

Orange County Public Schools

Lakeville Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Lakeville Elementary

2015 LAKEVILLE RD, Apopka, FL 32703

<https://lakevillees.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Sarasty

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part 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

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Swanson, Cynthia	Principal	Serves as the school instructional leader, evaluates instructional staff, responsible for sharing the SIP and the MTSS plan with staff and parents; scheduling data meetings and providing a focus, scheduling time and resources for professional development and working with the Instructional Coach on professional development that is driven by student data and teacher needs, working with the MTSS academic and behavior teams in analyzing school wide academic and behavioral data.
Hayes, Sandra	Administrative Support	Responsible for implementing specific actions of the SIP, participating in common planning meetings, working with the MTSS team to analyze the school wide academic needs, delivering professional development that is driven by student data and teacher needs, and providing targeted small group instruction.
Pemberton, Donna	Administrative Support	Responsible for implementing specific actions of the SIP. Creates and implements the school's Parent Family Engagement Plan (PFEP), Responsible for working with the Parent Engagement Liaison to plan parent involvement activities, educating staff regarding parent involvement, and communicating . Serves as Social Media completes Title I documentation according to compliance standards, chairperson of the SAC, and Partners In Education Coordinator. Manages curriculum inventory. Testing coordinator. ing professional development that is driven by student data and teacher needs.
Milton, Robin	Guidance Counselor	Responsible for implementing a comprehensive school guidance program including classroom guidance, small group counseling, individual counseling, consultation with parents, and referrals to outside agencies. Responsible for compliance with 504 plans and is the Title IX designee and McKinney-Vento, Migrant and Foster Care designee.
Bustamante, Denise	Instructional Media	Responsible for circulation of print and media materials to all students and staff, teaches library and reading skills to all primary grade classes, serves as administrator for school website and Sharepoint site, plans twice yearly book fairs, serves on Literacy Leadership Council, teaches intervention groups as needed.
Bien-Aime, Sonny	Attendance/ Social Work	Responsible for providing behavior support in the EBD unit; facilitating behavior team meetings; developing behavior plans and assisting with the implementation of behavior

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		plans; communicating behavior concerns to parents; providing social skills; participating in ESE team meetings and Threat Assessment meetings; communicate with the transportation department.
Randall, Archna	Psychologist	Responsible for working with the MTSS Coordinator in the problem solving process and implementation of best practices; meeting with individual teachers regarding classroom and/or individual student needs based on data; reviewing school wide data and Tier II and Tier III data with the MTSS Coordinator; working with the MTSS academic and behavior teams in analyzing school wide academic and behavioral data.
Petit-Frere, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Leads positive behavior support team, working with the MTSS academic and behavior teams in analyzing school wide academic and behavioral data. implements and supervises the Safe School Plan, oversees facility maintenance, serves as instructional leader, evaluates instructional and classified staff.
Moncur, Patricia	Administrative Support	Responsible for working with the exceptional education team in the problem solving process and implementation of best practices; reviewing school wide data and Tier II and Tier III data with the MTSS Coordinator and School Psychologist for students not making sufficient progress; working with the MTSS academic and behavior teams in analyzing school wide academic and behavioral data; monitoring compliance of regulations for English Language Learners.
Perino, Krista	Administrative Support	Responsible for working with the exceptional education team in the problem solving process and implementation of best practices; reviewing school wide data and Tier II and Tier III data with the MTSS Coordinator and School Psychologist for students not making sufficient progress; working with the MTSS academic and behavior teams in analyzing school wide academic and behavioral data; monitoring compliance of regulations for English Language Learners. Meets with the School Psychologist in the problem solving process and implementation of best practices; meeting with individual teachers regarding classroom and/or individual student needs based on data and filling out the Lakeville MTSS Summary Form; monitoring and analyzing Tier II and Tier III data forms and graphs on Lakeville SharePoint site; advising teachers on Tier II and Tier III best practices; participating in data meetings; working with the

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
<p>MTSS academic and behavior teams in analyzing school wide academic and behavioral data.</p>		

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/20/2014, Melissa Sarasty

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Demographic Data

<p>2020-21 Status (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Active</p>
<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Elementary School PK-5</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p>	<p>K-12 General Education</p>
<p>2018-19 Title I School</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p>	<p>95%</p>
<p>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)</p>	<p>Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students</p>
<p>School Grades History</p>	<p>2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (53%)</p>

	2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	27	113	120	99	112	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	569
Attendance below 90 percent	9	24	20	17	25	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	5	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/20/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	114	97	113	106	125	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	11	10	18	11	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	9	7	3	9	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	4	1	1	15	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	32	48	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	4	1	1	8	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year		1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	114	97	113	106	125	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	11	10	18	11	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	9	7	3	9	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	4	1	1	15	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	32	48	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	4	1	1	8	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	47%	57%	57%	46%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	58%	58%	48%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	52%	53%	40%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	55%	63%	63%	55%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	62%	61%	62%	54%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	48%	51%	35%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	51%	56%	53%	50%	55%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	55%	-4%	58%	-7%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	57%	-5%	58%	-6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	43%	54%	-11%	56%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	34%	54%	-20%	56%	-22%
	2018	43%	55%	-12%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	50%	62%	-12%	62%	-12%
	2018	48%	61%	-13%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	63%	-10%	64%	-11%
	2018	61%	62%	-1%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	52%	57%	-5%	60%	-8%
	2018	52%	59%	-7%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	45%	54%	-9%	53%	-8%
	2018	49%	53%	-4%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	12	24	25	14	47	48	15				
ELL	25	33	25	44	63	55	35				
BLK	40	49	46	48	61	65	42				
HSP	46	42	32	51	67	48	52				
WHT	58	47		69	58		73				
FRL	39	46	36	48	59	51	38				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	14	45	46	23	43	33	32				
ELL	25	56	56	36	54	44	29				
BLK	38	43	38	46	45	24	36				
HSP	47	56	47	58	62	44	55				
WHT	54	45	31	65	62	60	66				
FRL	40	48	39	51	53	33	46				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	421
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students

Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant 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 lowest performance was demonstrated by the lowest 25th percentile of students in ELA, with a proficiency rate of 37%. A contributing factor was lack of consistency with interventions during certain periods of time, such as testing season.

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

The lowest performance was demonstrated by the lowest 25th percentile of students in ELA, with a proficiency rate of 37%. A contributing factor was lack of consistency with interventions during certain periods of time, such as testing season.

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

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is the lowest 25th percentile for ELA. Lakeville students in this category demonstrated 37% proficiency to a state average of 54%. Inconsistent monitoring of interventions and whole group instruction contributed to this gap.

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

The data component with the most improvement was 4th grade ELA. Professional development was provided for Thinking Maps and was implemented with fidelity. Lakeville grew 8% in math learning gains and 19% in learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

The greatest area of potential concern with Lakeville's EWS indicators is the number of students in 4th and 5th grade who scored a level 1 on the state assessments.

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

1. Increasing proficiency for the lowest 25th percentile of students in ELA.
2. Increasing proficiency for the 5th grade ELA.
3. Increasing proficiency for Hispanic students.
4. Increasing proficiency for ESE students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Increase ELA Proficiency. ELA Proficiency for 2018-2019 was at 47%.

Measureable Outcome: Lakeville will increase ELA proficiency from 47% to 50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Debra Jerrett (debra.jerrett@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Lakeville is implementing vocabulary strategies and small group instruction to increase ELA proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The strategies were chosen to support our lowest 25% who are also ESE and ELL students. These subgroups struggle with identifying the meaning of unknown words which hinders their ability to understand text. Implementing small group instruction will provide a more strategic focus on closing achievement gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Lakeville will continue to implement and improve a culture that supports social and emotional learning for adults and students. Student achievement will increase when students are given the opportunity to interact with others in a positive manner to complete tasks.

Measureable Outcome: With an increased focus on social and emotional learning, threats to others will decrease by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Petit-Frere (jennifer.petit-frere@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Lakeville is using Sanford Harmony and district lessons to teach social and emotional learning. The use of class meetings will be implemented in each classrooms. The leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs with a focus to observe social and emotional lessons as well as class meetings. The administrators will look for strategies in teacher lesson plans as well.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Lakeville has chosen class meetings as a way to teach social and emotional learning because it allows for positive relationships to be built between teachers and students. The Sanford Harmony resources as well as the district provided resources will be used to support the strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Lakeville's Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL) position has been tremendously valuable to our school. Her relationship-building with families through Parent Resource Room, translating school communications in native languages, and assisting administration in planning parent events has made families from all backgrounds feel welcome at Lakeville. This year, we will continue school-wide use of ClassDojo to encourage timely and widespread communication with parents. In addition, multiple other avenues of communication are utilized, including newsletters, calendars, flyers, Facebook, Twitter, Skylert, SAC and PTA meetings. We will continue family social and curriculum-based events, as these are very popular events with our parents and students. Our PTA and new community partnerships, such as the Kiwanis Club, have helped to sponsor recognition of our students, which has led to additional involvement and pride in our school.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget			
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00