

Orange County Public Schools

Stone Lakes Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	14
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Stone Lakes Elementary

15200 STONEYBROOK BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

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

Demographics

Principal: Andronidus Rollins

Start Date for this Principal: 1/6/2018

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	36%
2019-20 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%)
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	14
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Stone Lakes Elementary

15200 STONEYBROOK BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	34%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	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 ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rollins, Andrew	Principal	Student Achievement Student Safety Skyward Captain Student Observations Observations FTE Budget DPLC PTA/SAC Team PLCs Canvas Data Chats Staff Handbook Planners Hiring School Safety Threat Assessment Team Other duties as assigned
Plank, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Student Achievement Observations Behavior Facility Use Transportation School Inventory Team PLCs Intern Assignments Substitutes (no splitting) Eagle Cafe Threat Assessment Team Digital Training Data Chats PTA/SAC Attendance Custodial Safety Drills Inputting Drills Emergency Maps Emergency Folders Safe School Plan Club Supervisor Other duties as assigned Skyward Captain-RCs, PRs, Parent Access
Brock, Carol	Teacher, K-12	Student Achievement Tier 3 MTSS Resource Survey MTSS Class Visits MTSS Data Collection

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		MTSS Trainings MTSS Monitoring and Teacher Support FLKRS MTSS Resource Facilitator Other duties as assigned
Morris, Alison	School Counselor	
Nyffeler, Roberta	Other	Student Achievement ESE support IEP Meetings PD for ESE grading PD for Accommodations Gifted screening/Testing PD for Exec. Functioning FSAA Testing Coordinator ESY info management EPT mtg coordinator MTSS documentation Other duties as assigned
Benscoter, Jessica	Instructional Coach	Student Achievement Instructional Coach Skyward Captain 5th grade committee liaison PLC DPLC Committee Data Chats Planning Days Coaching Observations Threat Assessment Team 3rd gr Portfolio Instructional PD Skyward PD/trainings Progress Report/Report Cards Literacy Coaches Meetings Advanced Coaching/FCS Meetings Approval of Dates on Master Calendar Facebook Site (1 post per week minimum) MTSS Groups Tier III Groups Other duties as assigned SAC Curriculum-order, distribute
Pollard, Sara	Other	Student Achievement T3 Math Support STEM Coordinator

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Science Coaches Meetings PD for STEM Clubs PTA/SAC STEM Fair Science Nights Science Field Trips (in house) Other duties as assigned PMAs and BIFs for all grade levels
Scott, Natalie	Instructional Media	Student Achievement Team assigned to for PLCs- Kindergarten Media Classes Check in, Check out, Shelve all books Library Inventory AR Celebrations Eagle's Nest School Nominations AR goal makers (4) Keep track of AR Data Birthday books ENN broadcasts School Website Overhaul Facebook Administrator ELL Meetings Teach-In PIE coordinator Spirit Nights Media Center Trainings Digital Trainings Makerspace Textbook Inventory (2) Prop 4s summer laptops/ipads Summer library days (6) Book Fairs (2) Book It Local Author Visits- set up, permission slips, collect money, coordinate with teachers Celebrate Literacy Week SSYRA voting Laminating Keeping up with the downstairs computer lab ILL loans for unit & novel studies Facebook Site (1 post per week minimum) MTSS Tier 3 Groups Marquee- changed weekly Other duties as assigned

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 1/6/2018, Andronidus Rollins

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	36%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

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	55	92	110	129	119	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	641
Attendance below 90 percent	4	5	13	18	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/14/2020

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	
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	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	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	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	
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	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	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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				

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
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
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%	2

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%	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
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	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	64
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	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that 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?

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. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and 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.

Measurable Outcome: The ELA and Math learning gains combined for SWD will increase to 50% for the 2020-2021 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 Steps to Implement

1. Implement and utilize different progress monitoring tools to determine if SWD are making adequate progress.
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). This will be provided in class or in a small group setting. The goal is to provide the support in class.
4. Quarterly data chats with individual teachers (focus onSWD).

Person Responsible Jessica Benscoter (jessica.benscoter@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and 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%.

Measurable Outcome: 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: Andrew Rollins (andronidus.rollins@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 Steps to Implement

1. Implement and utilize different progress monitoring tools to determine if black students are making adequate progress.
2. Analyze common assessment data, Write Score Reading, Write Score writing, iReady data diagnostic and lesson pathways, LAFs FSA Mock Assessment data.
3. Revamp MTSS process and conduct monthly MTSS meetings (Tier 2 and Tier 3). This will be provided in class or in a small group setting. The goal is to provide the support in class.
4. Quarterly data chats with individual teachers (focus on our black students).

Person Responsible: Michelle Plank (michelle.plank@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our students have been out of school since March. Many of our families and students have experienced some extreme financial changes and some have experienced some mental health changes which could include trauma. This will have an impact on student behavior and on the academic achievement of students.

Measurable Outcome: For the 2020-2021 school year Stone Lakes Elementary will see a decrease in students with emotional needs. Data will be collected during the first nine weeks of school and analyzed throughout the year to observe if progress is being made.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Alison Morris (alison.morris@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Stone Lakes Elementary will implement the Sanford and Harmony SEL curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The SEL of students will have an impact on student behavior and on the academic achievement of students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Stone Lakes Elementary will utilize a school wide SEL program that will involve Guidance classroom visits.
2. Stone Lakes Elementary will implement the Sanford and Harmony SEL curriculum.

Person Responsible Alison Morris (alison.morris@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

We will address the learning gains for the lowest 25% following the same monitoring process as our black students and SWD.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the community and school culture.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$7,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	7200	100-Salaries	1771 - Stone Lakes Elementary	General Fund		\$3,500.00
			<i>Notes: Tutoring</i>			
	7200	590-Other Materials and Supplies	1771 - Stone Lakes Elementary	General Fund		\$3,500.00
			<i>Notes: Write Score or Other Progress Monitoring Tool</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American				\$7,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	7200	100-Salaries	1771 - Stone Lakes Elementary	General Fund		\$3,500.00
			<i>Notes: Tutoring</i>			
	7200	590-Other Materials and Supplies	1771 - Stone Lakes Elementary	General Fund		\$3,500.00
			<i>Notes: Write Score or Other Progress Monitoring Tool</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
					Total:	\$14,000.00