

Seminole County Public Schools

# Lake Orienta Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

# Lake Orienta Elementary School

612 NEWPORT AVE, Altamonte Springs, FL 32701

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0601>

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/24/2023.

## 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.**

The mission of Seminole County Public Schools is to ensure that all students acquire the knowledge, skills and attitudes to be productive citizens. The mission of Lake Orienta is to create a learning environment focused on the whole-student, which encourages autonomy, perseverance, and confidence through productive struggle with the support of families and the community.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

The vision of Lake Orienta Elementary is to create productive life-long learners who value achievement and are responsible for their own success.

### 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
Peacock, Christine	Principal	Maintain the operations of the school by ensuring the students and staff are learning and collaborating in a safe and positive environment.
Yaros, Meagan	Assistant Principal	Maintain the operations of the school by ensuring the students and staff are learning and collaborating in a safe and positive environment.
Boring, Denise	Administrative Support	Support overall school operations while overseeing the implementation of Lake Orienta's PBIS, discipline and Title 1 plans.
Harrell, Toni	Instructional Coach	Oversee reading, literacy and overall instruction for K-2nd grades, provide instructional support for teachers, manage MTSS and subsequent intervention for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.
DeBonville, Mary	Instructional Coach	Oversee reading, literacy and overall instruction for 3rd-5th grades, provide instructional support for teachers, manage MTSS and subsequent intervention for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.
Johansson, Kristina	School Counselor	Facilitate weekly student study meetings and 504 meetings to discuss students' academic, behavioral and social-emotional needs.
Nunez, Linda	Attendance/Social Work	Oversee FIN (Families in Need), truancy and social emotional supports for students, while supporting teachers with social-emotional learning (SEL) within the classroom.
Pagan, Antonio	Behavior Specialist	Provide in class, one on one, small group and behavioral interventions for students.

### 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.

Lake Orienta Elementary School reviewed feedback from parents and other stakeholders on the Spring 2023 SnapShot Survey. Ideas for monitoring student safety, student achievement, and student engagement were considered when developing this plan. We created a committee to review the school's mission, vision and action items in this plan. The committee consists of parents, teachers and members of our leadership team.

**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))

After each progress monitoring, data will be shared and analyzed by all stakeholders. We will utilize the data findings to make instructional shifts for remediation and acceleration aligned with the SIP.

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	73%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	76%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	38	28	17	30	19	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	3	3	2	0	0	0	13
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	8	8	1	2	2	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	1	7	4	4	8	1	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	26	25	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	28	23	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	12	21	20	18	20	0	0	0	92

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	1	13	18	14	31	27	0	0	0	104

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	1	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	2	10	12	2	0	1	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	1	8	9	4	3	1	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	10	22	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	18	21	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	9	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	6	9	8	6	3	0	0	0	32

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	6	6	14	4	2	0	0	0	33
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	2	10	12	2	0	1	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	1	8	9	4	3	1	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	10	22	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	18	21	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	9	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	40

**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	6	9	8	6	3	0	0	0	32

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	6	6	14	4	2	0	0	0	33
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*	48	61	53	53	65	56	52		
ELA Learning Gains				60			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			45		
Math Achievement*	49	64	59	62	46	50	51		
Math Learning Gains				59			26		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			25		
Science Achievement*	42	65	54	55	65	59	43		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	60	77	59	69			71		

\* 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	250
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	468
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	20	Yes	4	1
ELL	34	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	42			
MUL	38	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	41			

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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	57			

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%
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	72			
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	48			49			42					60
SWD	14			24			13				5	43
ELL	27			36			17				5	60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42			31			18				4	
HSP	38			41			28				5	59
MUL	38			38							2	
PAC												
WHT	70			76			74				4	
FRL	38			38			28				5	59

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	60	51	62	59	59	55					69
SWD	22	46	37	34	45	38	33					
ELL	44	48	30	49	52							69
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	40	56	58	43	41	47	31					
HSP	49	53	41	61	58	65	57					73
MUL	62			69								
PAC												
WHT	68	71		77	70		73					
FRL	43	55	53	51	54	54	47					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
All Students	52	44	45	51	26	25	43					71
SWD	25	43	54	26	24	21	25					45
ELL	35			42								71
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	36	50	30	18		25					
HSP	52	42		48	16		35					75
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	76	67		77	56		81					
FRL	43	40	44	41	25	29	39					66

**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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	38%	61%	-23%	54%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	66%	-9%	58%	-1%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	47%	60%	-13%	50%	-3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	66%	34%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	49%	66%	-17%	59%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	54%	68%	-14%	61%	-7%
05	2023 - Spring	17%	44%	-27%	55%	-38%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	40%	64%	-24%	51%	-11%

### 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 progress monitoring and state assessments the area for greatest improvement are our SLD and ELL students.

There were a number of factors contributing to this area. Invention for these students was not targeted to address specific deficiencies. Also teachers struggled with data analysis to determine the most effective areas for interventions. There were concerns regarding consistent implementation of accommodations during whole group, small group and pull-out direct instruction.

Using PLCs to facilitate targeted data analysis with suggestions for small group instruction and additional intervention. Provide targeted professional development on ESE/ELL accommodations.

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

There was a significant decline in 5th grade math proficiency. There were concerns pertaining to lack of pre-requisite skills and math fluency. Student engagement with higher order problem solving and math discourse was minimal.

**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.**

5th grade ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Contributing factors include the low performance of students with disabilities.

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

Students were continually exposed to critical content and new standards throughout the year. Teachers spiraled back to reinforce prerequisite skills and while providing ongoing practice of new skills.

There needs to be targeted intervention for all students including those on and above level.

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

Student attendance and on-grade level performance in ELA and Math

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

1st: Closing the achievement gap for Students with Disabilities

2nd: Increasing Math Proficiency for all subgroups of students

3rd: Addressing the challenges with FAST Writing

4th: Increasing the number of students in all subgroups making learning gains for ELA

5th: Increasing the number of students demonstrating proficiency for Science

### **Area of Focus**

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



**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Christine Peacock (christine\_peacock@scps.k12.fl.us)

**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 following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention, iReady or iStation, Success for All – FastTrack Phonics (at Title 1 schools), Reading Mastery, FastForward, Corrective Reading, Quick Reads and Elements of Reading.

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: iReady, DreamBox, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System, Seminole Numeracy Project.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum.

All of the listed interventions have been approved by Just Read, Florida through the vetting process for the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

Math- All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.

Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

**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.

What do we want all students to do?

We want all students to read and comprehend grade-level complex texts proficiently while decreasing the achievement gap for our ESE and ELL students. Additionally, we want all students to complete tasks with mathematical fluency.

How will we know if they learn it?

Student data will be reviewed at each progress monitor to determine which students are demonstrated mastery and who needs additional interventions and supports.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

There will be discussion in PLCs for additional tools for instruction while adjusting intervention groups.

What evidence/data will there be to reflect monitoring for this strategy/action?

Teachers will be responsible for data analysis sheets after each progress monitor. Additionally on-going PLC documents will reflect data analysis with whole group, small group and intervention plans.

**Person Responsible:** Christine Peacock (christine\_peacock@scps.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the school year

**#2. 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.

Students succeed when conditions for learning are optimized. A focus on campus safety, development of a culture where student voice and belonging are valued and sharing collective responsibility for the success of all students in the school increase student achievement.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

5 Essentials Survey indicators for trust, collective responsibility and academic personalism will increase to or remain Well Organized.

**Monitoring:**

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

Conditions for Learning monitoring will occur during classroom walk through, PLC meetings, attendance and discipline data reviews.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Christine Peacock (christine\_peacock@scps.k12.fl.us)

**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 Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS) process is a team-based approach that relies on a strong collaboration between families and professionals from a variety of disciplines regardless of the level implemented. MTSS provides a positive and effective means to support student learning, attendance and behavior.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

MTSS methods are research-based and proven to positively impact school climate and increase academic performance.

**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.

Increase the number of students feeling comfortable talking to Lake Orienta's Resource Officer. The school resource officer will introduce him/herself to each classroom at the beginning of the year, explaining their role on campus. Periodic classroom visits will continue throughout the year,

Increase the number of teachers that feel responsible when students fail.

Teachers will collaboratively examine individual and grade level data while increasing capacity for collective ownership.

**Person Responsible:** Christine Peacock (christine\_peacock@scps.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Ongoing 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).

In collaboration with the Assistant Superintendent, school leaders identify and align resources to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Evaluation of student achievement data and related early warning factors such as attendance and discipline referrals are at the core of this work. Principals review data with the school leadership team, staff, and other relevant stakeholders, then develop or modify goals and strategies to align with the school needs presented. These goals and strategies are then operationalized through action items within the annual School Improvement Plan. These specific interventions or activities are noted within the SIP, and funding resources are assigned (i.e., Title I, Part A, UniSIG).

### Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

#### Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

For grade 1, coaches at RAISE schools will receive extra support from the State Regional Literacy Director through Professional Development that Just Read, Florida! has developed. In turn, coaches will use this professional development to improve the support to teachers at their respective schools. This should support more explicit, systematic, benchmark-aligned instruction in classrooms to lead to improvement in student outcomes on state assessments.

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

For grade 5, coaches at RAISE schools will receive extra support from the State Regional Literacy Director through Professional Development that Just Read, Florida! has developed. In turn, coaches will use this professional development to improve the support to teachers at their respective schools. This

should support more explicit, systematic, benchmark-aligned instruction in classrooms to lead to improvement in student outcomes on state assessments.

### **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**

The number of students in grade 1 that are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment will decrease by 2 percent.

### **Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

The number of students in grade 5 that score below a Level 3 on the end of the year statewide ELA assessment will decrease by 2 percent.

### **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.

This area of focus will be monitored through strategic, data aligned PLC planning and collaboration, common formative assessment data, DRA, FAST and district progress monitoring assessment outcomes.

#### **Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Peacock, Christine, christine\_peacock@scps.k12.fl.us

### **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?

Research reflects a 0.47 effect size for small group learning.

**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?

By working with students in small groups, teachers can provide targeted lessons and feedback to quickly accelerate student learning through both differentiation in the core and intervention

**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
-------------	-----------------------------------

Developing highly collaborative PLCs strategically focused on the use of formative assessment data.  
 Utilizing results of FAST PM1 and PM2, DRA and district progress monitoring to design reading acceleration support for students.  
 Utilizing SCPS Early Warning/MTSS systems to support interventions.  
 Reading walk-throughs focused on identifying standards-based and differentiated whole group instruction and small group instruction.  
 Utilizing pacing calendars and research based instructional materials and practices in 90-minute block.  
 Utilizing additional research-based intervention curriculum for tier 2 and 3 students.

Peacock, Christine,  
 christine\_peacock@scps.k12.fl.us

## 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.

Lake Orienta Elementary School reviewed feedback from parents and other stakeholders on the Spring 2023 SnapShot Survey. Ideas for monitoring student safety, student achievement, and student engagement were considered when developing this plan. We created a committee to review the school's mission, vision and action items in this plan. The committee consists of parents, teachers and members of our leadership team.

<https://sim.scps.k12.fl.us/school/info/0601>

**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))

In an effort to build positive relationships with all stakeholders, Lake Orienta Elementary School hosts several community events throughout the year including book fairs, parent curriculum nights, PTA events, Title I meetings and Title I family and parent engagement events. The goal is to promote family involvement and help parents understand the need to support their students' academic and social/emotional growth. We use Skyward, School Messenger, parent-teacher conferences, and MTSS/SST meetings to communicate students' progress with our parents. We follow the SCPS Pupil Progression Plan with progress reports and report cards distributed quarterly.

<https://lakeorienta.scps.k12.fl.us/>

**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)**

There will be a shift in small group instruction based on data with station activities aligned to standards at the demands of the benchmark while adhering to the Instructional Framework and Pacing Calendar.

**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))**

During the planning phase of Title I school-wide plans, which typically begins late February or early March for the upcoming school year, leadership from the Department of Teaching and Learning (Title II,

Part A), ESOL World Languages and Student Access (Title III, Part A), Families in Need (Title IX, Part A), Student Support Services (IDEA), Student Assignment and Program Access (magnet programs), Alternative Program (Title I, Part D), and Early Learning (Pre-K/VPK) are invited to participate in collaborative planning sessions. At these collaborative planning sessions, school leadership teams begin developing their Title I, Part A plans for the upcoming school year, with support and guidance from these various district-level grant and/or program managers. For instance, the Director of ESOL/World Languages and Student Access would share with Title I school leadership teams relevant updates to those programs for the upcoming school year, which may lead them to leverage their Title I, Part A funds to supplement such initiatives.