

Person Responsible: Karl Fox (karl.fox@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing for the 2023-2024 school year

Analyze formative assessment data and provide opportunities for remediation for students not achieving proficiency.

Person Responsible: Emily Thompson (emily.thompson@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing for the 2023-2024 school 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).

N/A

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

N/A

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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: Other				\$2,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24

	Student recognition	incentives	0561 - Lakemont Elementary	General Fund	600.0	\$2,500.00
			<i>Notes: Incentives for school-wide behavior support system</i>			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				\$20,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	Common Planning Days		0561 - Lakemont Elementary	Other	600.0	\$20,000.00
			<i>Notes: Common planning days for grade levels to work collaboratively with administrative team and grade level colleagues to plan standards-based instruction, create small group and teacher-led centers and plan standards based formative assessments.</i>			
Total:						\$22,500.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes