

Orange County Public Schools

Bay Lake Elementary



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	19

Bay Lake Elementary

12005 SILVERLAKE PARK DR, Windermere, FL 34786

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

Demographics

Principal: Myrlene Jackson Kimble

Start Date for this Principal: 8/8/2016

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	32%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: 2014-15: 2013-14:
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	TS&I
* 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

OCPS Mission - To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement

OCPS Vision - To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jackson Kimble, Myrlene	Principal	Myrlene Jackson-Kimble, Principal, is the school-based instructional leader for academic and behavior instruction. She also ensures professional development is based on the needs of the staff in order to increase student achievement.
Hird, Gregory	Dean	Mr. Gregory Hird, Administrative Dean, is an instructional leader who serves as the curriculum and data manager. He also coordinates staff development, serves as the testing coordinator, plans and implements our new teacher mentoring program, and coordinates the tutoring program as well as the ADDitions volunteers.
Foust, Kacey	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Kacey Foust, Instructional Coach, provides instructional support to teachers and oversees and participates in common planning for kindergarten through fifth grades. Mrs. Foust also supports teachers in data analysis and planning for differentiated activities, small group instruction, and interventions in order to increase student learning gains. Mrs. Foust works with teachers through the coaching cycle to improve instructional practices school-wide.
Parra, Miluska	Other	Mrs. Miluska Parra, Curriculum Compliance Specialist, provides research-based suggestions for interventions and instruction that best meet ELL students' needs. Mrs. Parra also completes all English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) documentation for compliance and works with teachers to develop and implement Multi-Tiered Support Structures and intervention plans for struggling ELLs.
Keysor, Aundrea	Other	Ms. Aundrea Keysor, Staffing Specialist, provides resources to the staff regarding ESE instruction and monitoring the progress of Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals. She works with the staff to provide our ESE students with supports and services in the classroom. Ms.Keysor also collects and analyzes the data for Tier III interventions and works with leadership and teachers to provide intervention support.
LaFave, Heather	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Heather LaFave, Assistant Principal, serves as instructional and behavioral leader. She oversees and supports teachers in implementing and monitoring effective whole group and small group instruction, including the implementation of MTSS interventions and enrichment. She also oversees and works with the staff and leadership team to plan and implement the School Improvement Plan, SAFE plan, School Advisory Council initiatives, data meetings, and classroom walkthroughs.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	-------	---------------------------------

Robinson, Carissa	Other	Ms. Robinson, Behavior Specialist, serves as a behavior and instructional leader. She works to support teachers with behavior and provides classroom supports and instruction for ESE students. Ms. Robinson also oversees our school-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program to support all students in building positive behavior expectations and habits.
-------------------	-------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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	182	193	211	215	200	195	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1196
Attendance below 90 percent	22	21	12	8	23	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	9	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	39	40	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110

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	1	0	3	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	0	1	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	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

48

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/15/2019

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
Attendance below 90 percent	25	14	14	21	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	10	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	37	39	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

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	10	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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
Attendance below 90 percent	25	14	14	21	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	10	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	37	39	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

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	10	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	80%	57%	57%	78%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	71%	58%	58%	69%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	52%	53%	61%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	85%	63%	63%	79%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	74%	61%	62%	65%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	48%	51%	56%	46%	47%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement	77%	56%	53%	77%	55%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	182 (0)	193 (0)	211 (0)	215 (0)	200 (0)	195 (0)	1196 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	22 (25)	21 (14)	12 (14)	8 (21)	23 (16)	15 (22)	101 (112)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (2)	0 (3)	0 (7)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	9 (10)	1 (1)	2 (4)	1 (0)	0 (0)	13 (15)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	39 (37)	40 (39)	31 (48)	110 (124)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019	70%	55%	15%	58%	12%
	2018	70%	55%	15%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	57%	11%	58%	10%
	2018	69%	54%	15%	56%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	69%	54%	15%	56%	13%
	2018	61%	55%	6%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	79%	62%	17%	62%	17%
	2018	73%	61%	12%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	63%	13%	64%	12%
	2018	76%	62%	14%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	75%	57%	18%	60%	15%
	2018	64%	59%	5%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	70%	54%	16%	53%	17%
	2018	65%	53%	12%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	32	27	9	41	33	18					
ELL	68	71	66	77	76	64	74				
ASN	87	74		98	74		78				
BLK	85	81		82	57						
HSP	75	70	63	77	72	58	73				
WHT	82	69	37	90	81	63	86				
FRL	73	68	37	80	68	59	71				

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	28			39							
ELL	65	68	60	73	69	68	65				
ASN	86	72		88	70						
BLK	80	56		77	63		50				
HSP	72	64	63	74	67	67	73				
WHT	83	79	62	81	63	40	88				
FRL	69	62	52	72	60	49	62				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	73
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	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	583
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%	1

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	72
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	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
----------------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	76
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	71
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

Multiracial Students	
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	73
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	66
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

This year we performed the lowest in Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile in ELA and Math. In the previous year, Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile was also an area of low performance, although we were able to increase those learning gains this year. In both of these areas, the school team is working to strengthen differentiated instruction and interventions in order to target some of the subgroups that make up our Lowest 25th Percentile, such as our Students With Disabilities and our English Language Learners.

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

Our greatest decline in performance occurred in ELA Learning Gains for our Lowest 25th Percentile. In looking at learning gains for student subgroups in the Lowest 25th Percentile, our Students With Disabilities did not make any learning gains, although this subgroup accounts for less than 20% of the Lowest 25th Percentile in ELA. English Language Learners account for about 85% of the Lowest 25th Percentile for ELA and instruction for ELL students has been a targeted area for improvement for our school since last year.

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

Currently data is not available to complete a full comparison between the school and the state averages.

When looking at proficiency scores for ELA, Math, and Science, Bay Lake has scored at least 20% points above the state average in each subject area. This achievement has been maintained over the past two years, with a higher achievement gap in Math this year.

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

Performance in Math Learning Gains showed the most improvement with a 9 percentage point increase from 65% in 2018 to 74% in 2019. This past year we focused on strengthening Math instruction with increased close reading and small group instructional strategies as well as the addition of a dedicated weekly Math intervention block.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Although we have improved in all areas of the Early Warning Systems since the previous year, we continue to focus on attendance as an area of concern. Throughout the year, we find that our attendance seems to drop around the winter holidays (November to January), and students are missing critical instructional time. For each of our students with multiple EWS indicators, attendance is one of their areas of concern.

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

1. Targeted Instruction and Interventions for Students With Disabilities
2. Targeted Instruction and Interventions for the Lowest 25th Percentile in ELA
3. Targeted Instruction and Interventions for the Lowest 25th Percentile in Math
4. Strategic Implementation of Instructional Strategies and Accommodations for English Language Learners
5. Culturally Responsive Strategies to Increase Achievement for ELL and FRL students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase Student Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile
Rationale	Student Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile were the lowest scoring components in all subject areas this year. In ELA, the Learning Gains declined slightly and, in Math, Learning Gains had slight improvement, but still remained under 60%. By strengthening strategies to improve achievement and learning gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile, we expect for these strategies to also narrow achievement gaps for some of our low-performing subgroups, such as ELL, ESE, and FRL.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile will increase from 56% in ELA to 61% and from 59% in Math to 64%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>At Bay Lake, we will provide intensive instruction by working with students with similar needs on a small number of high priority, clearly defined skills or concepts critical to academic success.</p> <p>While our school scored well on overall learning gains and proficiency, in order to increase student learning gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile and low-performing subgroups, we need to provide more targeted, intensive instruction that effectively meets the needs of lower performing students. The school team will use FSA results, along with i-Ready assessments and other diagnostic tools to identify groups of students with similar needs and establish high priority, clearly defined skills and goals to meet their needs. Using this data, the school team will be able to target students' foundational gaps in learning as they support their growth with standards-based skills using research-based intervention materials and formative assessments. With clearly defined skills and goals, teachers will be able to effectively monitor students' progress as well as the narrowing of achievement gaps for low-performing subgroups and adjust instruction accordingly to ensure that each student is making adequate learning growth.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analyze data to group students with similar needs 2. Establish high priority, clearly defined skills and goals for student groups 3. Identify appropriate research-based resources to target students' needs through explicit instruction and interventions 4. Monitor students' progress and the narrowing of achievement gaps through frequent formative assessments and data analysis within our PLCs 5. Utilize data to assess effectiveness and adjust instruction as needed
Person Responsible	Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Accelerate Student Performance with a Focus on SWD
Rationale	Proficiency and Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities is an area that needs improvement. Especially in ELA, Achievement for SWD is at 32% while Learning Gains is 27%. Although, the population of SWD students at Bay Lake is 4.7%, as a school team we need to strategically adjust how we implement instructional strategies for our SWD in order to ensure that they are learning and growing.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By strategically implementing high yield strategies for ESE, including Acceleration strategies, Learning Gains for SWD will increase from 27% to 40% in ELA and from 33% to 40% in Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>The Bay Lake team will increase our systematic use of explicit instruction for our Students with Disabilities through the implementation of push-in support and the addition of weekly acceleration instruction.</p> <p>Previously, support for SWD was provided through a combination of push-in and pull-out instruction with small groups of students. In order to make instructional support more impactful, SWDs have been clustered in classrooms and push-in support will be provided so as to maximize instructional time. With explicit instruction, teachers will model and scaffold the content while calling attention critical components, highlighting examples and non-examples, anticipating common misconceptions, and providing strategic supports that will support students in applying skills and completing tasks successfully and independently. Weekly acceleration instruction as upcoming units will be pre-taught to small groups of students. This strategy will benefit SWD students by helping them preview and learn new content while also building their confidence to engage in whole-group instruction as they will already have a basic understanding of the new content.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analyze data to strategically cluster SWD students in grade level classrooms and group students with similar needs for push-in support and small group instruction 2. Build a culture of collaboration between classroom teachers and ESE support through weekly collaborative planning 3. Plan for small group instruction utilizing strategies for explicit instruction and acceleration. Strategically plan for and embed ESE strategies into classroom lesson plans 4. Provide research-based curriculum and resources to implement best practices for inclusive education for all SWDs 5. Utilize frequent formative assessments to monitor student growth and adjust instruction accordingly
Person Responsible	Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)

#3	
Title	Increase Cognitive and Conative Engagement of All Students Through Academic Discussions
Rationale	Through academic discussions, teachers are able to increase the cognitive engagement of all students and increase learning gains for all students. The strategic implementation of academic discussions in the classroom also serves to develop students' social and emotional skills and supports the establishment of culturally responsive classroom environments.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By increasing student engagement through the use of academic discussions, Learning Gains for all students will increase from 56 to 61% in ELA and from 59% to 64% in Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Heather LaFave (heather.lafave@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Building upon strategies for close reading, the school team will use academic discussions to cognitively and conatively engage students in reading and writing across all content areas. Through the DPLC process, teachers will engage in a cycle of professional learning in order to develop an understanding and improve the effectiveness of academic discussions throughout the year. By collaboratively planning lessons, grade level teams will plan purposeful and rigorous discussions to help students learn new content, deepen their understanding of previously taught content, and practice skills and processes. Students will also engage in learning activities that require them to practice core skills, such as elaborating and clarifying, paraphrasing, synthesizing, supporting ideas with evidence, and building on or challenging another person's ideas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	As teachers and students practice the use of close reading strategies across all content areas, we see a need to increase cognitive engagement within the classrooms so as to maximize learning growth for each child. At Bay Lake, we have a very diverse students population with over 30% of our students being English Language Learners. In order to effectively support student learning, we have to strategically implement strategies that build students' language as well as literacy skills. Focusing on academic discussions as a strategy for learning not only maximizes cognitive engagement, but it also helps students build their literacy, language, social, and emotional skills. Additionally, these strategies can be used to strengthen culturally responsive classroom environments as students engage in discussions with a classmates who often come from different cultural backgrounds.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attend regular district trainings to strengthen our understanding of close reading and the effective implementation of academic discussions (DPLC team) 2. Establish a school-based plan to support cycles of professional learning 3. Provide professional development to the staff and open up classroom practice to increase pedagogical expertise and build collective efficacy 4. Monitor the impact of close reading strategies and academic discussions

on student achievement through the use of regular formative assessments and quarterly diagnostic assessments
5. Modify cycles of professional learning to enhance school improvement efforts

Person Responsible Myrlene Jackson Kimble (myrlene.jackson-kimble@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

For our ELL students, the school team will be providing explicit vocabulary instruction, language-based intervention instruction, and strategic use of academic discourse in addition to appropriate ESOL strategies in order to target the needs of our ELL students. In addition to collaborative common planning, teachers will meet twice a month to analyze intervention data and make changes as needed to instructional grouping.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

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

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

Bay Lake Elementary would like to set a standard of at least 80% of our parents volunteering and participating in events including Meet the Teacher, Open House, and at least one family night event. Our parent involvement target includes increasing communication with parents, especially those new to the country, in order to help them learn about our school and get involved in our many programs and activities. This includes using the website, school Facebook page, and PTO Facebook page to connect to our parents in a way that allows for communication in various languages, supports our mission and vision, and increases parent involvement. Access to ProgressBook, parent-teacher conferences, and MTSS meetings will also help keep parents informed of their child's progress. The school will provide targeted activities for parents for whom English is a second language in order to increase their involvement in the PTO, Parent Leadership Council, and SAC. In addition, Bay Lake Elementary School will focus on making parents more aware of the MTSS and Exceptional Student Education (ESE) processes - providing ideas and suggestions on how they can support their child's academic growth in the home environment.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

The school will build a culture of collaboration between the guidance counselor, classroom teachers, support personnel, and students' families in order to support students' social-emotional needs. Through Health lessons, all students will be taught critical health and social-emotional skills critical to support their general well-being and achievement. Students may also be referred to the guidance counselor for targeted small social group lessons and/or for individual solution-focused counseling.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

Bay Lake Elementary will provide program information to preschools located in our attendance zone and will post curriculum information on our school website. In addition to providing flyers about primary literacy and parent nights, we will also provide surrounding daycare providers with kindergarten registration packets and invitations to our "Kindergarten Round-Up" for students entering school in 2020.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

The teachers will use the core reading and math programs to teach the Florida Standards with rigor and fidelity. After diagnostic assessments are completed, students will be placed in intervention/enrichment groups and small instructional groups within their class to address their individual needs. These groups will change frequently as data is collected and needs are determined using diagnostic assessments, formative assessments, and unit tests. Kacey Foust, our instructional coach, will work with teachers in planning rigorous lessons, targeted interventions, and small group instruction.

Through the MTSS process, data will drive the instructional delivery model and determine strategies that will be utilized to ensure all students are able to make at least a year's worth of growth. The assistant principal and ESOL compliance specialist will work with teachers to make sure the MTSS process is implemented with fidelity. The tiered process will start immediately for students who are demonstrating minimal progress or working below grade level. Teachers, with the support of administration, will meet during their grade-level MTSS Professional Learning Community (PLC) to discuss academic and behavioral data. They will use the data to determine the most effective strategies or interventions needed to support the students' academic and behavioral needs and monitor students' progress at monthly meetings. The targeted skill deficits will be monitored and adjusted based on the progress of the students. Mrs. Parra will work with teachers to monitor ELL students' language acquisition and determine appropriate academic interventions for ELL students who do not demonstrate adequate learning progress.

Through these processes, additional support or scaffolding will be added based on the needs of the student. Bay Lake Elementary School will also provide free tutoring services for students in grades 3 to 5 that focuses on closing the achievement gap for the lowest performing students.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

At Bay Lake, students are prepared through organizational tools such as the use of planners and note-taking strategies. These strategies give students the ability to organize and present their thoughts in a manner that promotes planning for future success. These skills are synonymous with college and career readiness skills.

Part V: Budget						
1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Increase Student Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1392 - Bay Lake Elementary			\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Accelerate Student Performance with a Focus on SWD				\$0.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Increase Cognitive and Conative Engagement of All Students Through Academic Discussions				\$0.00
					Total:	\$0.00