

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

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

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 profess 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.

PFEF Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEF), 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	
<i>Notes: Write Score Reading (3rd, 4th, and 5th) Write Score Writing (4th and 5th)</i>						
7200	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	1771 - Stone Lakes Elementary	General Fund		\$2,000.00	
<i>Notes: LAFs FSA Mock Assessments</i>						
7200	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	1771 - Stone Lakes Elementary	General Fund		\$1,000.00	
<i>Notes: Before/After School Tutoring</i>						
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	
<i>Notes: Before/After School Tutoring</i>						
7200	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	1771 - Stone Lakes Elementary	General Fund		\$2,000.00	
<i>Notes: MAFs FSA Mock Assessments</i>						

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
			<i>Notes: Before/After School Tutoring</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: SWD				\$0.00
					Total:	\$18,000.00