

Orange County Public Schools

Sand Lake Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Sand Lake Elementary

8301 BUENA VISTA WOODS BLVD, Orlando, FL 32836

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

Demographics

Principal: Kathleen Phillips B

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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)	48%
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 Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Sand Lake Elementary

8301 BUENA VISTA WOODS BLVD, Orlando, FL 32836

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)

Elementary School
PK-5

2018-19 Title I School

No

2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)

48%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

59%

School Grades History

Year Grade	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
	A	A	A	B

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://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

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

Provide the school's vision statement

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
Suprenard, Laura	Principal	Principal: ensures the mission and vision of OCPS are enacted daily, serves as the instructional leader and primary source of professional development and monitors distribution of leadership roles Assistant Principal: serves as an instructional leader, oversees facility management and maintains behavioral expectations
Munoz, Noemi	Other	Curriculum Compliance Teacher (CCT): facilitates and monitors services for ELLs and organizes Multilingual Parent Leadership Council (MPLC) meetings, serves as MTSS Lead and assists teachers in implementing instructional/behavioral strategies, monitors the effectiveness of the strategies, holds monthly MTSS team meetings to review student data and adjusts instruction as needed and facilitates instruction for Tier II and Tier III interventions, Instructional Coach-provide coaching cycles and support for teachers
Strack, Chelsea	Other	Facilitates all Exceptional Student Education (ESE) and Section 504 meetings and monitors accommodations provided by instructional staff
Smith, Christina	Guidance Counselor	Guidance Counselor: facilitates individual and group counseling, classroom guidance, Child Safety Matters, Act 4 Change, and Change Starts With Me; serves as Title IX coordinator, Safe coordinator and McKinney-Vento program coordinator
Lawhorn, Wendy	Instructional Coach	Hold weekly meetings with Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and individual meetings as necessary, facilitate instruction for Tier II intervention, monitor implementation of standards-based instruction, coach teachers in instructional practices that facilitate the instructional shifts and serve as assessment coordinators
Belton, Michele	Other	Hold weekly meetings with Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and individual meetings as necessary, facilitate instruction for Tier II intervention, monitor implementation of standards-based instruction, coach teachers in instructional practices that facilitate the instructional shifts and serve as assessment coordinators

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	76	70	90	81	103	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	518
Attendance below 90 percent	0	14	9	11	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	31	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

40

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/14/2019

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	14	9	11	12	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	0	2	3	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	28	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

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	9	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	21	17	13	14	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	0	0	2	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

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	6	8	8	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	75%	57%	57%	71%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	58%	58%	64%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	52%	53%	43%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	79%	63%	63%	77%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	74%	61%	62%	71%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	48%	51%	56%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	77%	56%	53%	64%	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	76 (0)	70 (0)	90 (0)	81 (0)	103 (0)	98 (0)	518 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (14)	14 (9)	9 (11)	11 (12)	12 (8)	8 (13)	54 (67)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)	2 (0)	0 (2)	3 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (1)	1 (0)	0 (2)	2 (3)	3 (1)	1 (12)	7 (19)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (31)	31 (28)	28 (24)	60 (83)

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	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
	2018	66%	55%	11%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	57%	21%	58%	20%
	2018	65%	54%	11%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
	2018	64%	55%	9%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	72%	62%	10%	62%	10%
	2018	69%	61%	8%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	63%	11%	64%	10%
	2018	75%	62%	13%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	75%	57%	18%	60%	15%
	2018	75%	59%	16%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	68%	54%	14%	53%	15%
	2018	57%	53%	4%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
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	11	37	33	29	50	52					
ELL	63	62	50	72	66	50	68				
ASN	94	86		91	95						
BLK	66	44		66	61		64				
HSP	67	61	44	73	69	47	66				
WHT	78	70	29	82	77	50	86				
FRL	62	59	44	65	69	49	64				

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	15	23	16	19	41	40	30				
ELL	52	61	47	68	74	64	41				
ASN	88	76		88	89		82				
BLK	38	32		52	32						
HSP	63	57	46	73	70	64	50				
WHT	79	76	54	83	79	62	83				
FRL	61	53	40	66	64	54	48				

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	68
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	80
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	64
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	92
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	60
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	63
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	71
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	62
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 data component that scored the lowest was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile area. For the last 3 years, the percent of students showing learning gains in this area has been between 44% and 41%. A contributing factor to this decline was the focus on acceleration lessons for targeted students as well as a focus on increasing overall student proficiency in the area of ELA.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline is Math Lowest 25 Percentile area. In 2018, 56% of this data component showed gains compared to 51% in 2019. Students in this data component were provided less small group targeted instruction than our students receiving acceleration lessons.

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

There was a -12% gap between the school and the state in the area of ELA Lowest 25 Percentile. A factor that contributed to this decrease was putting too much emphasis on increasing our overall student proficiency in the area of ELA.

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

Science is the data component that showed the most improvement with 77% of students scoring a level 3 or above on the FSA. Prior to 2019, between 61% and 64% of students were proficient on the Science FCAT 2.0. There was an increased accountability for all teachers to teach the science standards and follow the scope and sequence. Science bulletin boards with vocabulary and students at work were posted on the first and second floor of the building. For each unit, every class had access to the vocabulary on a ring and students would quiz each other in the mornings before the bell rang. Third through fifth grade students took district common assessments and data was used to plan for re-teaching. In addition two STEM nights were provided for families during the course of the school year.

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

An area of concern is attendance rate. In 2018-2019 12% of students had an attendance rate of less than 90%.

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

1. Increasing the number of students making learning gains in the lowest 25 percentile in the areas of reading and math
2. Increasing the number of ESE students meeting grade level expectations
3. Increase the amount of acceleration and enrichment opportunities for all students
4. Decrease the percent of students attending school less than 90% of the time.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Teachers will plan and facilitate opportunities for all students to utilize literacy strategies to write with evidence in response to complex texts across all content areas.
Rationale	Data indicates that our teachers will benefit from acquiring knowledge and understanding of implementing literacy strategies that will allow all students opportunities to utilize literacy and social and emotional learning strategies to write with evidence in response to complex texts, across all content areas.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By June 2020, 41% of students with disabilities will demonstrate proficiency in the area of ELA and Math. The percent of students in the lowest 25% data component will increase to 55% in the areas of reading and math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Wendy Lawhorn (wendy.lawhorn@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Cycles of professional learning in the area of literacy strategies and writing with evidence in response to complex texts across all content areas will be implemented throughout the school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	More students need to make learning gains in the area of reading and math. Increasing opportunities for students to utilize literacy and social and emotional learning strategies to write with evidence in response to complex texts across all content areas. Classroom observation data indicates a need for additional support implementing academic discourse within the classroom during content lessons.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will meet once a month in order to review data for all subgroups to include the students in the lowest 25% data component for ELA and math 2. Teachers will be provided opportunities to participate in opening up classroom practice across content areas 3. Teachers will implement literacy and social and emotional learning strategies and have students write with evidence in response to complex texts across all content areas. 4. Teachers will implement appropriate strategies to increase the quality of academic discourse within the classroom. 5.
Person Responsible	Michele Belton (michele.belton@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	In order to decrease the achievement gap, teachers will plan using standards-based lessons, Equitable Classroom Practices and frequent student monitoring in order to adjust instruction to meet the needs of all students.
Rationale	In 2018-2019, only 11% of our students with disabilities (SWD) were on grade level in ELA and only 29% scored on level in math. Collaboration with general education teachers, paraprofessionals and support staff is necessary to support students' learning toward measurable outcomes and to facilitate students' social and emotional well-being across all school environments and instructional settings (e.g., co-taught).

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By June 2020, 41% of students with disabilities will demonstrate proficiency in the area of ELA and Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chelsea Strack (chelsea.strack@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will effectively collaborate (e.g., sharing ideas, active listening, questioning, planning, problem solving, negotiating) to develop and adjust instructional and behavior plans based on student data and the coordination of expectations, responsibilities, and resources to maximize student learning. Support facilitation structures will be put in place for all grade levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Last year, we trained two primary classroom teachers and the ESE teachers in how to effectively provide support facilitation services. The outcomes for students in classrooms where the classroom teachers were trained alongside the ESE teachers were more positive than students who were in classes with teachers who had not been trained.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create a Support Facilitation Professional Learning Community 2. Teachers will be trained on the various structures for implementing Support Facilitation in the classroom. 3. Monthly PLC meetings will be held to analyze data and discuss successes/struggles in order to make instructional decisions for ESE students 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Laura Suprenard (laura.suprenard@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)

All students in grades 2-5 will attend STEAM lab once a week to Increase the amount enrichment opportunities for all students.

Targeted students in grade 2-5 will receive acceleration lessons in order to continue to close the achievement gap among student subgroups.

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Teachers will plan and facilitate opportunities for all students to utilize literacy strategies to write with evidence in response to complex texts across all content areas.	\$0.00
----------	---------------	--	---------------

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: In order to decrease the achievement gap, teachers will plan using standards-based lessons, Equitable Classroom Practices and frequent student monitoring in order to adjust instruction to meet the needs of all students.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00