
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lake Whitney Elementary

1351 WINDEMERE RD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

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

Demographics

Principal: Elizabeth Prince

Start Date for this Principal: 7/8/2019

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)	21%
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 (73%) 2017-18: A (73%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (66%)
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	N/A

* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lake Whitney Elementary

1351 WINDEMERE RD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<https://lakewestones.ocps.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)

21%

Primary Service Type
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

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

45%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

2018-19
A

2017-18
A

2016-17
A

2015-16
A

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 producers 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
Prince, Elizabeth	Principal	Duties include serving as instructional leader by providing teachers with a common vision based upon data-based decisions by promoting standards-based instruction in order to maximize student achievement.
Abel, Kristin	Instructional Coach	Duties include serving as Instructional coach for reading, MTSS, PLCs,, beginning teachers and student interns.
Dudek, Nancy	Instructional Media	Duties include serving as classroom coach for teachers to assist them with implementing rigorous reading and learning strategies.
Smirti, Kimberlee	Other	Duties include overseeing the implementation of the curriculum and assessments of students.
Durham, Tambi	Guidance Counselor	Duties include monitoring students mental and emotional health to ensure that students are ready for learning.

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	61	84	78	60	100	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	480
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	3	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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

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

40

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/28/2019

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	4	2	3	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	3	1	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	4	2	3	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	3	1	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	84%	57%	57%	83%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	58%	58%	67%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	52%	53%	53%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	86%	63%	63%	89%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	77%	61%	62%	76%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	48%	51%	63%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	83%	56%	53%	82%	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	61 (0)	84 (0)	78 (0)	60 (0)	100 (0)	97 (0)	480 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	6 (4)	5 (2)	3 (3)	3 (0)	3 (4)	2 (2)	22 (15)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (2)	0 (3)	0 (1)	1 (0)	2 (3)	2 (4)	5 (13)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (2)	8 (5)	9 (12)	23 (19)

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	88%	55%	33%	58%	30%
	2018	89%	55%	34%	57%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	57%	17%	58%	16%
	2018	79%	54%	25%	56%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
05	2019	86%	54%	32%	56%	30%
	2018	76%	55%	21%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	87%	62%	25%	62%	25%
	2018	89%	61%	28%	62%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	86%	63%	23%	64%	22%
	2018	87%	62%	25%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	84%	57%	27%	60%	24%
	2018	80%	59%	21%	61%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	83%	54%	29%	53%	30%
	2018	76%	53%	23%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
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	61	71		45	62		50				
ELL	61	73		78	73						
ASN	89	56		95	100		85				
BLK	60	60	50	67	65		50				
HSP	86	77	58	82	69		93				
WHT	87	70	44	89	77	74	88				
FRL	78	70	60	82	82	64	70				

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	55	50	36	59	59	50					
ASN	92	68		100	79						
BLK	68	54		74	57						
HSP	67	53	33	77	79	64	82				
WHT	88	74	64	91	77	69	82				
FRL	65	45	22	75	65	52	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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	100
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	611
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	77
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	85
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	59
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	78
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	76
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	72
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

ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% continues to be of concern with a 50% proficiency level. This is a re-occurring trend with ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% scoring at 53% in 2018 and 56% in 2017. A contributing factor is the lack of differentiation in ELA instruction in fourth and fifth grades.

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

ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% with a proficiency level of 50% showed the greatest decline of three percentage points from 56% proficiency level in 2018.

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

Our school grade components scored higher than the state average in all areas. However, in ELA learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile, the gap between Lake Whitney and the state was only three percentage points. Overall proficiency levels in ELA were at 84% while the state was at 56%.

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

Math learning gains showed the most improvement in the 2019 assessment period by increasing two percentage points from 76% proficient in 2018 to 78% in 2019. We offered a competitive math team that was comprised of third through fifth grade students.

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

Lake Whitney had one third grade student, 2 fourth grade students, and 2 fifth grade students with two or more EWS. These students were ESE for reading and math, and free and reduced lunch. Our concern is the lack of proficiency or gains for these students.

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

1. ELA learning gains for the lowest 25%
2. ELA learning gains for all students
3. Math learning gains for the lowest 25%
4. Our ESE and free and reduced lunch students did not show as much growth as we had hoped

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase math learning gains. [Division Priority - Narrow Achievement Gaps] The learning gains for Math dropped in 2018 compared to 2017 in the student
Rationale	subgroups of SWD and Free and Reduced Lunch as indicated below: SWD: 65% to 59% SWD Lowest 25%: 60% to 50% Free and Reduced Lunch: 68% to 65% Free and Reduced Lunch Lowest 25%: 53% to 52%
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By targeting the specific needs of our students, overall student achievement will increase, as well as student achievement for SWD and Free and Reduced Lunch. We will improve the FSA Math learning gains of our students as follows: SWD: 59% to 62% SWD Lowest 25%: 50% to 53% Free and Reduced Lunch: 65% to 63% Free and Reduced Lunch Lowest 25%: 52% to 55%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kristin Abel (kristin.abel@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	The Multi-Tiered Student Support (MTSS) process will be monitored by the leadership team to ensure fidelity. Student data will be analyzed to determine appropriate interventions and support.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	MTSS helps improve the performance of students by identifying needs early and modifying instruction in a timely manner in order to close the achievement gap of struggling students. In order for all students to succeed, instruction often needs to be differentiated to target specific needs. It is important that the MTSS process is a priority so there is a clear understanding of expectations and implementation.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regularly conduct data meetings to review MTSS graphs along with formative assessments, iReady growth monitoring, iReady diagnostic scores, and FSA data. 2. We will conduct data chats with teachers and collect graphs of student performance. 3. We will analyze student data and monitor student progress according to MTSS tiers (Tier 1, 2, 3.) 4. The principal will review requested lesson plans. 5. The leadership team will conduct classroom observations to look for differentiated instruction opportunities to meet the needs of all students.
Person Responsible	Elizabeth Prince (elizabeth.prince@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Increase learning gains in ELA lowest quartile and reduce the achievement gap for black students, Hispanic students, and students with disabilities (SWD). (Division Priority Accelerate Student Performance)
Rationale	The learning gains for ELA dropped in 2019 compared to 2018 in the student subgroups of Black, Hispanic, and ESE.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan on seeing an increase in ELA learning gains for our lowest quartile from 50% proficiency to 53% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Elizabeth Prince (elizabeth.prince@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will use collaborative lesson planning to focus on standards based instruction and implement close reading strategies (through DPLC) to improve teacher proficiency and student achievement. Members of the leadership team will monitor grade level PLC meetings for fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Making sure that students understand the meaning behind content is at the root of text dependent analysis. Students need to have the ability to synthesize content. Students who have experience with text complexity and text dependent analysis are more apt to be successful in their learning.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will be provided additional provided additional time to plan culturally responsive lessons in their PLCs as well as DPLC. 2. Teachers will choose culturally diverse text and deliberate questioning techniques when planning standards-based lessons and units. 3. Teachers will be provided additional time to create formative assessments in their PLCs. 4. Teachers will analyze student performance on common assessments to determine student progress toward grade level standards. 5. Teachers will determine appropriate differentiated activities based upon common assessments. 6. Teachers will monitor progress of students regularly.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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)