

Orange County Public Schools

Stone Lakes Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Stone Lakes Elementary

15200 STONEYBROOK BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

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

Demographics

Principal: Andronidus Rollins

Start Date for this Principal: 8/5/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-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) | 36% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (73%) 2015-16: A (68%) 2014-15: A (83%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| 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 | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Stone Lakes Elementary

15200 STONEYBROOK BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

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

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School KG-5 | No | 30% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 60% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B | A | A | 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 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 |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Rollins, Andrew | Principal | Observations, Budget, DPLC, PTA/SAC, Team PLCs, Canvas, MTSS, PTA/SAC, Print Services, Discipline 3rd-5th, Janitorial Staff, Data Chats, MTSS, ESE Procedures, Staff Handbook, Planners, Hiring, School Website, School Safety, Facebook Site |
| Plank, Michelle | Dean | Student Behavior, Instructional PD, ELL Trainings, Advanced Coaching/FCS Meetings, PIE, Teach-In, FLKRS, K-Second Instructional Coach/Testing, Data Chats, Canvas, ELL Resource Groups, Supply Purchasing, Approval of Dates, Testing iReady, Testing FSA, Literacy/Science Coaches Meetings. |
| Long, Kathy | Assistant Principal | Observations, Facility Use, Transportation, School Inventory, Team PLCs, Intern Assignments, Canvas, Field Trips/Approval of dates, Data Chats, Discipline K-2nd |
| Albright, Kristy | Instructional Coach | Coaching Observations, Curriculum (order, distribute), IMS Coordinator, Progress Book Coordinator, Testing-FSA, IREADY, Testing trainings, Standards Mastery, PMAs, Third Grade Portfolios, Good Cause, CFEs, Alt assessment CFEs, School Calendar, Literacy/Science Coaches Meetings, IMS Coordinator, Data Chats, Planning Days, Instructional PD, Gifted Testing Rostering, DPLC Committee, Advanced Coaching/FCS meetings, Third-Fifth Instructional, Coach/Testing, Canvas, Supply Purchasing, Approval of Dates, Professional Development Points, Recertification, Spelling Bee |

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 | 106 | 119 | 104 | 146 | 151 | 169 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 795 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 17 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |

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 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

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 | |
| 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)

80

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/5/2019

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 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 78% | 57% | 57% | 82% | 54% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 56% | 58% | 58% | 62% | 58% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 33% | 52% | 53% | 55% | 53% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 82% | 63% | 63% | 86% | 61% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 60% | 61% | 62% | 73% | 64% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 41% | 48% | 51% | 75% | 54% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 72% | 56% | 53% | 79% | 50% | 51% |

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 | 106 (0) | 119 (0) | 104 (0) | 146 (0) | 151 (0) | 169 (0) | 795 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 (3) | 5 (10) | 5 (5) | 6 (7) | 7 (12) | 7 (12) | 38 (49) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 1 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (0) | 2 (0) | 7 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 14 (1) | 17 (9) | 19 (18) | 50 (28) |

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 | 82% | 55% | 27% | 58% | 24% |
| | 2018 | 81% | 55% | 26% | 57% | 24% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 78% | 57% | 21% | 58% | 20% |
| | 2018 | 76% | 54% | 22% | 56% | 20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 67% | 54% | 13% | 56% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 72% | 55% | 17% | 55% | 17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -9% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 84% | 62% | 22% | 62% | 22% |
| | 2018 | 84% | 61% | 23% | 62% | 22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 86% | 63% | 23% | 64% | 22% |
| | 2018 | 85% | 62% | 23% | 62% | 23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 74% | 57% | 17% | 60% | 14% |
| | 2018 | 82% | 59% | 23% | 61% | 21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -11% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 70% | 54% | 16% | 53% | 17% |
| | 2018 | 75% | 53% | 22% | 55% | 20% |
| 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 30 | 19 | 14 | 28 | 29 | 14 | 25 | | | | |
| ELL | 46 | 41 | 31 | 71 | 63 | 61 | 69 | | | | |
| ASN | 92 | 66 | | 90 | 79 | | 88 | | | | |
| BLK | 56 | 48 | 33 | 64 | 36 | 10 | 36 | | | | |
| HSP | 74 | 51 | 31 | 75 | 54 | 42 | 61 | | | | |
| MUL | 75 | | | 92 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 82 | 57 | 31 | 89 | 62 | 46 | 82 | | | | |
| FRL | 65 | 48 | 32 | 67 | 46 | 36 | 56 | | | | |
| 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 22 | 29 | 26 | 39 | 46 | 42 | 15 | | | | |
| ELL | 59 | 51 | 52 | 76 | 65 | 69 | 69 | | | | |
| ASN | 91 | 66 | | 98 | 89 | | 100 | | | | |
| BLK | 65 | 48 | | 75 | 70 | | 75 | | | | |
| HSP | 74 | 61 | 44 | 77 | 60 | 52 | 69 | | | | |
| MUL | 84 | 46 | | 89 | 54 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 83 | 62 | 52 | 92 | 72 | 77 | 81 | | | | |
| FRL | 72 | 58 | 47 | 79 | 60 | 67 | 69 | | | | |
| 2017 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 | 26 | 31 | 26 | 37 | 54 | 55 | 21 | | | | |
| ELL | 65 | 52 | 46 | 73 | 73 | 71 | 45 | | | | |
| ASN | 82 | 65 | | 90 | 85 | | 75 | | | | |
| BLK | 70 | 52 | | 80 | 64 | 64 | 64 | | | | |
| HSP | 77 | 61 | 55 | 83 | 77 | 84 | 69 | | | | |
| MUL | 82 | 50 | | 88 | 83 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 87 | 65 | 63 | 88 | 68 | 64 | 87 | | | | |
| FRL | 68 | 50 | 53 | 75 | 70 | 69 | 58 | | | | |

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 | 62 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 74 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 496 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 23 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 57 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 83 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 40 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 57 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 84 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 64 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 53 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

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 performed the lowest was the ELA learning gains for the lowest 25%. The ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% was 33%. This was a 14% decline from the 2018-19 school year. However, the projection for the ELA lowest 25% was 55%. We utilized the IReady learning gain targets to progress monitor the lowest 25%. This was a 22% discrepancy.

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 biggest decline was our math learning gains for the lowest 25%. The math learning gains for the lowest 25% were 41% for the 2018-19 school year. The math learning gains for the lowest 25% was 65% for the 2018-19 school year. This was a 24% decline. However, the projection for the Math lowest 25% was 63%. We utilized the IReady learning gain targets to progress monitor the lowest 25%. This was a 22% discrepancy.

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 that had the biggest gap compared to the state average were the ELA learning gains for the lowest 25%. Our average was 33% and the state average was 53%. This is a 20% gap.

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

The data component that showed the biggest improvement was the ELA proficiency for our SWD. We increased by 8% to a proficiency rate of 30%. Although there was an increase in proficiency this is still an area of focus.

Processes were implemented to elicit a positive outcome for an improvement in student data which included the following: MTSS, tier 3 support, tutoring, data chats, data meetings.

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

Priority 1: The overall proficiency for ESE students.
Priority 2: The overall proficiency for Black students.

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

1. The Math learning gains for the lowest 25%.
2. The ELA learning gains for the lowest 25%.
3. The overall proficiency for ESE students.
4. The overall proficiency for Black students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| #1 | |
|---|--|
| Title | ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25% |
| Rationale | The ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% decreased to 33% for the 2018-19 school year. The ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% during the 2017-18 school year was 47%. This is a 14% decrease. The decrease occurred because the MTSS process needed to be enhanced and progress monitored more often to determine the effectiveness of the program. The projection for the ELA lowest 25% was 55%. We utilized the IReady learning gain targets to progress monitor the lowest 25%. This was a 22% discrepancy. This tool did not provide the accuracy needed to progress monitor the lowest 25% in ELA. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% will increase from 33% to 50% for the 2019-20 school year. This is a 17% increase. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Andrew Rollins (andronidus.rollins@ocps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Increase the progress monitoring of the subgroup with common assessments and standardized assessments. Also review and enhance the MTSS monitoring and documentation process. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Improving the progress monitoring will provide more frequent and accurate data related to each student. Research shows that a strong MTSS program yields an increase in student achievement. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement and utilize different progress monitoring tools 2. Analyze common assessment data, iReady data diagnostic and lesson pathways, Write Score Reading and writing data, LAFs standardized assessment data 3. Revamp MTSS process and conduct monthly MTSS meetings (Tier 2 and Tier 3) 4. Quarterly data chats with individual teachers (focus on the lowest 25%) |
| Person Responsible | Andrew Rollins (andronidus.rollins@ocps.net) |

| #2 | |
|---|--|
| Title | Math Learning Gains Lowest 25% |
| Rationale | The Math learning gains for the lowest 25% decreased to 41% for the 2018-19 school year. The Math learning gains for the lowest 25% during the 2017-18 school year was 65%. This is a 23% decrease. The decrease occurred because the MTSS process needed to be enhanced and progress monitored more often to determine the effectiveness of the program. The projection for the Math lowest 25% was 63%. We utilized the IReady learning gain targets to progress monitor the lowest 25%. This was a 22% discrepancy. This tool did not provide the accuracy needed to progress monitor the lowest 25% in Math. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The Math learning gains for the lowest 25% will increase from 41% to 55% for the 2019-20 school year. This is a 14% increase. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Kristy Albright (kristy.albright@ocps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Increase the progress monitoring of the identified subgroup with common assessments and FSA Mock assessments. Also review and enhance the MTSS monitoring and documentation process. This will include MTSS professional development opportunities for teachers. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Improving the progress monitoring will provide more frequent and accurate data related to each student. Research shows that a strong MTSS program yields an increase in student achievement. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement and utilize different progress monitoring tools 2. Analyze common assessment data, iReady data diagnostic and lesson pathways, MAFs FSA Mock Assessment data. 3. Revamp MTSS process and conduct monthly MTSS meetings (Tier 2 and Tier 3) 4. Quarterly data chats with individual teachers (focus on the lowest 25%) |
| Person Responsible | [no one identified] |

| #3 | |
|---|---|
| Title | Culturally Responsive Plan (Narrow Achievement Gaps)-ELA Proficiency-Black Students |
| Rationale | The ELA proficiency rate for black students was 56% for the 2018-19 school year. The overall school proficiency rate was 78%. The achievement gap is 22%. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The ELA proficiency rate for black students will increase from 56% to 70% for the 2018-19 school year. This is a 14% increase. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Michelle Plank (michelle.plank@ocps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Increase the progress monitoring of the identified subgroup with common assessments and FSA Mock assessments. Also review and enhance the MTSS monitoring and documentation process. This will include MTSS professional development opportunities for teachers. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Improving the progress monitoring will provide more frequent and accurate data related to each student. Research shows that a strong MTSS program yields an increase in student achievement. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement and utilize different progress monitoring tools 2. Analyze common assessment data, iReady data diagnostic and lesson pathways, Write Score Reading and writing data, LAFs FSA Mock Assessment data 3. Revamp MTSS process and conduct monthly MTSS meetings (Tier 2 and Tier 3) 4. Quarterly data chats with individual teachers (focus on black students). |
| Person Responsible | [no one identified] |

| #4 | |
|---|---|
| Title | SWD |
| Rationale | The ELA Math learning gains for SWD decreased from 29 % to 19% for the 2018-19 school year. This was a 10% decrease. The Math learning gains for SWD decreased from 46% to 29% for the 2018-19 school year. This is a 23% decrease. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The ELA and Math learning gains combined for SWD will increase to 50% for the 2019-20 school year. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Roberta Nyffeler (roberta.nyffeler@ocps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Increase the progress monitoring of the identified subgroup with common assessments and FSA Mock assessments. Also review and enhance the MTSS monitoring and documentation process. This will include MTSS professional development opportunities for teachers. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Improving the progress monitoring will provide more frequent and accurate data related to each student. Research shows that a strong MTSS program yields an increase in student achievement. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement and utilize different progress monitoring tools 2. Analyze common assessment data, iReady data diagnostic and lesson pathways, MAFs FSA Mock Assessment data. 3. Revamp MTSS process and conduct monthly MTSS meetings (Tier 2 and Tier 3) 4. Quarterly data chats with individual teachers (focus on the lowest 25%) |
| 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).

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, Â§ 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.

Positive relationships are built in a number of ways including 100% of classes will have assigned room parents. At monthly PTA and SAC meetings which are attended by the Principal, Assistant Principal and

other staff members, the school's mission, vision and overall student data are communicated. This communication leads to determining the needs that are to be identified in the school improvement plan and allow for stakeholders to work collaboratively to solve those needs. Additionally, an electronic Principal Newsletter is sent to all families, staff, and Partners in Education weekly.

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's guidance counselor and behavior specialist work closely with teachers and identified students who may need guidance lessons or mentoring for their social/emotional needs. The school's social worker and psychologist are also used as resources to support students and families outside of school. The guidance counselor also implements a weekly lunch bunch program, where grade level students with social/emotional needs work in small groups during lunch on problem-solving and discussing concerns that they may have in school or at home. In addition, our behavior specialist and guidance counselor work with small groups of students or individual classes to provide them with social skills lessons and build their skills for working with others.

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

FLKRS assessments will be given to all Kindergarten students within the first month of school. Teachers will use the results of both I-Ready and common standards-based assessments to facilitate small group instruction for enrichment as well as intervention. Results from this initial testing will also be shared with parents and SAC.

PTA will host a Kindergarten Question and Answer session in May and a week prior to the first day of school in August 2019. During this Q&A, parents will be welcomed to Stone Lakes and receive crucial information from Administration, Kindergarten teachers, PTA, SAC, First Fund and the ADDitions coordinator to start off the school year. Tips for helping their child be successful, daily schedules, ADDitions opportunities, safety, drop off and pick up procedures are given during the meeting. The parents will meet the Administrative team, get answers to their questions, and receive a welcome packet with the book "The Night before Kindergarten." Dr. Rollins, principal, will address the parents and impress upon them the importance of helping their students to read and think to become lifelong learners.

On the first day of school the PTA will host a "Coffee and Kisses" breakfast for Kindergarten parents to help them transition on the first day of school, network with other Kindergarten parents, and allow their student to adjust to being in the classroom. During this breakfast the parents will have a meet and greet with PTA and Administration. Parents also have the opportunity to ask additional questions.

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 school based MTSS leadership team will work collaboratively with classroom teachers of grade level teams to review and analyze universal screening data, diagnostic data, and progress monitoring data. Based on the information, the team will provide on-going job embedded professional development that addresses relevant areas essential to effective implementation of MTSS, fidelity of core instruction and interventions in all grades for improved student outcomes.

- With Tier I – Core Instruction in place along with the district 2019-2020-CRMs for reading and math, teachers continually identify and recommend students to the MTSS team.
- Using the problem solving process and root cause analysis, data information and dialogue, the team will identify students in need of additional academic and/or behavioral support (supplemental or intensive). An intervention plan identifying a student's specific area of deficiency and appropriate research based interventions to address these deficiencies for Tier II and III will be implemented and assessed.
- The MTSS leadership team will continually monitor the implementation of the Florida Standards and High Yield Learning Strategies into all grades across the curriculum and in ESE resource support classrooms. The team will work collaboratively to ensure funding for necessary resources and the intervention plan/materials are implemented with fidelity.
- Additional money will be used to provide tutoring to intervention students.

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

Teach-In will occur this year in November with a focus on increasing the awareness of a variety of careers to all K-5 students. Two curriculum/science family nights have been planned for the fall and spring of the 2019-2020 school year. During the spring of 2019, we will host Engineering Day through our PIE in fourth and fifth grade. Our PIE partnerships with Mathnasium, Lockheed Martin, UCF, along with NASA and other community partners will bring valuable STEM activities to our K-5 community. Fourth and fifth grade will also utilize components of the Project lead the Way program.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25% | | | | \$13,000.00 |
|---|----------|--|--|----------------|-----|-------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1771 - Stone Lakes Elementary | General Fund | | \$10,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Write Score Reading (3rd, 4th, and 5th) Write Score Writing (4th and 5th) | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1771 - Stone Lakes Elementary | General Fund | | \$2,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: LAFs FSA Mock Assessments | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1771 - Stone Lakes Elementary | General Fund | | \$1,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Before/After School Tutoring | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains Lowest 25% | | | | \$4,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1771 - Stone Lakes Elementary | General Fund | | \$2,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Before/After School Tutoring | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1771 - Stone Lakes Elementary | General Fund | | \$2,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: MAFs FSA Mock Assessments | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|----------|---|-------------------------------------|----------------|-----|------------|-------------|
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culturally Responsive Plan (Narrow Achievement Gaps)-ELA Proficiency-Black Students | | | | | \$1,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 | |
| | 7900 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1771 - Stone Lakes Elementary | | | \$1,000.00 | |
| | | | Notes: Before/After School Tutoring | | | | |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: SWD | | | | | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | | | | | \$18,000.00 |